



Hunting Management Plan / Environmental Assessment

Public Scoping Report

October 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS.....	1
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS.....	2
PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITIES	2
PUBLIC COMMENT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY	3
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	4
CONCERN STATEMENTS AND REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS	9
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1 – AGENCY/TRIBAL/CONTRACTOR PUBLIC MEETING SIGN-IN	22
APPENDIX 2 – INTERIM COMMENTS REPORT	23



INTRODUCTION

Public scoping is an early and open process to determine public concerns in relation to a proposed action. Public involvement is an important requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), especially in determining the appropriate scope of the analysis. In accordance with Director's Order 12: *Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-making* and National Park Service (NPS) *Management Policies*, the NPS conducted public scoping for the Big Cypress National Preserve (BICY) Hunting Management Plan / Environmental Assessment (EA) to ensure input from all interested parties.

PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS

The public scoping period for the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA was scheduled from August 8 through September 16, 2011 (40 days). The public scoping period was initiated by the NPS by publishing a news release on the NPS BICY website and publishing notices of the proposed public scoping meeting in local newspapers.

A public scoping newsletter was posted on the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website. The public scoping newsletter provided background information on the project, information on how to comment on the project, and the preliminary draft purpose, need, objectives, and alternatives. The public scoping newsletter also posed four questions about the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA:

Question #1: Do you feel that the draft purpose, need, and objectives adequately express the goals of the Hunting Management Plan / EA?

Question #2: Do you have any additional alternatives in mind that would better address the draft purpose, need, and objectives of the Hunting Management Plan / EA?

Question #3: Describe any issues or concerns you feel should be addressed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

Question #4: Do you have any other comments related to the Hunting Management Plan / EA?

Additionally, in order to solicit agency input on the project, scoping letters were sent to the Florida State Clearinghouse, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Florida State Historic Preservation Officer, the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, Seminole Tribe of Florida, and the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma.



PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

Two public scoping meetings were held for the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA in proximity to the areas surrounding BICY to initiate public involvement early in the planning stage and to obtain community feedback regarding the preliminary draft project purpose, need, objectives, and alternatives.

The first public scoping meeting was held at Edison State College in Naples, Collier County, Florida, on August 30, 2011. A total of 26 public participants and 19 agency/tribal/contractor personnel attended.

The second public meeting was held at the Hyatt Regency Bonaventure in Weston, Broward County, Florida, on August 31, 2011. A total of 60 public participants and 17 agency/tribal/contractor personnel attended.

Each meeting was structured into the following sessions. Participants were asked to sign in to the meeting and were provided with the project scoping newsletter. From 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., an open house session was held with a series of exhibits illustrating the preliminary draft project purpose, need, objectives, and alternatives. National Park Service and contractor staff were available to discuss the project, answer questions, and record comments on flip charts. From 6:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., there was a brief presentation about the project, outlining the project background, EA process, public involvement opportunities, and preliminary draft purpose, need, objectives, and alternatives. From approximately 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.¹, the public was provided with an opportunity to provide official statements on the project while NPS and contractor staff recorded comments on flip charts.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The public was invited to participate in the scoping portion of this project in the following ways:

- Participation in one of the two public meetings. Comments could be provided via the following methods at the public meetings:
 - Spoken comments recorded by NPS and contractor staff on flip charts during the open house portion of the meetings
 - Spoken comments recorded by NPS and contractor staff on flip charts during the formal comment session
 - Written comments via the project comment form provided in the public scoping newsletter
- Submission of comments at any time during the scoping period. Comments could be provided via the following methods:
 - The NPS PEPC website
 - E-mail to NPS BICY staff
 - Hard copy letter to the BICY Superintendent
 - The project comment form provided in the public scoping newsletter

¹ The planned structure of the public meetings was to provide an additional open house session from 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., but the public participants requested the opportunity to make formal comments on the project and the Superintendent granted the request.



PUBLIC COMMENT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

During the comment period 272² pieces of correspondence were received with 1,113 comments. Correspondence was received by one of the following methods: web form (PEPC), public comment form (attached to the public scoping newsletter), hard copy letter, e-mail, fax, and public meeting flip charts. Letters received by hard copy, e-mail, or fax, as well as comments from the public meeting flip charts, were entered into the PEPC system for analysis. Each of these letters or submissions is referred to as correspondence.

Once all correspondence was entered into PEPC, each was read, and specific comments within each correspondence were identified. Once comments were identified, they were assigned a topic (code). To facilitate this, a coding structure was developed that considered all of the correspondence received. This coding structure was comprised of codes that are established in the NPS PEPC system, referred to as national codes, as well as codes that were developed specifically for this project. The codes selected from the national list and those added that were specific to this project were used to identify the general content of a comment.

During coding, comments were also classified as substantive or non-substantive. A substantive comment is defined as one that does one or more of the following (NPS Director's Order 12, Section 4.6A):

- Question, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EA;
- Question, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental analysis;
- Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EA; and/or
- Cause changes or revisions in the proposal.

Although the above refers to an EA document and not public scoping, the same general concept was applied to the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA public scoping comments. If a comment met one or more of the above criteria, it was categorized as substantive. As further stated in Director's Order 12, substantive comments "raise, debate, or question a point of fact or policy." Comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives, or comments that only agree or disagree with NPS policy, are not considered substantive.

Under each code, all comments were grouped by similar themes, and those groups were assigned a concern statement. A concern statement is a statement that captures the content of several comments. For example, one concern statement identified was "Hunting regulations should be reviewed, clarified, and revised as part of the Hunting Management Plan / EA." This one concern statement captured many comments and the representative quotes from the respondents were assigned to that concern statement.

² The flip chart comments recorded at each of the public meetings were compiled and entered as one piece of correspondence for each public meeting.



SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Correspondence from respondents regarding the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA ranged from strong support to strong opposition to a hunting management plan for the Addition. The remaining correspondence did not express an opinion clearly supporting or opposing a hunting management plan for the Addition, but only provided comments, questions, recommendations, or concerns.

Regarding Question #1 (*“Do you feel that the draft purpose, need, and objectives adequately express the goals of the Hunting Management Plan / EA?”*), a similar number of commenters responded affirmatively and negatively. A little more than half of respondents either did not answer Question #1 or did not clearly state their opinion in the affirmative or negative.

Regarding Question #2 (*“Do you have any additional alternatives in mind that would better address the draft purpose, need, and objectives of the Hunting Management Plan / EA?”*), slightly more commenters responded by stating ‘yes’ than those respondents that stated ‘no.’ A little more than half of respondents either did not answer Question #2 or did not clearly state their opinion either way.

Regarding the open-ended Questions #3 (*“Describe any issues or concerns you feel should be addressed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA”*) and #4 (*“Do you have any other comments related to the Hunting Management Plan / EA?”*), varied responses were received from commenters. The responses to these questions have been summarized by topic below and included in the concern statements in the following section.

Comments received that were in favor of the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA included reasons such as the enjoyment of the recreational opportunity to hunt, appreciation of the natural resources while hunting, and the desire to pass on the hunting opportunity to future generations. A few of the correspondents in favor of the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA also expressed a concern that it has taken a long time to open the Addition for hunting opportunities.

Those respondents that expressed opposition to the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA discussed reasons such as protecting the natural resources, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species present in the preserve; protecting the preserve for future generations to enjoy; and the ample availability of other hunting lands both in the state of Florida and in other parts of BICY. A few of the respondents opposed to the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA also expressed opposition to the allowance of hunting in other parts of BICY.

Several correspondents requested that hunting regulations be reviewed, clarified, and/or revised. A few of the requested changes included: reinstating turkey hunting during regular gun season; instituting an alligator hunt; abolishing the 10:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. daily closure to off-road vehicle (ORV) operators; abolishing the requirement that stipulates that hunters must check-in and check-out at the same check station; prohibition of the trapping of small game; and review of the closure of the Stair Step Unit. There was also a request to provide general hunting information and education as part of the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA.

Many correspondences received included requests to revise the wording in portions of the preliminary draft purpose, need, and objectives presented to the public during the scoping period. A few comments were received which stated that the preliminary draft purpose, need, and objectives only expressed the needs of hunters and did not express the needs of non-hunting visitors.



Comments were also received which requested that some of the preliminary draft need and objectives statements be removed from the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA.

Many respondents stated their support for one of the preliminary draft alternatives, including support for Alternatives #1, #2, and #3, as they were currently proposed during the public scoping period. Many of those commenting on the alternatives also requested changes to the existing preliminary draft alternatives or proposed new alternatives for the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA. A few pieces of correspondence mentioned that the no-action alternative should be no hunting in the Addition. A few respondents also requested that Alternative #2 not be included in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA. A large number of correspondents requested that the USFWS be removed from the decision-making process for Alternative #3. Comments were also received which expressed the need for an additional alternative that allows the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) to independently manage hunting in BICY.

Many pieces of correspondence received referenced the enabling legislation for BICY. Some commenters stated that the NPS must allow hunting in the Addition in order to comply with the enabling legislation, while other commenters stated that the NPS does not have to allow hunting in the Addition to comply with the enabling legislation. A few pieces of correspondence also referenced NPS regulations, such as the need to implement the "Precautionary Principle" for the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA. Other respondents included requests to comply with NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. A few commenters also expressed that it would be undesirable to have to comply with NEPA in the future for changes in hunting protocol within BICY.

Correspondence received that referenced public involvement included the following: a request that project information be better disseminated to the public; concern that too much weight is given to local concerns during the public involvement process; concern that too much weight is given to out-of-town concerns during the public involvement process; and a request to start a volunteer program to assist with project related issues.

A few comments referred to park management issues. Some commenters expressed a concern about enforcement of hunting regulations and the availability of NPS resources for enforcement. A couple of respondents also stated their belief that the NPS and FWC have done a good job of managing hunting in BICY.

Wildlife and habitat comments received during the scoping period included the need for additional studies as part of the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA and general concern for impacts associated with implementation of a hunting management plan. Comments were received which expressed a concern that the deer population in BICY has been declining in recent years. Other commenters stated that wildlife poaching is a problem in the Addition and BICY. Correspondence was also received that mentioned hunting as a wildlife management tool. A few respondents also expressed concern about exotic species and the need for exotic species impacts to be analyzed in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA.

A large number of those commenting on the project expressed a concern for direct and indirect impact to endangered species in the Addition and BICY in general, especially the federally and state-listed endangered Florida panther. Commenters requested that studies be conducted to determine the abundance and distribution of threatened and endangered species in BICY as well as the impacts of hunting on the Florida panther and its prey.



Socioeconomic impacts were mentioned by a number of correspondents. A few commenters requested that the socioeconomic impacts of allowing hunting in the Addition be analyzed in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA, while other comments were received which state that socioeconomic considerations should not be a part of the decision-making process for the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA. Other socioeconomic concerns expressed by respondents included the need to complete the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA in the most economical manner possible and the potential for a fee to be charged to visitors of BICY.

Visitor use and experience was discussed by many of the respondents. Those opposed to hunting in the Addition expressed concern about a safety conflict between hunters and non-hunting visitors, as well as negative impacts on the visitor experience for non-hunters. Many comments were received which expressed an opposition to ORV use in the Addition. A number of correspondences also mentioned the need for better access options in the Addition.

A concern for cultural and ethnographic resources in the Addition was mentioned by some of the respondents. Commenters requested that cultural resources impacts be fully analyzed in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA. Other respondents expressed opposition to allowing hunting in the Addition due to concerns about cultural resources impacts. Comments were also received which requested that the Gladesmen culture be recognized in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA.

Other questions, concerns, and issues that were raised by respondents included: a request to designate the Addition as wilderness lands; the need to analyze indirect, secondary, and cumulative impacts in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA; the need to define certain terms (i.e., hunting management, science-based, adaptive management) in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA; and the need for prescribed burning in the Addition.

SUMMARY OF AGENCY/TRIBAL/ORGANIZATION COMMENTS

Correspondence from agencies, organizations, and businesses included letters and comments from the following entities with the number of correspondences denoted in parentheses³. The remaining 231 pieces of correspondence were received from unaffiliated individuals.

- Airboat Association of Florida (3)
- American Indian Movement / Florida Chapter (1)
- Ancient Trees (1)
- Animal Welfare Institute (1)
- Antelope Club / Largo, Florida (1)
- Audubon Society (6)
- Big Cypress Sportsmen's Alliance (3)
- Broward Chapter of the Native Plant Society (1)
- Broward County Master Gardener (1)
- Center for Biological Diversity (1)
- Christian Outdoorsmen of Southwest Florida (1)
- Citizens Allied for Safe Energy, Inc. (1)
- City of Cooper City (1)
- Coastal Conservation (1)

³ The total number of agencies/tribes/organizations/businesses reported exceeds the total number of correspondences due to the fact that some individuals associated themselves with more than one organization.



Council of Civic Associations, Inc. (1)
 Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People (1)
 Defenders of Wildlife (1)
 Ducks Unlimited (2)
 Eagle Watch (1)
 Ecology Party of Florida (1)
 Everglades Conservation and Sportsman Club (2)
 Everglades Coordinating Council (1)
 Federal Bureau of Prisons (1)
 Florida Biodiversity Project (1)
 Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources (1)
 Florida State Clearinghouse (1)
 Florida Trail Association (7)
 Fulltrack Conservation Club of Dade County (2)
 GatorGuides.com (2)
 Green Party (1)
 Inholder (1)
 Jetport Conservation and Recreation Club (1)
 Kosher Caregivers (1)
 National Parks Conservation Association (1)
 National Rifle Association (6)
 National Wild Turkey Federation (5)
 National Wildlife Federation (3)
 New York Bowhunters (1)
 Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition (1)
 Popss Hunt Club / Southwest Ranches, Florida (1)
 Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (2)
 Reading Environmental Advisory Council (1)
 Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (1)
 Safari Club International (16)
 Save our Sovereign Lands, LLC (1)
 Sea Turtle Oversight Protection (STOP) (1)
 Seminole Tribe of Indians (1)
 Sierra Club (1)
 Sierra Club (10)
 South Florida Wildlands Association (2)
 Southwest Florida Boy Scout Council (1)
 Tropical Theatre (1)
 Unified Sportsman (1)
 United Waterfowlers of Florida (3)
 UWF (1)

Agency/Tribal Correspondence Summary

Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources

The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) reviewed the scoping notice for the project for possible impact to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places. The review was conducted in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended and 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties. The SHPO letter stated the following regarding the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA:



“Based on the information provided, it is the opinion of this office that the above-referenced undertaking will have no effect on historic properties.”

Florida State Clearinghouse

The Florida State Clearinghouse coordinated a review of the scoping notice for the project under the following authorities: Presidential Executive Order 12372; § 403.061(42), Florida Statutes; the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464, as amended; and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347, as amended.

The Florida State Clearinghouse letter contained the following comment from the FWC:

“The [FWC] is pleased to see the opportunity for public input into a Hunting Management Plan for [BICY]. FWC has been a full partner with the Preserve staff in drafting the alternatives and looks forward to continued participation at that level throughout the remainder of the plan development process.”

The Florida State Clearinghouse letter concluded the following regarding the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA:

“Based on the information contained in the scoping notice and state agency comments, at this stage, the state has no objections to the proposed federal action. To ensure the project’s consistency with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP), any concerns identified by our reviewing agencies during future reviews must be addressed prior to project implementation. The state’s continued concurrence will be based on the activity’s compliance with FCMP authorities, including federal and state monitoring of the activity to ensure its continued conformance, and the adequate resolution of any issues identified during subsequent reviews.”

Seminole Tribe of Indians

A member of the Seminole Tribe of Indians commented on the proposed BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA, but no official correspondence was received.

Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People

- Allowing hunting in the Addition violates the traditional, customary, and cultural rights of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People, including hunting, fishing, harvesting materials for homes, and practicing traditional customs.
- The area that comprises the Addition is a monument to the Aboriginal Indigenous Miccosukee Simanolee People.
- The Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People strongly objects to recreational hunting and recreational ORV use in the Addition.
- The Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People objects to destruction of natural systems, damage to the wildlife habitat, damage to the land, destruction of vegetation, disruption of the natural water flow and water quality, and disruption of the wildlife balance in the Addition.
- Allowing hunting in the Addition will reduce the prey base for the endangered Florida panther.
- Allowing for trails and roads, ORVs, and hunting in the Addition will force wildlife (including the Florida panther) in developed areas, which will increase mortality.



- The remaining habitat for the Florida panther is limited.
- The Addition needs to be preserved for future generations.

CONCERN STATEMENTS AND REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS⁴

HUNTING MANAGEMENT PLAN – GENERAL CONCERNS

Big Cypress National Preserve contains unique natural resources that should be protected; all natural resource impacts should be documented in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- In their current state, the Addition Lands are a biological treasure chest, providing rare habitat for an interconnected web of plants and animals (approximately 100 plants and 30 animal species in the Addition are federally or state listed as endangered, threatened, or species of special concern) found nowhere else on earth. The land provides scientists with one of the few undisturbed remnants of the original Everglades (on the border between the western and eastern Everglades) and a crowded population with an opportunity to still experience the tranquility of a natural Florida that is now largely gone. (ID #167)
- Allowing hunting in this fragile protected environment would cause irreparable damage on many levels. Any a pristine ecosystem is altered, we have lost something forever which can never be replaced. Please do not mess with this treasure! (ID #212)

Hunting should be allowed in the Addition to allow opportunities for passing on hunting to younger generations.

- My belief is that any activity that provides for safe, conservation-minded access to the outdoors is vital to the development of our younger generations. (ID #1)

Hunting should not be allowed in the Addition to preserve the area for future generations.

- Please emphasize long-term habitat protection and remember the importance of the legacy we provide for future generations. Immediate consequences have profound long-term effects. (ID #26)

There are ample hunting lands in other parts of Big Cypress National Preserve, so hunting should not be allowed in the Addition.

- The remainder of Big Cypress is available for hunting. This one area, the Addition Land, should remain free of hunting. This insures a safe place for the 30 species of animals listed as endangered, threatened, or species of special concern to thrive. (#236)
- 528,000 acres of BCNP are ALREADY open for hunting. Of the approximately 800,000 users of the park annually, the vast majority do not hunt. Why can't BCNP keep a portion of the Preserve closed to hunting and open for other, more natural use which will have little to no impact and certainly no consumption of the natural resources of the area. (ID #240)

⁴ Representative comments have been extracted directly from correspondence received by the public and have not been reviewed or revised for spelling or grammar.



There are ample hunting lands in other parts of the state, so hunting should not be allowed in Big Cypress National Preserve.

- Please consider that Florida already has nearly 6 Million Acres where Hunting Is Allowed (5,759,701 is the acre-count reported by FWCC's Diane Eggeman). Yet, Florida wildlife has fewer than 800,000 acres (approximately 795,809 including Florida State Parks and Greenways) of Public Lands where hunting is not allowed. Florida has an excess of hunting lands, and a paucity of Refuge or Sanctuary Lands. We need MORE No-take reserves (non-hunting refuges or sanctuaries) to insure survival of Florida's imperiled species and in-tact ecosystems. (ID #33)

Hunting regulations should be reviewed, clarified, and/or revised as part of the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Set up several quota hunts for the year that will help cover Hog, Deer, and Turkeys - limited entry to prohibit excessive traffic - the Quota hunts will keep the harvest under control, but most importantly keep the impact on the refuge to a dead minimum (ID #90)
- Quota permits should not be used unless credible statistical data exists to prove they are necessary especially in the Addition (ID #106)
- I think that hunting should be limited by a lottery system in the Addition. I am not aware that this is done elsewhere in the preserve. This would raise a bit of revenue, and make it easier to control the number of hunters. (ID #145)
- Abolish the requirement that stipulates that hunters must check in and out at the same check station in Big Cypress and the Addition. Doing this will conserve energy (gasoline) and hunters money, enhance hunters perception of the eventual F.A.C rule promoting necessary buy-in which assists enforcement. (ID #161)
- PEER supports the prohibition on trapping small game found in current Florida hunting rules for the State's designated Big Cypress Wildlife Management Area. (ID #163)

Hunting information and education should be a part of the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Whatever Alternative is chosen for the Addition, I think that hunting information needs to be more readily available and easier to decipher, especially for the Preserve's non-hunting visitors. Many of these visitors are accustomed to visiting National Parks and automatically equate the NPS logo with Parks where hunting is prohibited. These visitors may not even be aware that they are in a National Preserve (vs. a National Park) and that hunting is allowed here, especially if these visitors do not stop at the Visitors Center for information. These visitors may rely solely on information posted at trailheads and kiosks. This information should make it very clear to visitors that they are entering an area where hunting is allowed, what they need to be aware of, and what precautions they should take. (ID #165)

PURPOSE, NEED, AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose, need, and objectives only express the needs of hunters and do not express the needs of the non-hunting visitors.

- It expressed the needs of the HUNTING community and they are not the primary users of the land (ID #54)
- The goals are skewed towards hunting and do not adequately address the total impact on the species inhabiting the area. (ID #235)



Revisions should be made to the project draft purpose statement.

- In order to avoid misinterpretation of intent in phrases such as, "in the best interest of . . ." and "visiting public", the Purpose statement should be amended to more clearly reflect the enabling language, such as: "To develop a federal/state cooperatively managed hunting management plan for the Big Cypress National Preserve/Wildlife Management Area to provide for hunting, fishing, frogging and other traditional opportunities in a manner consistent with the preservation, conservation, and protection of the natural, scenic, hydrologic, floral and faunal, and recreational values of the Preserve and to provide for the enhancement and public enjoyment thereof while meeting the requirements set forth by the NPS, the Preserve's enabling legislation, the NPS/FWC Cooperative Partnership Agreement, and all federal, state and local laws and regulations." It's more wordy, but far less ambiguous, and sets the stage for further clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the NPS as the land management agency and FWC as the hunting management agency that will presumably be outlined in the final hunt plan. (ID #260)

Revisions should be made to the project draft need statements.

- The second bullet point should read: "To provide and enhance traditional recreational uses and other visitor uses in a manner that complies with the enabling legislation for the Preserve." Although the forth bullet point lists the NPS/FWC Cooperative Agreement as a requirement to be met, ECC recommends the vital management role of the FWC be clarified in this paragraph by amending the first line to ". . .provide a cooperative framework . . ." The fifth line of the paragraph should also be amended by inserting "the FWC's regulatory process," prior to reference to the aforementioned NPS/FWC Cooperative Partnership Agreement. The fifth bullet point should be amended to delete reference to the need to provide consistency with the USFWS regulations. The hunt plan should pertain to the two primary partners and should not be complicated by the additional bureaucratic red tape of including another federal agency. Compliance with USFWS regulations will be the duty of the NPS in meeting its own regulatory obligations. (ID #260)

Revisions should be made to the project draft objectives statements.

- In the proposed objectives statement 5 (Provide for a positive visitor use experience for hunters and non-hunters) This also must be removed from the proposal .1. This is supposed to be a hunt plan not a general management plan. 2. A positive hunt experience varies too much for any agency to predict. Due to NPS oppressive management practices I have witnessed far too many people give up the Cypress and for many still here it would take going back to before the NPS partnered up with us to Create the BICY in order to provide for a positive hunt experience that allowed the traditional cultural activities we grew up with. Those of us still here have been living a slow and cruel death experience that is still going on. Remove the bullet point 5 excerpted below from NPS's newsletter since no government agency can effectively predict what all hunters consider a positive hunt experience (e.g. for many Big Cypress hunters it would take going back to 1973 or earlier regulations to provide a truly positive and culturally sustainable hunt experience). Another reason to remove this statement is because it refers to non-hunters visitor experience. This is a hunt plan not a general visitation plan. Bullet point 6 must also be removed from the NPS proposal (Provide an array of access options to allow for a diversity of hunting opportunities within the framework of existing regulations and funding. All types of access and hunting should be allowed throughout the entire preserve both the original and the Addition newsletter s without any additional Deep Lake style areas that specifically prohibit ORV access and hunting other than archery. (ID #234)



ALTERNATIVES

Alternative #1 should be implemented with the existing language proposed during public scoping.

- I strongly support Alternative One (1) that allows hunting in the Addition Lands as in the rest of Preserve. This is a thriving, wild area and to some extent over run with game and the hunting there will not have adverse affects on the game nor the area as a whole or in part. (ID #129)

Revisions should be made to Alternative #1.

- The Jetport Conservation and Recreation Club (JCRC) must decline to choose any of them at this time due to lack of information but would consider Alternative 1 in the future if the " Adaptive Management Strategy" were added in to the title of Alternative 1 and that concept were included in Alternative 1. (ID #259)

Alternative #2 should be implemented with the existing language proposed during public scoping.

- I strongly supports ALTERNATIVE 2 - No hunting in the Addition. This will provide protection for the Florida panther and its natural food supply, conserve the natural ecology of the area, and allow continued year round enjoyment of these very unique lands by the general public. (ID #35)

Alternative #2 should not be included in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- The second option cannot be considered as it is in direct conflict with the purpose, content and intent of the enabling legislation. (ID #109)
- Alternative #2 would be illegal and is apparently provided to fulfill NEPA's requirement for a Status Quo option. (ID #260)

Alternative #3 should be implemented with the existing language proposed during public scoping.

- I like alternative 3, in that it does allow for annual review of issues by the combination of US Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife and Florida Fish and Game. Those three agencies should have a good handle on the usage (impact) to the land and wildlife. With an ever increasing population, more land available to Florida's hunters is value added usage of the land. (ID #132)

The USFWS should be removed from the decision-making process for Alternative #3.

- I support Alternative Three (3) that allows hunting in the Addition Lands as in the Big Cypress National Preserve. However it is very important that the US Fish and Wildlife Service be removed from the decision-making process in Alternative 3. (ID #140)

The No-Action Alternative should be no hunting in the Addition.

- Finally, it is unclear why the NPS lists Alternative 1 as the No Action Alternative, when Alternative 1 actually calls for opening the Addition to the same hunting regulations that exist in the 582,000 acre original Preserve. That plan includes five separate hunting seasons spread out from September through April, and virtually no restrictions on the number of hunters who can enter the area. Therefore, it appears that the true "No Action Alternative" is actually Alternative 2



- "No Hunting in the Addition" which describes the baseline conditions and would preserve the status quo. In its draft environmental assessment, NPS should more clearly explain this distinction. (ID #172)

Additional alternatives or elements should be added to the suite of alternatives analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- An alternative for the Addition that combines no hunting zone(s) with a reservation or lottery system for hunting within permitted areas is a compromise that would take into account the interests of the entire visiting public (not just the hunters' interests) and provide greater protection for the Addition's resources while complying with the enabling legislation for the Preserve. (ID #165)
- I want an alternative that adds to #1 a commitment on the part of BICY to monitor hunting populations themselves and in cooperation with the South Florida Caribbean Inventory Monitoring Program. They will consult and collaborate with USFWS multi species recovery plan and USGS for analysis and research. NEPA will be triggered as needed according to the rules. Cooperation with to address concerns if BICY neighbors (tribes, state) need adding. (ID #256)

LAWS/POLICIES/REGULATIONS

The NPS must comply with the enabling legislation for the Big Cypress National Preserve in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- It was written into law in 1988 to allow hunting in this area. Honor the law and allow hunters to enjoy this area as well. (ID #88)
- The enabling legislation states that the Preserve, as a unit of the national park system, is to be managed in a manner that will ensure its "natural and ecological integrity in perpetuity." Big Cypress was established by Congress in 1974 to "assure the preservation, conservation, and protection of the natural, scenic, hydrologic, floral and faunal, and recreational values of the Big Cypress Watershed in the state of Florida and to provide for the enhancement and public enjoyment thereof." Thus, the natural and ecological integrity of the Preserve is the fundamental value that Congress directed the NPS to protect. (ID #221)

The NPS should implement the "Precautionary Principle" for the Big Cypress National Preserve Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- The deep concern expressed by past findings and the uncertainty about impacts (throughout the most recent Environmental Impact Statement by the NPS) with regard to the relationship between deer, panthers, and recreational hunting in the Addition, should clearly trigger the NPS's "precautionary principle" in NPS's drafting of a hunting management plan for the Addition. As stated in the NPS Management Policies of 2006: "In cases of uncertainty as to the impacts of activities on park natural resources, the protection of natural resources will predominate." (ID #167)

It would not be desirable to have the NEPA process triggered for changes in the Hunting Management Plan.

- I would not want to see the process of approval extended by the triggering of the [N]EPA study (ID #1)



The Hunting Management Plan / EA should comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

- Compliance with/inclusion of ADA (ID #105)

Allowing hunting in the Addition would be a violation of the Endangered Species Act.

- I believe that Alternative 2--No hunting in the Addition--is the only acceptable and almost certainly the only legal alternative. Adoption of either Alternatives 1 or 3 would be a clear violation of the Endangered Species Act. (ID #24)

The BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA should comply with the National Historic Preservation Act.

- Planning team should/must acknowledge and use the Gladesmen Cultural Study and ORV benefits report for planning so as to comply with NHPA of 2000 (ID #106)

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Project information should be better disseminated to the public.

- More non-hunting stakeholders need to be involved in the process in true democratic fashion ... Perhaps simple postcards sent to registered voters would be the best vehicle for the government to get "news" to its citizens. Signage at major US Hwy. intersections, grocery stores, public libraries, and post offices would be other good choices ... (ID #33)

Too much weight is given to local concerns during the public involvement process.

- I believe that you are giving inordinate weight to local concerns and the natural resource consumption lobby. BICY is a NATIONAL preserve. While the rights and opinions of local hunters, ATV riders and others should receive due consideration, they deserve no more consideration than the views of a person like myself, a thousand miles away, but who has a deep and abiding love for the Everglades ecosystem. (ID #10)

Too much weight is given to out-of-town concerns during the public involvement process.

- Note must be taken that the pro hunting/traditional use comments will come almost entirely from people in the local and near areas who are affected by the decisions. Anti use comments will come from anti hunting/wilderness use groups and individuals all across the country who would seek to stop all such activity nationwide. The leaders who wrote the enabling legislation realized this and added the traditional use wording to avoid having the local and traditional use voice drowned out by groups with larger and more widespread agendas. (ID #109)

A volunteer program should be started to help with project issues.

- there are a lot of disabled vets out here who can't find a job and live with the demons. you should start a volunteer program together. circulate it through the V,A. system as rehab. to many vets end up on alcohol and drugs and suicide. I'm talking from experience I'm 100% P/T disabled and a member of the NRA. (ID #3)



PARK MANAGEMENT

Enforcement issues should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Enforcement would clearly be a vital component of a sustainable hunting plan and Audubon will be looking for adequate funding and planning for this. (ID #269)

WILDLIFE AND HABITAT

The deer population in Big Cypress National Preserve has been declining; the impact of this should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- In their brochure for the hunting management plan, the NPS strongly implies that allowing hunting in the Addition Lands is required in order to be in compliance with the preserve's enabling legislation. They provide the following excerpt: "The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and water under his jurisdiction within the Preserve and the Addition in accordance with the applicable laws of the United States and the State of Florida?" If the sentence were to end at that point, we would not have bothered writing this lengthy action alert on a very complex topic. It doesn't. As NPS notes, the sentence goes on to say: "except that he may designate zones where and periods when no hunting, fishing, trapping, or entry may be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, floral and faunal protection and management, or public use and enjoyment." This ability - to control an activity which is causing or has the potential to cause harm to natural resources or interfere with "public use and enjoyment" - is central to all National Park Service legislation and policy. When NPS, acting in conjunction with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission (FWC), recently closed deer hunting in 104,000 acres of the preserve's Stairsteps Unit, it was relying on this same authority. As explained by the FWC in a FAQ page: Why is deer hunting being limited in the Stairsteps Unit of Big Cypress Wildlife Management Area for the 2010-2011 hunting season? Since 2001, the deer population has undergone a steady and significant decline. 393 deer were counted in 2001 during a summer survey conducted in Zone 4 of the Stairsteps Unit, and those numbers have declined to 18 in 2009 with only 4 deer being seen during the spring 2010 survey. (ID #18)

Hunting in the Addition would serve as a wildlife management tool.

- I'm very much in favor of the plan, as properly managed hunting on the addition as well as the preserve is to the favor of wildlife. Managed hunting is the most beneficial to wildlife and society. (ID #253)

Wildlife poaching is a problem in the Addition; the impact of this should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Expand scope to include poaching, dumping, fires, and illegal access due to new trail system (ID #169)

Exotics species management and impacts should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- PEER requests that the NPS continue to employ its authority under 16 U.S.C. to remove animals deemed to be "detrimental" such as non-native nutria by whatever means available consistent with Federal law, and adopt more liberal take provisions than Florida law may allow. (ID #163)



THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

A study needs to be conducted to determine the abundance and distribution of threatened and endangered species and their prey in Big Cypress National Preserve.

- In regard to the issues to be consider in the Draft EA, in order to meet NPS mandates and to provide the level of analysis required by NEPA, NPS must include in its pending Draft EA the following information/analyses: 3. A comprehensive analysis of all animals that are hunted within BICY or that may be hunted in the addition. NPS needs to provide information about the biology, ecology, population estimates, population trends, and threats (natural and anthropogenic) for each species. (ID #221)
- What is the time-weighted population of species and sub-species of deer and major predators? Is the Everglades Panther the only endangered species that depends upon deer populations? What scaling factor has been calculated to identify any disproportional impact on panthers or other endangered native predators? (ID #225)

A study needs to be conducted to determine the impact of hunting in the Addition on the federal and state-listed endangered Florida panther.

- In regard to the issues to be consider in the Draft EA, in order to meet NPS mandates and to provide the level of analysis required by NEPA, NPS must include in its pending Draft EA the following information/analyses: 2. A comprehensive review of the history of the Florida Panther and its management. This review must include the alleged origins of these panthers, how they were managed prior to the creation of BICY, how hunting including hunter access to BICY impacts panthers, exhaustively discuss other threats (natural and anthropogenic) to the panther, and how opening the Addition to hunting will affect the panther ecology and biology and panther habitat. (ID #221)

Allowing hunting in the Addition will adversely impact the federal and state-listed endangered Florida panther and other threatened and endangered species.

- The introduction of public hunting in the Addition Lands will likely lead to impacts to the Florida panther in terms of reduction of the prey base and fragmentation of the habitat (note - as an “umbrella species”, protecting Florida panther habitat also benefits numerous rare and listed species which share the same area – e.g. eastern indigo snakes, fox squirrels, Florida black bears). (ID #18)

A study needs to be conducted to determine the impact of hunting in the Addition on federal and state-listed endangered species.

- Ascertain environmental impact of endangered species before even proposing changes (ID #28)

SOCIOECONOMICS

The socioeconomic impacts of allowing hunting in the Addition should be included in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Provide a detailed economic analysis. This analysis must include a detailed short and long-term cost benefit analysis comparing and contrasting the cost of the no-action or status quo alternatives with the cost of any other BICY management strategy evaluated in the Draft NEPA



document. Such an analysis must be comprehensive and consider all costs of any BICY management strategy including the impact on the legal and social precedent set by such a decision, the impact on visitors to BICY, the impact to the value of the panther population (i.e. scientific, ecological, cultural, aesthetic), and the impact to the values of the park. A contingent valuation methodology or some similar economic impact measurement tool must be used to perform this analysis. It must be noted, however, that because BICY is a federal park supported by federal tax dollars, cost must not be used as the sole basis for rejecting an alternative that may best protect BICY, its wildlife, and the preservation-based statutes, regulations, and policies of the NPS. (ID #221)

Socioeconomic considerations should not be a part of the decision-making process for the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Also, local and regional economic considerations, whether eco-tourism or hunting tourism, should have NO BEARING on doing what's right to protect that ecosystem. (ID #10)

A fee should be charged for visitors to Big Cypress National Preserve.

- Make the visitors pay a annual permit fee to visit the park , that way they pay their fair share of the budget to maintain the park (ID #90)

VISITOR USE AND EXPERIENCE

Allowing hunting in the Addition will create a safety conflict for non-hunting visitors.

- It will also require the non-hunting public, including myself, who use the Addition in great numbers for passive recreation (hiking, nature photography, bird and native plant observation), to either take precautions and accept serious risk of injury or death when using the area during proposed hunting seasons or stay away completely. NPS's own social science research in the original preserve indicates that NPS is well aware of that likely outcome. (ID #24)

Allowing hunting in the Addition will adversely impact the visitor use experience of non-hunting visitors.

- I believe that opening the entire Addition to hunting (and therefore the entire Preserve), does not satisfy the needs and concerns of non-hunters. While this alternative obviously meets the objective of providing a positive visitor use experience for hunters, it interferes with the enjoyment sought by non-hunters in the Preserve and therefore does not meet the objective of providing a positive visitor use experience for non-hunters. (ID #165)

Off-road vehicles should not be allowed in the Addition.

- Even more so than the hunting, I am completely opposed to allowing off-road vehicles any access to the Big Cypress addition lands. Swamp buggies and their various related machines cause immense damage to these ecosystems, muddy ruts that are easily visible from the air and appear to be long-lasting, not to mention noise and air pollution. All access to this beautiful remnant of the former ecological glory that was South Florida should be on foot. (ID #183)



The Off-road Vehicle Benefits Report should be considered in the BICY Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Planning team should/must acknowledge and use the Gladesmen Cultural Study and ORV benefits report for planning so as to comply with NHPA of 2000 (ID #106)

Better access options are needed to access the Addition.

- Better access points for foot-based hunters are sorely needed. The current entrances for walk-in hunting place hunters sometimes miles from good hunting habitat and causes hunters to end up in exceptionally close proximity to each other. (ID #15)
- Access; with the current ORV trail system we have to have more secondary ORV trails in both the original BICY and the Addition. We have to have connectability between the different hunting units in the BICY via the ORV trail system so that the "traditional" use clause in the Amended BICY Act can be complied with. The plan should not stop regulator actions that will allow connectability between units via ORV trails. (ID #265)

CULTURAL/ETHNOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

Cultural resource impact should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- The Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People has the Rights for Traditional, Customary, or Culture Rights in Big Cypress National Preserve, New Addition Lands, Everglades, and beyond, to hunt, fish, cut materials for our homes, and practice of our Way of Life because it is the Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal Peoples' Aboriginal Indigenous Land. In all that area and beyond, when the newcomers came in they hunted down the Aboriginal Indigenous Miccosukee Simanolee Nation and slaughtered them, young or old, men and women and children. (ID #252)

Hunting should not be allowed in the Addition in order to protect the cultural resources present there.

- I object to hunting on Native American Sacred and Holy land. There is no need to further desecrate burials of the Original People. Our ancestor's burial sites should be respected and treated the same as non Native cemeteries. (ID #156)
- The Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People strongly objects to what you have done illegally in our Land, and strongly objects to your ideas of recreational hunting and recreational O.R. V. use in the so-called New Addition Lands. Which is; the Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal Peoples' Aboriginal Indigenous Land. You have no right to continue destroying Natural Systems, damaging the Wildlife Habitat, damaging the Land, destroying the Vegetation, and disrupting the Natural Water Flow and Water Quality, and disrupting the Wildlife Balance in our Land. (ID #252)

The Gladesmen culture should be recognized in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- The traditional Gladesmen culture has not been spotlighted or applied to the plan. (ID #166)



WILDERNESS RESOURCES

The Addition should be designated as Wilderness lands.

- To protect the resources (e.g., habitat, wildlife, protected species) present in the Preserve) we must not allow hunting. This area should be designated as a wilderness area which should be protected from hunting. (ID #46)

INDIRECT, SECONDARY, AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Indirect, secondary, and cumulative impacts of allowing hunting in the Addition should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- The Addition has never been open to public hunting...will NPS scope all cumulative the impacts of expanding hunting to a once safe area: direct, indirect, secondary, and cumulative impacts on all other stakeholders? (ID #169)

OTHER INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN THE HUNTING MANAGEMENT PLAN / EA

“Science-based” and “adaptive management” need to be defined in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Yes. Too often, misuse abuse and misunderstanding of what constitutes science or scientific management of land from a Federal perspective is used to squash hunting rights. Already I can smell the stink starting, with use of vague language ... Who determines what is science based? Who defines adaptive decision making and where is that explained? Who decides what will or will not be a protected species? Where is there room in your statement for the public (hunters in particular) to be part of your rule making processes? Worst of all, where do you get the idea you can come to Big Cypress and independently decide what resources need protecting, from what, from whom, why, etc. which MAY (not defined either) have an effect on hunting?? (ID #5)

Adaptive management should be conducted in a scientifically sound manner.

- Adaptive management is only as effective as the thoroughness of monitoring, so Audubon strongly recommends a robust science-based monitoring plan as part of hunting management. Prey base status, imperiled species responses, and habitat conditions, among other elements, all must factor in hunting management, matched to each distinct unit of the Preserve, including the Addition. Audubon is confident that this approach offers the best opportunity for achieving the overall goal of a sustainable hunting management plan which is compatible with the resources being managed and protected for the public. (ID #269)
- Because of the sensitivity and highly technical factor of multiple endangered and threatened species living in the Preserve, an adaptive management approach to hunting protocols very appropriately should engage the US Fish and Wildlife Service in monitoring habitat and wildlife responses to hunting. This should be a necessary complement to the Commission and Park Service's role in managing the hunting, and certainly not a conflict. (ID #269)



“Hunting management” should be defined in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Exactly what does hunting management mean? The title of this almost implies that there will be hunting, despite what might be better for the environment and the animals therein. (ID #92)

Other development pressures should be considered in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- So much of Fla is already ruined with over pumping, haphazard home developments, acid rain, mercury, oil leaks, unregulated growth, and uncontrolled destruction of wildlife habitat, we don't need another pristine piece of biodiversity deliberately destroyed by hunting, a one class of population benefit. (ID #223)

Climate data should be analyzed in the Hunting Management Plan / EA.

- Disclose climatic data such as precipitation trends, extreme weather events (i.e., drought, extreme cold), and the frequency and severity of storms must also be disclosed along with an analysis of the impact of such events on all species, including imperiled species, and their habitats. (ID #221)

More prescribed burning should be conducted in Big Cypress National Preserve.

- Do more prescribed burns and take care of this great natural resource. (ID #13)



APPENDICES

The appendices are organized as follows:

Appendix 1 – Agency/Tribal/Contractor Public Meeting Sign-In: All public scoping meeting attendees (public and agency/tribal) were asked to sign in. The name, affiliation, phone number, and e-mail address of the agency/tribal/contractor personnel participants that attended each of the public meetings is provided. The names and contact information of the public participants is not included in this report due to a request from the public to not disclose the information; however, this information is contained in the Administrative Record for the project.

Appendix 2 – Interim Comments Report: This is the basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers of comments received. Data are presented on the correspondence by type (i.e. amount of e-mails, letters, etc.); amount received by state; and amount received by organization type (i.e., organizations, governments, individuals, etc.)



APPENDIX 1 – AGENCY/TRIBAL/CONTRACTOR PUBLIC MEETING SIGN-IN

	Name	Affiliation	Phone	E-mail Address	Collier County (Aug. 30, 2011)	Broward County (Aug. 31, 2011)
1	Pedro Ramos	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1102	pedro_ramos@nps.gov	✓	✓
2	Ed Clark	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1108	edward.clark@nps.gov		✓
3	Ron Clark	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1106	ron_clark@nps.gov	✓	✓
4	Valerie Clark	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1103	valerie_clark@nps.gov	✓	✓
5	Damon Doumlele	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1158	damon_doumlele@nps.gov	✓	✓
6	David Hamm	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1181	david_hamm@nps.gov	✓	
7	Don Hargrove	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1150	don_hargrove@nps.gov	✓	✓
8	Deborah Jansen	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1179	deborah_jansen@nps.gov	✓	✓
9	Paul Murphy	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1147	paul_murphy@nps.gov	✓	
10	Steve Schulze	NPS BICY	(239) 695-1121	steve_schulze@nps.gov	✓	✓
11	Leslie Wells	NPS BICY	(239) 340-0113	leslie_wells@nps.gov	✓	
12	Tracy Atkins	NPS DSC	(303) 969-2325	tracy_atkins@nps.gov	✓	✓
13	Mike Anderson	FWC	(561) 625-5122	michael.anderson@myfwc.com		✓
14	Ron Bergeron	FWC				✓
15	Joe Bozzo	FWC	(239) 417-6352	joseph.bozzo@myfwc.com	✓	
16	Josh Caraker	FWC	(239) 825-5314	joshua.caraker@myfwc.com	✓	
17	Chuck Collins	FWC	(561) 625-5122	chuck.collins@myfwc.com		✓
18	Don Coyner	FWC	(352) 732-1760	don.coyner@myfwc.com	✓	✓
19	Wesley Seitz	FWC	(561) 625-5122	wesley.seitz@myfwc.com	✓	
20	Valerie Chartier	NPS Contractor	(786) 374-8359	valerie.chartier@urs.com	✓	✓
21	Dan Levy	NPS Contractor	(305) 514-2463	dan.levy@urs.com	✓	✓
22	Don Pybas	NPS Contractor	(305) 733-4081	don_pybas@urscorp.com		✓
23	Rory Feeney	Miccosukee Tribe		roryf@miccosukeetribe.com	✓	
24	Bobby C. Billie	Miccosukee Simanolee Nation		ancienttrees@hotmail.com	✓	✓



APPENDIX 2 – INTERIM COMMENTS REPORT
(Generated from NPS PEPC on September 29, 2011)

Number of Correspondences: 272

Number of Comments: 1,113

Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type		
Type	# of Correspondences	Percentage
Web Form	243	68.26%
Other	86	24.16%
Letter	11	3.09%
Park Form	11	3.09%
E-mail	3	0.84%
Fax	2	0.56%
Total	356	100%

Correspondence Signature Count by Organization Type		
Organization Type	# of Correspondences	Percentage
Unaffiliated Individual	260	73.03%
Conservation/Preservation	50	14.04%
Recreational Groups	22	6.18%
Civic Groups	11	3.09%
Business	5	1.40%
Tribal Government	2	0.56%
Town or City Government	2	0.56%
State Government	2	0.56%
University/Professional Society	1	0.28%
Federal Government	1	0.28%
Total	356	100%

Correspondence Distribution by State		
State	# of Correspondences	Percentage
California	2	0.56%
Colorado	1	0.28%
District of Columbia	3	0.84%
Florida	233	65.45%
Georgia	4	1.12%
Idaho	1	0.28%
Illinois	1	0.28%
Michigan	1	0.28%
Minnesota	1	0.28%
Missouri	1	0.28%



Correspondence Distribution by State		
State	# of Correspondences	Percentage
North Carolina	1	0.28%
Nebraska	1	0.28%
New Jersey	1	0.28%
New York	3	0.84%
Ohio	1	0.28%
Oregon	1	0.28%
Pennsylvania	1	0.28%
South Carolina	1	0.28%
Texas	1	0.28%
Vermont	1	0.28%
West Virginia	1	0.28%
N/A	95	26.69%
Total	356	100%

Correspondence Distribution by Country		
State	# of Correspondences	Percentage
United States	356	100.00%
Total	356	100%

