

FINAL

## Public Scoping Report

Summary of Public Scoping Comments  
for Transportation Management Plan  
and Environmental Assessment



# *Cumberland Island National Seashore*



07036\_002\_NEPA

By:  
Hartrampf, Inc.  
7000 Central Parkway Suite 1475  
Atlanta, Georgia 30328

Jordon, Jones & Goulding, Inc.  
6801 Governors Lake Parkway  
Norcross, Georgia 30071

## CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION .....	2
1.1 Park Purpose and Significance.....	2
1.2 Cumberland Island National Seashore.....	2
1.3 Legislative Intent .....	3
1.4 Purpose.....	3
1.5 Significance.....	4
1.6 Mission Statement.....	4
2 BACKGROUND .....	5
2.1 NPS Organic Act and Management Policies .....	5
2.2 Overview of NPS Regulations and Policies Governing Transportation and Concessions ...	6
2.3 Status of Transportation Management and Concession Operations at the Park .....	7
3 SCOPING PROCESS .....	10
3.1 Approach.....	10
3.2 Scoping Participation .....	10
3.3 Public Scoping Meeting.....	11
Table 3.1 Public Comment Submission Method .....	10
4 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS .....	12
Table 4.1 Summary of TMP Support.....	12
5 FURTHER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT .....	15
APPENDIX A – Detailed Comment Summary .....	16
APPENDIX B - Materials from Public Scoping Meeting .....	18
Welcome Letter.....	20
Project Description.....	21
Public Information Open House Comment Card.....	23
Photos.....	24

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS  
FOR THE CUMBERLAND ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE  
TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**1 INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Park Purpose and Significance**

National Park System (NPS) units were established by Congress to fulfill specified purposes based on each area's unique and "significant" resources. A park's purpose, as established by Congress, is the fundamental building block for decisions to conserve resources while providing for "enjoyment of future generations."

The following was explored with NPS staff: Why was the unit established as a park? What resources did Congress recognize as needing NPS protection? What purpose, mission, and objectives must be fulfilled by each NPS unit? After an impact analysis is completed on the alternatives, the purpose of the park, as defined by its enabling legislation, will be revisited to ensure that the alternatives are consistent with the purpose.

The Strategic Plan and/or General Management Plan for the NPS units summarize purpose and significance as well as broad mission goals for the future. These statements were reviewed with the NPS and are presented in this section.

In addition, the park's enabling legislation, purpose, and management objectives are all linked to the impairment findings that are made in the NEPA process (see NPS Management Policies 2006, sec. 1.4.5).

**1.2 Cumberland Island National Seashore**

Cumberland Island was designated a part of the National Park System because of its spectacular environmental features including almost 17 miles of beach, a maritime forest, rich estuaries, and abundant wildlife. Cumberland Island is approximately 17.5 miles long 3 miles wide at its widest point. It is located south of Jekyll Island and north of Amelia Island, Florida. The island is composed of two areas: Little Cumberland and Great Cumberland. Great Cumberland is the southern portion of the Cumberland Island National Seashore (CUIS) administered by the NPS. Cumberland Island National Seashore encompasses approximately

40,500 acres. While the NPS does not administer the northern portion, Little Cumberland, it is included in the boundary of CUIS.

The Island's undeveloped natural areas attract recreation enthusiasts for activities such as swimming, fishing, hiking, and beachcombing. Significant archaeological artifacts such as the shell heaps on the island are evidence of the existence of villages during the archaic period 5,000 to 10,000 years ago. Evidence of human burial in sand mounds also indicates pre-historic Native American occupation of the Island. Other artifacts from the colonial times, the plantation era, and to the present day have added to the historical significance of the island.

### **1.3 Legislative Intent**

Cumberland Island National Seashore was established by Congress as a unit of the National Park System in the Act of October 23, 1972 (Public Law 92-536, codified at 16 U.S.C. 459i *et seq.*). The purpose of the park, as stated in Section 1 of the aforementioned act, is "to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of certain significant shoreline lands and waters of the United States and to preserve related scenic, scientific, and historical values." On September 8, 1982, much of the northern half of CUIS was designated as wilderness or potential wilderness to be managed as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System (Public Law 97-250, 16 U.S.C. 1131 *et seq.*).

### **1.4 Purpose**

The purpose of Cumberland Island National Seashore is stated in guidance documents, such as the General Management Plan, and includes the following:

- Protect and enhance the natural and recreational values of the park;
- Protect and preserve the cultural resources on the island;
- Provide safe and reasonable access from the mainland to the island and circulation on the island that minimizes damage to the environment;
- Provide interpretive opportunities of the unique environmental and historical features of the island;
- Ensure the establishment of developments and services necessary to acquaint visitors with the resources of the island and locate and implement them in a way that is compatible with the environment;

### **1.5 Significance**

The significance of Cumberland Island National Seashore is reflected in the following statements as presented in the General Management Plan for the unit:

- Outdoor public recreation opportunities including swimming, sunbathing, and exploring the beach;
- Unique topography of a mostly undeveloped barrier island with high dunes on the ocean side transitioning to a maritime forest which often drops abruptly to the marshes on the western side of the island;
- The island has a large variety of wildlife and plant communities. More than 300 species of birds have been identified on the island. The island also provides feeding, resting, and nesting areas for many of these species.
- Provides habitat for several protected species including the loggerhead turtle, piping plover, and bald eagle;
- High scenic value;
- Excellent opportunities for solitude and relaxation;
- Potential inspirational place for artisans including writers, photographers, painters, etc;
- Contains several significant cultural resources including historic and archaeological sites that have been determined eligible for the National Register. For example:
  - Slave settlements
  - Native American sites and artifacts more than 4,000 years old
  - Plantation-era structures and agricultural sites
  - The Half-Moon Bluff African-American community, High Point Hotel, and other structures
- Provides multiple opportunities for the public to learn about the unique history of the early settlement of America;
- Contains many unique environmental sites for research, study, observation, and interpretation;

### **1.6 Mission Statement**

As stated in the *Final General Management Plan* (CUIS), the purpose and significance of CUIS has been translated into the following Mission Statement:



Cumberland Island National Seashore is dedicated to preserving the island's primitive character, natural processes, and the natural, cultural, historic and wilderness resources, while offering visitors a feeling of isolation and wonder, and an opportunity to understand, learn about, and appreciate this island paradise.

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 NPS Organic Act and Management Policies

In 1916, Congress exercised its power under the Property Clause of the United States Constitution (Article IV, Paragraph 3, Clause 2) and passed the NPS Organic Act (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] §1 et seq.). The Organic Act directed the NPS to “promote and regulate” units of the National Park System “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” (16 U.S.C. §1) Congress reiterated this mandate in the General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. §1a-1) by stating that the protection, management, and administration of such units “shall be conducted in light of the high public value and integrity of the National Park System and shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress.” Finally, Congress further authorized the Secretary of the Interior to “make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the use of the parks...” (16 U.S.C. §3)

Despite these mandates, the Organic Act and its amendments afford the NPS latitude when making resource decisions that balance visitor recreation and resource preservation. By these acts, Congress “empowered [the National Park Service] with the authority to determine what uses of park resources are proper and what proportion of the parks resources are available for each use” (*Bicycle Trails Council of Marin v. Babbitt*, 82 F.3d 1445, 1453 (9th Cir. 1996)).

Nevertheless, courts have consistently interpreted the Organic Act and its amendments to elevate resource conservation above visitor recreation. *Michigan United Conservation Clubs v. Lujan*, 949 F.2d 202, 206 (6th Cir. 1991) states, “Congress placed specific emphasis on conservation.” The *National Rifle Ass’n of America v. Potter*, 628 F.Supp. 903, 909 (D.D.C. 1986) states, “In the Organic Act Congress speaks of but a single purpose, namely,

conservation.” The NPS *Management Policies* also recognize that resource conservation takes precedence over visitor recreation. The policy dictates “when there is a conflict between conserving resources and values and providing for enjoyment of them, conservation is to be predominant” (NPS *Management Policies* 2006, sec. 1.4.3).

Because conservation remains predominant, the NPS seeks to avoid or to minimize adverse impacts on park resources and values. The NPS has discretion to allow negative impacts when necessary and appropriate to fulfill the purposes of a park (NPS *Management Policies* 2006, sec. 1.4.3). However, while some actions and activities cause impacts, the NPS cannot allow an adverse impact that constitutes a resource or value impairment (*Management Policies*, sec. 1.4.3). The Organic Act prohibits actions that permanently impair park resources unless a law directly and specifically allows for the acts (16 U.S.C. §1 a-1). An action constitutes an impairment when its impacts “harm the integrity of park resources or values, including the opportunities that otherwise would be present for the enjoyment of those resources or values” (*Management Policies*, sec. 1.4.5). To determine impairment, the NPS must evaluate “the particular resources and values that would be affected; the severity, duration, and timing of the impact; the direct and indirect effects of the impact; and the cumulative effects of the impact in question and other impacts” (*Management Policies*, sec. 1.4.5).

## **2.2 Overview of NPS Regulations and Policies Governing Transportation and Concessions**

The National Park Service, as an entity of the federal government, has the authority to regulate access to resources in units of the National Park System, including CUIS. The authority to manage and protect federal property arises from the Property Clause of the United States Constitution, which provides that “Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States...” (United States Constitution, Article IV, Paragraph 3, Clause 2). Congress’ power over federally-owned lands is without limitations, and extends to conduct that occurs on or off federal land that affects federal lands. Courts have consistently upheld Congress’ broad delegation of authority to federal land managing agencies under the Property Clause in a variety of contexts.

Pursuant to the authority delegated in the NPS Organic Act at 16 U.S.C §3, the Secretary of the Interior promulgated regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 4 to provide a system-wide regulatory framework that governs use of vehicles and traffic, and Part 51 dealing with concessions in NPS units. The purposes of the regulations are to set

standards for operation of motor vehicles on park roads and designated routes and to handle concession contracts for the provision of visitor services in park areas. The regulations fall within the broad scope of authority granted to the NPS from Congress under the NPS Organic Act, authority that includes the power to regulate conduct that occurs on or off federal land that may affect federal lands. The regulations are designed to control conduct associated with vehicle usage and concessions contracts on federal land to avoid or minimize harm to park resources and values.

Because the CUIS Transportation Management Plan (TMP) has the potential to cause adverse impacts to the environment, the NPS is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate these potential impacts. The EA would evaluate various build alternatives and a no-action alternative. A public scoping meeting was held on August 22, 2006, to obtain comments and input from the public and other interested parties. The specific details and approach for the public scoping are described in greater detail below.

### **2.3 Status of Transportation Management and Concession Operations at the Park**

There are currently no concession operators on Cumberland island. The only concession associated with the park is the ferry operator that transports visitors to the island and provides bicycle rentals at Sea Camp. There are also no stores on the island, so visitors must bring their own food, beverages, sunscreen, and other necessities. Private boaters may dock at Sea Camp or Plum Orchard. Overnight boaters must anchor offshore.

The ferry runs seven days a week from March through November. From December through February, it operates five days a week. There is no ferry service Tuesday and Wednesday, December through February. A special tour to Plum Orchard Mansion is also offered on the second and fourth Sunday of each month. The ferry has a capacity of 149 persons, and reservations are strongly recommended and may be made six months in advance. Reservations can be made by phone Monday - Friday (10:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.). There is currently no on-line option for making reservations.

The ferry is \$17 per adult, \$15 per senior citizens (65 and over), and \$12 for children (12 years and under). The concessionary also collects the park Day Use Fee of \$4 per person (annual Day Use Pass \$20 per person) and the campground fees. All campgrounds including Sea Camp Campground and Back Country Camping are \$4 per person per day.



The principal purpose of the Transportation Management Plan and Environmental Assessment (TMP/EA) is to identify and assess alternatives for initiating motorized tours to the north end of Cumberland Island. However, the plan should also address visitor transportation over the entire island including such high visitor-use areas as the island docks, the Dungeness Ruins, Sea Camp, Stafford, and Plum Orchard. The island is traversed from north to south by a single principal roadway, a narrow, dirt track known as the Main Road. Various shorter dirt tracks radiate from the Main Road, principally on the southern half of the island. The Main Road extends from the Dungeness Mansion ruins on the island's south end to the Cumberland Wharf ruins on the north end, a distance of approximately 14 miles. Until 2004, a large part of the Main Road was included in the park's designated wilderness area. Only island residents having a pre-existing legal right to do so could drive on this portion of the Main Road. The NPS was prevented from using motorized vehicles on this portion of the road for routine patrols or most maintenance activities.

Until recently, NPS offered motorized tours to areas on the north end of the island once a month by "piggybacking" these tours onto regularly-scheduled maintenance reconnaissance trips. Sites of principal interest on the tours included the Plum Orchard mansion and an historic African-American community known as The Settlement. The piggyback tours passed through designated wilderness on the Main Road. These tours generated a good deal of controversy. Some argued that the tours violated the Wilderness Act, and others argued that the tours were an authorized and appropriate activity. Over time, a number of people began to suggest that including the Main Road in Wilderness hindered visitor access to cultural resources on the north end of the island.

In response to these concerns, Congress included language in Public Law 108-447 (2004) removing the road corridor for the Main Road and two side roads (North Cut Road and the Plum Orchard Spur) from Wilderness. The result of this change was to clearly allow NPS and Greyfield Inn (a private landowner within the National Seashore) to provide motorized tours to the north end of the island. (Greyfield Inn must obtain a permit from NPS to conduct its tours.) In addition, this statute directed the Seashore to develop a plan for managing visitor access to the north end. Specifically, the statute directed NPS to:

complete a management plan to ensure that not more than 8 and not less than 5 round trips are made available daily on the Main Road north of the Plum Orchard Spur and the

North Cut Road by the National Park Service or a concessionaire for the purpose of transporting visitors to and from the historic sites located adjacent to [the CUIS] Wilderness.

It should be noted that it is possible to make a single round trip to the north end of the island between 10:00 a.m. (the time the ferry drops visitors off on the island) and 2:45 p.m. (the first ferry trip back to the mainland [note: this ferry pickup is only available March 1 to September 30]). However, such a trip is reported to be somewhat rushed and does not leave time for tours of Plum Orchard Mansion or lingering at other sites. The second and last ferry trip back to the mainland is at 4:45 p.m.

The purpose of this project is to develop a transportation management plan for CUIS. The plan shall have as its principal focus the management of access to the north end of the island consistent with the foregoing statute, the park's mission, and its enabling legislation. However, the plan shall also cover all other developed visitor use areas on the island. Among other issues, the transportation plan shall address travel routes, travel schedules, vehicle types, number of trips, and entities authorized to conduct tours (e.g. NPS, a contractor operating pursuant to a service contract, holders of special use permits, concessionaires). In particular, the plan shall include a feasibility study to determine whether a concession operation for transporting visitors on the island is both (a) necessary and appropriate, and (b) economically feasible. Because most of the north half of the Seashore is congressionally-designated Wilderness, it is imperative that the motorized transport of visitors through this area be compatible with Wilderness values to the greatest extent possible. The environmental assessment for this project will analyze the environmental consequences of implementing the proposed transportation plan.

### **3 SCOPING PROCESS**

#### **3.1 Approach**

A scoping brochure was composed to outline the preparation of the environmental assessment, give details about the legislation and proposed transportation management plan, and advertise the opportunity for public participation through a public scoping meeting. The scoping brochure was mailed to approximately 115 entities that were identified by the NPS as known stakeholders. Additional copies of the brochures were put in public places in St. Marys and NPS offices in Atlanta. The scoping brochure was also made available electronically through the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) web site (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov>).

The NPS conducted scoping for the EA from August 1 to September 15, 2006. These dates reflect the extended scoping period resulting from a high level of public interest in this project. During that period, the NPS invited the public and interested parties to provide comments on the scope of the proposed TMP. This report presents a summary of the comments that were received during the scoping period for consideration in preparing the draft EA. It does not present each individual comment received, nor does it present responses to the comments, conclusion, or decisions related to the content of the scoping comments. The scoping brochure identified three methods by which the public could submit comments or suggestions to the NPS:

- The Public Scoping Meeting (August 22, 2006)
- Traditional Mail Delivery
- Electronically via the PEPC web site

During the scoping period, comments were received through the methods noted above and also by email directly to NPS staff and facsimile transmission (fax). The NPS accepted multiple ways to communicate about issues and submit comments in order to encourage maximum participation. All comments, regardless of how they were submitted, will receive equal consideration in the preparation of the draft EA.

#### **3.2 Scoping Participation**

A total of approximately 2,227 individuals and organizations provided comments on the scope of the EA. The majority of the comments were from individual citizens. In addition, comments were also received from organizations such as The Nature Conservancy Georgia

Chapter, Amelia Island Tourist Development Council, National Trust for Historic Preservation Southern Office, Little Cumberland Island Homes Association, Inc., The Cumberland Island Conservancy, Inc., and Garden Club of America. Comment documents were submitted from national and international locations, however, the majority were submitted by residents of Georgia.

The electronic methods of comment submittal were the most popular, with 1,924 (86%) being submitted via the NPS PEPC web site or through email. Of the comments submitted electronically, 1,381 were submitted via the NPS PEPC web site. The other 543 were emailed directly to park staff. Thirteen percent (13%), or 284, of the total comments were received in the mail or via fax. Most of the comments submitted in this manner were standard form letters. Finally, the public scoping meeting on August 22<sup>nd</sup> generated nineteen (19) comment forms, or 1%, of the comments that were received during the public scoping period. This data is summarized in Table 3.1 below:

TABLE 3.1  
PUBLIC COMMENT SUBMISSION METHOD

COMMENT METHOD	NUMBER RECEIVED
PEPC Online	1,381
Email to NPS staff	543
Mail or Fax	284
Public Meeting Comment Forms	19
TOTAL	2,227

### 3.3 Public Scoping Meeting

A total of 45 attendees were present at the August 22<sup>nd</sup> public scoping meeting in Kingsland, Georgia, at the Camden County Recreation Center from 5:30-7:30 PM. Displays at the meeting included three maps of the island showing possible transportation routes, historic landmarks, and the newly-legislated Wilderness boundaries, a drawing of a conceptual section of the main road, and a chart showing proposed transportation mode alternatives. Additionally, a PowerPoint presentation was shown on a loop during the meeting that contained photos of various locations on the island. Handout materials distributed to each attendee during the

meeting included a welcome letter, project description, a CUIS brochure, and a comment card. See Appendix B for a sample of handouts and photos from the meeting.

#### **4 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS**

The following summarizes the categories of issues presented in the comments received during the scoping period. The summary does not evaluate the comments, nor does it determine or indicate which comments are viewed as being within or outside the scope of the EA. Inclusion of an issue is for the record only and does not imply that the comment will be addressed in the Draft EA. The wording is intended to categorize and summarize the substance of the comments, not to reproduce the exact wording of individual comments. There is a wide range of interest in and opinions about the CUIS Transportation Management Plan (TMP)/EA, and the comments summarized in each category illustrate the varied, and, at times, contradictory issues, concerns, and desired future conditions expressed by individuals, organizations, industry, and public agencies.

**General Environmental Impacts:** Commentors expressed concern that the implementation of the CUIS transportation management plan could result in a variety of environmental impacts and requested that consideration of the impacts factor into the alternative selection. Concerns included impacts to aquatic and terrestrial wildlife; impacts to areas of high biological importance, such as maritime forest and marsh land; habitat fragmentation; reductions in air quality; visual impacts; soundscape impacts; and impacts to recreation. Many commentors placed an emphasis on maintaining the pristine and unique beauty of the island. Some expressed concern that increased access to the northern end of the island would adversely affect the environment.

**EA Alternatives/ General Transportation Management Plan Alternatives:** Comments that both supported and opposed the CUIS TMP were received. Of the 2,227 comments, 306 (14%) expressed support for the TMP. An additional 881 (40%) were against the TMP and supported the no-action alternative. In some cases, commentors against the TMP provided additional direction about the plan should the no-action alternative become unfeasible. Of the remaining comments, 917 (41%) expressed conditional support and 123 (5%) were uncommitted.

Additionally, some commentors advocated implementation of only the minimum required by PL 108-447. Specific comments about the TMP generally fell into one of the alternative categories outlined in the Public Scoping Brochure: tour operations, route, type of vehicle (mode), visitor access, and support facilities.

TABLE 4.1  
SUMMARY OF TMP SUPPORT

COMMENT TYPE	NUMBER RECEIVED	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Supports TMP	306	14%
Against TMP	881	40%
Conditional Support	917	41%
Uncommitted	123	5%
TOTAL	2,227	100%

**Tour Operation:** A majority of commentors stated that no private contractors should be used to conduct tours on the island. Some further explained their concerns that a private contractor would prioritize profit over protection of the island's natural resources. A smaller number of the commentors supported the use of private contractors. These individuals felt that the NPS would be burdened by the additional responsibility of supervising, planning, and conducting tours. Some comments stated that the fee charged for the tours should make them self-sustaining, and others suggested the actual dollar amount. Commentors expressed concern with allowing one-way drop-offs for tourists.

There were also divided opinions about the merit of guided tours versus self-guided/no tours. Those favoring guided tours liked the educational and interpretive opportunities provided by a tour guide. Additionally, supporters of this option felt that guided tours can give structure which would prevent unauthorized access to environmentally-sensitive areas. Those in favor of self-guided/no tours expressed concern about tour guides impacting the island's soundscape. Others did not feel guided tours were necessary. Some supported the development of a tour brochure in different languages to provide limited guidance.

Finally, commentors felt that the mandated 5-8 daily round trips were excessive. Alternate proposals for the frequency of round trips ranged from 1 – 4 and occasionally included

expanding the time frame from daily to monthly or annually. The inclusion of tours offered by Greyfield Inn was also suggested as a way to reach the mandated 5 – 8 daily round trips.

**Route:** For comments related to route, the most common comment was against beach driving. Other common feedback regarding route included a preference for additional ferry routes/docks and using only the main road. Some specified that no modification should be made to the Main Road should it be selected as part of the route. Less common suggestions included visiting historic resources only, limiting access to the North end, preventing one way drop-offs, bicycle paths, and driving on the beach or dunes. Some commentors provided specific geographic suggestions regarding route and identified properties and trails upon which to focus.

**Mode:** Commentors provided a number of suggestions regarding transportation mode. Commentors were both for and opposed to the use of buses, SUVs or other gasoline powered vehicles. However, commentors opposed to the use of gasoline powered vehicles outweighed those in favor by 13: 1. Support for electric vehicles was given almost as often as people expressed their opposition to gasoline powered vehicles. Additional suggestions regarding vehicle features were: alternative fuel, hybrid (gasoline and electric), handicapped accessibility, solar power, or camper buses similar to those used at Denali National Park. Other comments suggested specific types of transportation such as Rhodes Cars, Hoverrounds, or Century Transportation Personal Transporters vehicles. Expanding beyond vehicles only, other transportation alternatives mentioned were horse/horse and buggy tours, bicycles, segways, sky lifts, a tram with open cars, electric carts, pedal-powered carts, slow-bottomed kayaks, limited flights to the north end, rickshaws, pedicabs, a farm tractor pulling a trolley with benches, bicycle drawn carriages, and covered, yet open air, jitneys/trams.

**Support Facilities:** Commentors discussed support facilities but did not come to a consensus regarding necessity or location. A significant number of comments specifically stated that there should be no paving, though a smaller number of comments supported paving. Some commentors wanted expanded support facilities such as an operation center for initiating tours. Others only wanted the minimum number of facilities, such as a few restrooms, or minor structures for interpretive opportunities. Another group did not support the addition of any support facilities and instead suggested only the use of currently existing structures. There was



no support for food vending on the island and some stated their opposition to food sales. One commentor suggested a Marine Rescue Facility with tours from mainland.

**Other Issues:** A few commentors mentioned specifics of the NEPA process as it related to the legislation and Draft EA. A greater number of individuals expressed their interest in keeping the 300-person limit on the number of visitors on the island. In contrast, a few comments expressed a desire to have the 300-person limit raised, though none wanted it removed.

A numerical summary of items most commonly identified by commentors is provided in Appendix A. Comments that present an opposing viewpoint are also included, though the number of individuals making that statement may be low.

## **5 FURTHER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Additional opportunities for public involvement will be provided during the preparation of the Transportation Management Plan Draft EA. The next public review and comment period, which will be at least 45 days in length and will include a public hearing, would begin upon publication of the Draft EA, anticipated for the summer of 2007.

The NPS appreciates the participation and comments by the public and by organizations during the scoping process and welcomes their continued participation at the next stage in the EA process. Please continue to access the NPS web site (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov>) for upcoming details regarding the Draft EA and future opportunities for additional public participation.

## APPENDIX A

---

### *Detailed Comment Summary*

## DETAILED COMMENT SUMMARY

### **GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
Preservation	736	33%
Concerns about Pollution	39	2%

### **EA ALTERNATIVES/ GENERAL TMP ALTERNATIVES**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
No Action Alternative	881	40%
Do the Minimum Required	647	29%

### **TOUR OPERATION**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
Guided Tours	278	13%
Originate from Sea Camp or Dungeness	228	10%
No Private Contractors	85	4%
No Guided Tours	40	2%
5-8 Tours is too many	36	2%
Use Private Contractors	6	< 1%

### **ROUTE**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
No Beach Driving	296	13%
No One Way Drop-offs	234	11%
Boat/ Dock Preference	39	2%
Use Main Road Only	31	1%
Limited access to the North End	12	< 1%
Historic Resources Only	10	< 1%
Beach Driving	6	< 1%

**MODE**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
Electric/ Hybrid Vehicles	357	16%
No Buses or Gas Vehicles	160	7%
Horse Tours	19	< 1%
Use Buses or Gas Vehicles	12	< 1%

**SUPPORT FACILITIES**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
No new structures or facilities	239	11%
No Paving	58	3%
Minor structures for interpretive opportunities	3	< 1%

**OTHER ISSUES**

	Number of Comments	Percentage of Total Comments
Keep 300 person limit	59	3%

## **APPENDIX B**

---

*Materials from Public Scoping Meeting*

*National Park Service*  
*US Department of the Interior*



August 22, 2006

Thank you for attending the public information open house for the proposed Cumberland Island National Seashore North End Access & Transportation Management Plan. In this handout package you will find a **project description**, **scoping brochure** (with location map) and a **comment card**. To make the most of your visit, please take a minute to read the following suggestions for your participation.

**Gather Information:**

There are educational displays that showcase different aspects of the project. Poster-size maps show various project elements, including support facility locations and potential routes to the north end of the island. You will also see displays of the typical cross section of the route on the Main Road, and potential vehicle types. National Park Service (NPS) representatives, who can be identified by their name tags, are available to discuss the project and answer your questions. Please take this opportunity to discuss the project with a NPS representative. There will be no formal presentation.

**Comment:**

All comments will be made a part of the project record. We hope you will take advantage of one of the following opportunities to let the NPS know your view of the proposal.

- There are two ways for you to submit a comment card
  - deposit it into the box provided here
  - send in written comments about the project until Friday, September 1, 2006. Written comments should be sent to Mr. John Fry, National Park Service, P.O. Box 806, St. Marys, GA 31558
- Comments can also be made via the web at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/>. Click on **Plans/ Documents Open for Public Comment** near the bottom of the page.

Again, thank you for attending this public information open house and for giving us your comments.

Sincerely,

Jerre Brumbelow  
Park Superintendent

JB/jf/kl  
Attachments

# **National Park Service**

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **Cumberland Island National Seashore Transportation Management Plan**

Historically, public access to the Cumberland Island National Seashore (CUIS) has been restricted due to several factors. First, the island can only be reached by ferry and it has no paved roads. Additionally, the general management plan for the park limits visitation to approximately 300 persons per day. Once on the island, visitors travel mainly by foot or bicycle, which keeps most visitors on the southern end of the island. Until 2004, a large part of the Main Road was included in the Park's designated wilderness area. This designation prevented the NPS from using motorized vehicles on this portion of road for routine patrols, maintenance or other operations.

In 2004, Congress took action to provide better Seashore access to the NPS and remedy citizens' concerns about restricted access to the cultural, natural, and scenic resources on the northern end of the island. Public Law 108-447(2004) removed the Main Road, North Cut Road and Plum Orchard Spur from the area designated as wilderness. Additionally, it directed the NPS to complete a plan that manages 5 to 8 daily round trips to the northern end of the island using the Main Road.

There are several different alternatives to provide motorized access to the north end of the island, with the main differences including the route to be followed, the type of vehicle, degree of visitor access, and what additional support facilities would be required. Listed below by category are several of the potential project alternatives presently being considered. Please note that a different combination of each category is feasible.

#### **Potential Vehicle Route**

- 1) Main Road
- 2) North Cut Road
- 3) Beach
- 4) Settlement Loop
- 5) Plum Orchard Spur
- 6) Stafford Area
- 7) Dungeness/Sea Camp

#### **Potential Start/End Locations**

- 1) South End
- 2) Plum Orchard
- 3) Cumberland Wharf



**Beach Vehicle Crossings**

- 1) North Cut Road
- 2) Stafford Beach
- 3) Little Greyfield
- 4) Dungeness

**Ferry Destinations**

- 1) South End
- 2) Plum Orchard
- 3) Cumberland Wharf

**Visitor Access**

- 1) Guided tour
- 2) Shuttle Service for transportation only

**Mode**

- 1) Horse and wagon
- 2) Electric type vehicle
- 3) Gas or alternative fuel van, minibus, larger shuttle, or large SUV (options of 4-wheel drive or special tires would be considered)

**Support Facilities**

- 1) Expanded dock at Plum Orchard
- 2) New dock/landing facilities at Cumberland Wharf
- 3) Operation center for initiating the tours
- 4) Minor structures for new interpretive opportunities
- 5) Visitor contact station/restroom facility on north end

**Tour Operations**

Consideration of tour stops and/or points of interest alternatives are part of the planning process. Specifics include the number of tours per day, tour fees, and the possibility of implementing operations through a private concession.



## National Park Service

### Public Information Open House Comment Card

Cumberland Island National Seashore Transportation Management Plan  
**August 22, 2006**

*PLEASE PRINT RESPONSES.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Do you support the project?      ☐ *For*      ☐ *Against*      ☐ *Conditional*      ☐ *Uncommitted*

Comments

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Were your questions answered by the NPS personnel?      ☐ **Yes**      ☐ **No**

Do you understand the project after attending this meeting?      ☐ **Yes**      ☐ **No**

Please share your suggestions on improving the way the NPS conducts public meetings.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Mail To:  
**Mr. John Fry**  
**National Park Service**  
**P.O. Box 806**  
**St. Marys, GA 31558**

## PHOTOS FROM AUGUST 22<sup>nd</sup> PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

