



# **Vegetation and Deer Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement**

## **Morristown National Historical Park**

### ***Public Scoping Comment Analysis Report***

October 2011



# CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	I
INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS PUBLIC SCOPING? .....	1
PUBLIC SCOPING FOR THE VEGETATION AND DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN EIS .....	1
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	2
METHOD OF COMMENT ANALYSIS .....	2
HOW WILL THE COMMENTS BE USED? .....	3
GUIDE TO THIS REPORT .....	3
CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT .....	5
CONCERN REPORT .....	7
APPENDIX A: INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE REPORT .....	A-1
APPENDIX B: INDEX BY CODE REPORT.....	B-1



## **INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS PUBLIC SCOPING?**

Public scoping is the process by which the National Park Service (NPS) solicits public input on the scope of issues and alternatives to be addressed in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document, such as an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Public scoping is conducted early in the NEPA planning process and is not a single event or meeting. Tools such as mailings and/or meetings may be used to educate the public on the project and on the planning process guiding the preparation of an EIS. After the public scoping period ends, the NPS uses an established protocol to analyze and summarize the public comments received during the scoping period. This report describes the public scoping process for the Morristown National Historical Park Vegetation and Deer Management Plan/EIS (plan/EIS) and presents the analysis and summary of public comments received.

## **PUBLIC SCOPING FOR THE VEGETATION AND DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN EIS**

The Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on July 12, 2011. A public scoping period for the plan/EIS was open from July 14, 2011 through August 15, 2011. During this time, the public was encouraged to submit comments on the scope of the planning process (purpose, need, objectives, or any issues associated with the plan) through the NPS's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) web site (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/projectHome.cfm?projectID=33415>). Comments were also accepted by postal mail, at public meetings, and in person at the park.

The NPS conducted two public scoping meetings for the plan/EIS at the Washington's Headquarters Museum on Wednesday, July 27, 2011, from 7pm to 9pm and on Thursday, July 28, 2011, from 2pm to 4pm. A total of approximately 50 individuals attended the meetings (37 attended on July 27 and 13 attended on July 28). Both meetings were conducted in an identical format beginning with an open house, followed by a brief PowerPoint presentation, and closing with small group breakout sessions where individual comments were recorded on flip charts. These flip chart comments were later added into the NPS PEPC system. Additionally, a comment station was set up to inform the public about how to comment and provide them with an opportunity to submit comments during the meeting, either in hard copy on an official comment form or electronic comments using the NPS PEPC system. Attendees also were welcomed to leave written comments they brought with them to the meeting in the box provided. Park staff members were available throughout the open house portion of the meeting to answer questions and provide additional information to attendees.

During the scoping period, 159 pieces of correspondence were received and entered into the PEPC system. The PEPC system serves as a database where the NPS can analyze and summarize public scoping comments.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

Primary terms used in the document are defined below.

**Correspondence:** A correspondence is the entire document received from a commenter. This includes letters, e-mails, written comment forms, comments written on flip charts at the public meetings, comments entered directly into PEPC, and any other written comments provided either by postal mail or in person at the park.

**Comment:** A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It could include such information as an expression of support or opposition for an alternative, additional data regarding the existing condition, or suggestions for resource topics to be considered.

**Code:** A category or grouping centered on a common subject. The codes were developed during the scoping process and were used to track major subjects. Each comment is assigned at least one code.

**Concern:** Concerns are statements that summarize the issues identified by each code. Each code was further characterized by concern statements to provide a better focus on the content of comments. Some codes required multiple concern statements, while others did not. In cases where no comments were received on an issue, the issue was not identified or discussed in this report.

**Quotes:** Representative quotes have been taken directly from the text of the correspondence received from the public and further clarify the concern statements. Quotes have not been edited for grammar.

## METHOD OF COMMENT ANALYSIS

As stated above, 159 pieces of correspondence were received during the public scoping comment period. Correspondence was received by one of the following methods: hard copy letter via postal mail, hard copy letter delivered in person at the park, e-mail, public meeting flip charts, or correspondence entered directly into the internet-based PEPC system. Letters received by e-mail, fax, through the postal mail, or submitted in person at the park were entered into the PEPC system for analysis.

Once all the correspondence was entered into PEPC, each was read, and specific comments within each correspondence were identified. Over 1,060 comments were derived from the correspondence received. When identifying comments, every attempt was made to capture the full breadth of comments submitted.

For categorization purposes, each comment was given a code to identify the general content of a comment and to group similar comments together. A total of 32 codes were used to categorize the public scoping comments received. An example of a code developed for this project is *AL1000 – Support Non-Lethal Methods*. In some cases, the same comment may be categorized under more than one code, reflecting the fact that the comment may contain more than one issue or idea. It should be noted that the issues brought up in the public scoping comments are unlikely to be the only issues considered in the EIS. Issues to be considered in the EIS will be informed not only by

the public comments but by a number of other sources as well, including information on site conditions; federal laws, regulations, executive orders (EO), *NPS Management Policies 2006* (NPS 2006), and director's orders; and staff knowledge of the park's resources.

## HOW WILL THE COMMENTS BE USED?

As described above, all comments are categorized under codes and summarized within concern statements, such as "Some commenters would like the park to use hunting to reduce the deer population in the park and/or manage vegetation" and "Some commenters are in favor of a no-action alternative which would allow deer populations to stabilize naturally." These concerns are listed in the Concern Report section of this document. These concerns will help guide the issues, alternatives, impact topics, and references to be considered during drafting of the EIS.

A second public comment period will be conducted following the release of the draft Deer and Vegetation Management Plan/EIS, which is currently scheduled for the spring of 2013.

## GUIDE TO THIS REPORT

This report is organized into the five sections described below. The *Content Analysis Report* and the *Concern Statement Report* are provided in the following sections of this document. Additional PEPC reports are provided as appendixes to this document.

**Content Analysis Report:** This is a basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code and by various demographics. The first table summarizes the number of correspondence by geographic origin (by state). All correspondence was received from government agencies, organizations, or individuals within the United States. The next table displays the number of correspondence by organization type (i.e., organizations, governments, individuals, etc.), followed by a table that summarizes the comments received by code or topic. The last table displays the number of correspondence by correspondence type (i.e., amount of comments received through PEPC, e-mail, hard copy letters, etc.).

**Concern Statement Report:** This report summarizes the comments received during the public scoping process. In the report, comments are organized by codes and then summarized into concern statements. Representative quotes are provided for each concern statement. A list of concern statements, in table format, is provided at the beginning of the *Concern Statement Report* section for quick reference.

**Index by Organization Type Report:** This report provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types (and in this order): recreational groups, state government, town or city government, and unaffiliated individual. The commenters or authors are listed alphabetically, organized by the various organization types. For privacy purposes, individual commenters who provided their names and are not associated with a particular organization are grouped together as "public". Commenters who did not provide either a name or an organization are grouped together in the report as "N/A" because more specific information is not available. The listing for each commenter includes their correspondence number and the codes that their comments fell under. This report is contained in Appendix A.

**Index by Code Report:** This report lists which commenters or authors (identified by organization type if they were commenting in an official capacity) commented on which topics, as identified by the codes used in this analysis. The report is listed by code, and under each code is a list of the authors who submitted comments that fell under that code (if an official organization correspondence) and their correspondence numbers. Consistent with the “Index by Organization Type Report”, for privacy purposes, individual commenters who provided their names and are not associated with a particular organization are grouped together as “public”. Commenters who did not provide either a name or an organization are grouped together in the report as “N/A” because more specific information is not available. This report is contained in Appendix B.



## CONTENT ANALYSIS REPORT

### Correspondence Distribution by State

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondence
NE	0.63%	1
NJ	84.91%	135
NY	7.55%	12
OR	0.63%	1
PA	0.63%	1
UNKNOWN	5.03%	8
VA	0.63%	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>159</b>

### Correspondence Signature Count by Organization Type

Organization Type	Number of Correspondences
Town or City Government	1
State Government	1
Recreational Groups	1
Civic Groups	4
Unaffiliated Individual	152
<b>Total</b>	<b>159</b>

### Comment Distribution by Code

(Note: Each comment may have multiple codes. As a result, the total number of comments may be different than the actual comment totals)

Code	Description	Number of Comments
AL1000	Support Non-Lethal Methods	28
AL1100	Oppose Non-Lethal Methods	20
AL1200	Support Vegetation Management	16
AL1300	Oppose Vegetation Management	41
AL2000	Support Lethal Reduction	8
AL2100	Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park	10
AL2200	Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness	10
AL2300	Lethal Reduction Methods	5
AL3000	Support No-Action	5
AL3100	Support Action	8
AL4000	New Alternative Elements: Deer	5
AL4100	New Alternative Elements: Vegetation	2
CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties	12
CC1100	Consultation and Coordination: Current Coordination	1

GA1000	Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used	31
IS1000	Issue: Vegetation	284
IS2000	Issue: Invasive Species	106
IS3000	Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat	285
IS4000	Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting	29
IS4100	Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Deer	4
IS4200	Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Vegetation	1
IS5000	Issue: Visitor Experience	9
IS6000	Issue: Water Resources	4
IS7000	Issue: Historic Conditions	54
IS8000	Issue: Air Quality	3
IS9000	Issue: Socioeconomic Resources	4
IS10000	Issue: Soundscapes	1
NI1000	NEPA Issues: Process	1
NI2000	NEPA Issues: Public Coordination	2
NI3000	NEPA Issues: Analysis	2
PN1000	Purpose and Need	14

#### Correspondence Distribution by Correspondence Type

Type	Number of Correspondences
Web Form	130
Other	3
Park Form	4
Letter	17
Fax	1
E-mail	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>159</b>

## CONCERN REPORT

As described above, this report summarizes the comments received during the public scoping period for the Vegetation and Deer Management Plan/EIS. Table 1 below provides a concise list of concern statements by code for quick reference. It is followed by the full concern report from PEPC, which includes representative quotes.

<b>Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement</b>	
<b>AL1000 – Support Non-Lethal Methods</b>	
Concern ID: 32383	<p>Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should use humane, non-lethal methods for managing deer, which could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of a fertility control program, such as the use of GonaCon</li> <li>• education for motorists to minimize collisions with deer</li> </ul>
<b>AL1100 – Oppose Non-Lethal Methods</b>	
Concern ID: 32406	<p>Some commenters feel that non-lethal deer management methods are ineffective, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fencing</li> <li>• trap and transport</li> <li>• surgical sterilization</li> <li>• other reproduction controls</li> </ul>
<b>AL1200 – Support Vegetation Management</b>	
Concern: 33102	<p>Some commenters are in favor of the use of vegetation management within the park to control deer browsing, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fencing/exclosures</li> <li>• seed banks</li> <li>• planting young trees</li> <li>• use of repellants</li> <li>• physical removal of invasive plant species</li> </ul>
<b>AL1300 – Oppose Vegetation Management</b>	
Concern: 33108	<p>Some commenters feel that vegetation management efforts, such as opening forest canopies, clear cutting, planting of agricultural crops, and controlled burns, enhance deer habitat and would result in an increase in deer population.</p>
<b>AL2000 – Support Lethal Reduction</b>	

<b>Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement</b>	
Concern ID: 33117	Some commenters would like the park to use hunting to reduce the deer population in the park and/or manage vegetation.
<b>AL2100 – Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park</b>	
Concern ID: 33124	Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should not implement lethal deer reduction methods at the park, including sport hunting.
<b>AL2200 – Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness</b>	
Concern ID: 33128	<p>Some commenters feel that lethal reductions within the park would be ineffective because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• hunting in the surrounding communities will continue to increase the number of deer within the park</li> <li>• state agencies are working to increase deer populations</li> <li>• killing deer results in increased birthing rates</li> </ul>
<b>AL2300 – Lethal Reduction Methods</b>	
Concern: 33132	<p>Some commenters feel that if lethal deer reduction methods are implemented at the park, the following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use of humane methods (not bolting)</li> <li>• donation of deer meat to local food banks</li> <li>• consumption of meat by the hunters</li> <li>• use of lead shot, which can poison other wildlife, air, water, and/or soil</li> <li>• management of hunters by experienced professionals</li> </ul>
<b>AL3000 – Support No-Action</b>	
Concern ID: 33139	Some commenters are in favor of a no-action alternative which would allow deer populations to stabilize naturally.
<b>AL3100 – Support Action</b>	
Concern ID: 33143	Some commenters feel that the deer population within the park must be controlled by the National Park Service.

<b>Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement</b>	
Concern ID: 33145	Some commenters feel that a combination of both vegetation and deer management efforts are necessary to achieve native plant regeneration.
<b>AL4000 – New Alternative Elements: Deer</b>	
Concern ID: 33151	<p>Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should consider additional alternative elements in their analysis, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• introduction of predators such as bears, coyotes, or bobcats</li> <li>• placement of predator scents throughout the park</li> <li>• termination of deer management strategies once desired conditions are achieved</li> </ul>
<b>AL4100 – New Alternative Elements: Vegetation</b>	
Concern ID: 33152	Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should consider liming soils within the park to regenerate vegetation.
<b>CC1000 – Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties</b>	
Concern ID: 33165	<p>Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should involve stakeholders in the planning process, including coordination with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lewis Morris County Park</li> <li>• Essex County Commissioner</li> <li>• New Jersey Audubon</li> <li>• adjacent municipalities</li> <li>• adjoining property owners</li> <li>• applicable interest groups</li> </ul>
<b>CC1100 – Consultation and Coordination: Current Coordination</b>	
Concern ID: 33167	One commenter is concerned about the park's consultations with a particular state biologist.
<b>GA1000 – Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used</b>	
Concern ID: 32626	Some commenters feel that the vegetation and deer management plan and associated decisions must be supported by unbiased, logical, accurate, and science-based resources.

<b>Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement</b>	
<b>IS1000 – Issue: Vegetation</b>	
Concern ID: 32496	Some commenters believe that the deer are improving the vegetation at Morristown National Historical Park, including aiding in the dispersal of native plant seeds.
Concern ID: 32497	<p>Some commenters feel that there are factors other than deer that are impacting vegetation within the park, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• canopy changes</li> <li>• pollution</li> <li>• gypsy moths and other insects</li> <li>• black bears</li> <li>• human presence</li> <li>• wildlife habitat incentive programs</li> </ul>
<b>IS2000 – Issue: Invasive Species</b>	
Concern ID: 32505	Some commenters feel that the deer are eating native plant species, allowing the spread of invasive plants. The sale of invasive plants at nurseries throughout New Jersey, and the resulting planting of these species in area gardens, further facilitates the spread of invasive plants.
<b>IS3000 – Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat</b>	
Concern ID: 32513	Some commenters would like the EIS to consider the role deer play in the ecology of Morristown National Historical Park.
<b>IS4000 – Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting</b>	
Concern ID: 32516	<p>Some commenters are concerned about the safety risks associated with hunting in the park, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• potential for shooting into homes</li> <li>• increased deer/vehicle collisions</li> <li>• increased risks to park visitors within hunting areas</li> </ul>

<b>Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement</b>	
<b>IS4100 – Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Deer</b>	
Concern ID: 33207	Some commenters feel that the presence of deer reduces visitor conflicts and improves safety within the park by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reducing the risk for fires</li> <li>• reducing the risk of Lyme disease</li> </ul>
<b>IS4200 – Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Vegetation</b>	
Concern ID: 33208	One commenter is concerned about trail hazards caused by overgrown invasive plants.
<b>IS5000 – Issue: Visitor Experience</b>	
Concern ID: 32556	Some commenters are concerned that the vegetation and deer plan would impact the visitor experience at the park, and they would like to see these impacts analyzed in the EIS.
<b>IS6000 – Issue: Water Resources</b>	
Concern ID: 32557	One commenter feels that the park’s water quality would not be harmed by any of the EIS alternatives.
Concern ID: 33213	One commenter feels that the presence of deer contributes to water pollution.
<b>IS7000 – Issue: Historic Conditions</b>	
Concern ID: 32657	Some commenters feel that retaining 18th or 19th century vegetation and animal composition in the park is not an achievable or desireable goal.
Concern ID: 32658	Some commenters are in favor of the park retaining 18 <sup>th</sup> or 19 <sup>th</sup> century vegetation and animal composition in the park.
<b>IS8000 – Issue: Air Quality</b>	
Concern ID: 33221	Some commenters feel that pollution and increased ozone are damaging the plants, insects, and wildlife within the park.
<b>IS9000 – Issue: Socioeconomic Resources</b>	
Concern ID: 33226	Some commenters feel that cost effectiveness is an important factor in achieving the plan objectives.
<b>IS10000 – Issue: Soundscapes</b>	
Concern ID: 33230	One commenter is concerned that hunting will impact soundscapes in the park.

<b>Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement</b>	
<b>MT1000 – Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document</b>	
Concern ID: 32598	Some commenters are concerned about the impact to humans from wildlife other than deer, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pigs</li> <li>• coyotes</li> </ul>
Concern ID: 32600	One commenter feels that Madison officials should have a deer and vegetation management plan for the Borough of Madison.
Concern ID: 32604	Some commenters are concerned about wildlife deaths caused by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, farmers, and ranchers.
<b>NI1000 –NEPA Issues: Process</b>	
Concern ID: 33245	One commenter feels that the planning process should be compressed.
<b>NI2000 – NEPA Issues: Public Coordination</b>	
Concern ID: 33246	One commenter would like public comments related to this plan/EIS to be accessible to all members of the public.
Concern ID: 33247	One commenter is opposed to the break-out group format used at the public scoping meetings.
<b>NI3000 – NEPA Issues: Analysis</b>	
Concern ID: 3248	Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should conduct a comprehensive analysis of natural and cultural resource topics as part of the EIS, including factors that contribute to the affected environment within the park. Metrics should be used to identify and analyze impacts and goals.



Table 1: Code, Corresponding Concern ID, and Corresponding Concern Statement	
PN1000 – Purpose and Need	
Concern ID: 32651	<p>Some commenters question the initial assumptions and hypotheses in the description of this project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• deer are damaging the understory and the landscape</li> <li>• deer are prohibiting native forest regeneration</li> <li>• there is a large deer population within the park</li> <li>• deer, not short sighted management policy, are causing overpopulation and subsequent habitat destruction in the park</li> </ul>

The following report is organized by codes and then concern statements. Representative quotes are provided for each concern statement.

Representative quotes provided below are taken directly from PEPC and are shown exactly as they were entered. Grammar and spelling have not been changed. These representative quotes are not the only comments received under this particular concern statement; however, these quotes have been chosen to represent those comments categorized under each concern statement.

**Report Date: 09/27/2011**

***AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods***

**Concern ID:** 32383

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should use humane, non-lethal methods for managing deer, which could include:  
- development of a fertility control program, such as the use of GonaCon  
- education for motorists to minimize collisions with deer

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 41 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220484 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** We believe only in non-lethal deer control, including GonaCon.

**Corr. ID:** 111 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220656 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The immunocontraception Gonacon can be used when addressing the white tail deer population. This contraception has been tested in Maryland as well as in New Jersey and has been proven to be both safe and effective.

**Corr. ID:** 119 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221821 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** With non-lethal and effective mitigation measures such as driver education, reduced speed limits, improved fencing, lining the roads with vegetation the is unpalatable to deer and using roadside reflectors to deter deer from crossing roads, many communities are actually reducing the number of deer vehicle collisions without relying on the "shoot first" mind set.

***AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods***

**Concern ID:** 32406

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that non-lethal deer management methods are ineffective, including:  
- fencing  
- trap and transport  
- surgical sterilization  
- other reproduction controls

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 9 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220355 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I am against reproductive control, because I think it is an expensive, as well as less effective, means of control.

**Corr. ID:** 25 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220397 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I disagree with using reproductive control methods for deer management due to the inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of the state of technology. Most importantly, I disagree with chemical control

because chemicals are ultimately distributed throughout the food chain, impacting the many species that consume deer, including humans

**Corr. ID:** 29      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220412      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Other means, such as deer contraception are far more expensive, and inefficient.

**Corr. ID:** 56      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220570      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I strongly oppose the use of contraceptives, as this method has never been proven effective. Furthermore, there has been no study to identify what effect the introduction of contraceptives will have on the animal's health, or on the health of any person consuming the animal. My concern is that the contraceptive may have a deleterious impact upon the animal's health and may remain in the meat, ultimately passing along to the person consuming the animal. While preservationist insist that this method is safe, one need only look the track record of the pharmaceutical industry in introducing drugs that have ultimately been found to be harmful to the humans they were intended to help.

**Corr. ID:** 150      **Organization:** State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

**Comment ID:** 226645      **Organization Type:** State Government

**Representative Quote:** Surgical sterilization is very expensive with costs at over \$1000 per animal does not solve the problem of overabundant deer, and is impractical from a logistical standpoint as MNHP is not in close proximity to a wildlife hospital or research center qualified to conduct these surgeries. Surgical field sterilization is still in the experimental stage.

## ***AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management***

**Concern ID:** 33102

### ***CONCERN***

### ***STATEMENT:***

Some commenters are in favor of the use of vegetation management within the park to control deer browsing, including:

- fencing/exclosures
- seed banks
- planting young trees
- use of repellants
- physical removal of invasive plant species

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1      **Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220318      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Again, by having a confined population (within fencing), relatively sound research programs could be carried out that also would help other communities facing the browsing deer scenario.

**Corr. ID:** 1      **Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220316      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Deer fencing around park perimeter seems like a cost-effective means of preventing major new deer introduction while the deer within the park gradually reach a "steady-state" population depending on the food supply. Such a contained population would be an ideal "controlled" population for sterilization and other population-management studies - if those are deemed necessary by NPS and other Federal and State agencies.

**Corr. ID:** 25      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220396      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Regarding White-tailed deer browse management, I

agree with; deer fencing, lethal reduction with firearms and without firearms.

**Corr. ID:** 26

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220402 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Also essential is the removal of the barberry bushes, wild mustard, and multiflora rose, and other nonnative plant species by what ever method is considered practical. Those programs have worked in neighboring Lewis Morris Park and I expect that they will work in Jockey Hollow Park also.

**Corr. ID:** 32

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220426 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Besides making erosion far less likely the greenery is responsible for ridding us of carbon dioxide and producing the oxygen we all breathe. Given the choice of deer or greenery there is no contest.

**Corr. ID:** 33

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220433 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I recommend that NPS either erect ten foot deer fencing on the entire property that you intend to restore or allowing an on going and aggressive hunt to reduce the current deer population and maintain deer population numbers at a small fraction of the current herd.

**Corr. ID:** 38

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220448 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 3. INVASIVE PLANTS - I AGREE WITH THAT. TAXPAYERS PAY FOR THE USDA TO KEEP OUT INVASIVE PLANTS, BUT THIS FEDERAL AGENCY HAS VILLED AMERICAN WITH TOTALLY INVASIVE PLANTS. ALL EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE, VOLUNTEERS IF YOU CAN, TO PULL OUT ALL THE INVASIVE PLANTS. IT COULD BE THAT THEY ARE MORE FITTED TO THE NEW CLIMATE SCHEME WE HAVE AND THAT NEEDS TO BE INVESTIGATED.

**Corr. ID:** 49

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220507 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I would say that we should remove the invasive Japanese Barberry and the soil that it has altered around it, along with removing Norway maple trees and replacing them with the native Sugar maple.

**Corr. ID:** 54

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220560 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The Morristown National Historical Park Vegetation and White-tailed Deer Management Plan needs to move forward as quickly as possible. As a resident of Morristown living near Fort Nonsense I see the impact of the large deer population every day. I understand that this plan will not cover the Fort Nonsense area but any reduction in the deer population in the area will have a positive impact on the surrounding area. There are so many deer in the area that they regularly walk down the street I live on and eat everything in sight. My neighbors and I are unable to have many plants in the front of our houses due to the deer. We do not live on a suburban street with land between each house. We live in the town of Morristown and are regularly surprised at the deer that are not afraid of people, cars, dogs, etc. Additionally, we regularly have deer jump the fence surrounding our backyard to feed on the landscaping we have. These deer are free to roam in town because there is nothing reducing their numbers.

**Corr. ID:** 68                      **Organization:** League of Humane Voters  
**Comment ID:** 220690    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** \* If J. barberry and other invasive hadn't been introduced. sold and still used by humans, deer browsing on natives in deep forest areas would NOT be an issue.

\* Remove J. barberry by physical not chemical mean.  
**Corr. ID:** 68                      **Organization:** League of Humane Voters  
**Comment ID:** 220668    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Vegetation Management

\* Agree - Removal of invasive species - by PHYSICAL means - instead of chemicals such as Round-Up.

**Corr. ID:** 81                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220738    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Deer don't stay in Park, so lack of effective deer management affects neighboring municipalities  
Effects include browse damage, deer ticks, and motor vehicle accidents

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221442    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Need forest with exclosures, as large as possible, before culling takes place. Seed banks first and then eliminate nonnatives.

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221386    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Consider the use of repellants

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221476    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Deer exclosure is main priority until seedlings are established, then cull. Use systemic herbicides wherever possible.

### ***AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management***

**Concern ID:** 33107

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that vegetation management efforts, such as opening forest canopies, clear cutting, planting of agricultural crops, and controlled burns, enhance deer habitat and would result in an increase in deer population.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221755 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Do not increase habitat suitability for deer through enhancement such as clear-cutting or agricultural crops.

**Corr. ID:** 97                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221108 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Among other management goals, the National Park Service proposes opening forest canopies so that sunlight reaches the floor. This is classic enhancement of deer range. White-tails browse and forage on warm weather grasses and woody stems.

**Corr. ID:** 97                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221105 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Both habitat enhancement for deer conducted on Wildlife Management Areas and on private lands leased for hunting provide

ample food, which means does breed at first estrus, with better neonatal health. This is happening in towns and parks adjacent to Jockey Hollow which are "managing" annual hunts and conducting "hunter satisfaction" surveys -- with taxpayer dollars.

**Corr. ID:** 131 **Organization:** Animal Protection League of New Jersey

**Comment ID:** 221854 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The difficulties lie in introduced non-natives, which thrive whether deer are present, or not. The ornamental Japanese barberry is sold at Morris County garden centers, and at centers throughout the state. A requisite first step would be mechanical removal. A second would be to ban its sale. The fact remains that MNHP, no matter what it does, is surrounded by locales whose actions are stimulating breeding and changing deer age structure.

Among other management goals, the National Park Service proposes opening forest canopies so that sunlight reaches the floor. The park is already engaged in controlled burns. Both are classic enhancement of deer range. White-tails browse and forage on warm weather grasses and woody stems.

**Corr. ID:** 137 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220858 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 10. Both habitat enhancement for deer conducted on Wildlife Management Areas and on private lands leased for hunting provide ample food, which means females breed earlier and with better neonatal health. This is happening in towns and parks adjacent to Jockey Hollow.

**Corr. ID:** 138 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220873 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The best things to do:

1. Stop farming deer through habitat modification programs.

**Corr. ID:** 139 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220839 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 1. Stop farming deer through habitat modification programs.

## ***AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction***

**Concern ID:** 33117

### ***CONCERN***

### ***STATEMENT:***

**Representative Quote(s):** [Some commenters would like the park to use hunting to reduce the deer population in the park and/or manage vegetation.](#)

**Corr. ID:** 9 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220351 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I believe that lethal reduction of the white-tailed deer population is appropriate. Because they no longer have any natural predators to keep their population in check, there is overpopulation of them in the region. They die from starvation during difficult winters, and they die miserably on roadways from car accidents.

**Corr. ID:** 26 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220401 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The only ways that I can suggest to bring back the native vegetation, small animals, and birds is to greatly thin the deer herds by controlled public hunting, as is done at the great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge and Lewis Morris Park.

**Corr. ID:** 30      **Organization:** NEW JERSEY BEACH BUGGY ASSOCIATION

**Comment ID:** 220415      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Archery is a good tool if the area is too grown up to safely use firearms.

**Corr. ID:** 43      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220497      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Please allow hunting. Bowhunting works real well. Thank you

**Corr. ID:** 71      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220627      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The National Parks Service should strongly consider controlled hunting to reduce the deer population in the park. The Morris County Park Commission is doing this effectively all around the national park at little cost.

**Corr. ID:** 72      **Organization:** N J Trappers Association

**Comment ID:** 220697      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The best and most cost effective method would be to allow public hunting. This could be done in a manner like the nearby Great Swamp area, which has a controled hunt each year.

**Corr. ID:** 85      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221436      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Parks with no deer hunt have invasive problems

**Corr. ID:** 85      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221464      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** ? Open public recreational hunting is the most effective response to occur

### ***AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park***

**Concern ID:** 33124

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should not implement lethal deer reduction methods at the park, including sport hunting.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1      **Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220314      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** This brings me to the question of deer management. As part of this Plan/EIS, NPS must decide whether sport or trophy hunting should be a part of the Plan. (My opinion is that it should not be.)

**Corr. ID:** 6      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220340      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** First, sport hunting cannot positively impact animal populations. It goes against the effective population control that happens naturally, where the weaker and sick animals die. Sport hunters love to kill the healthiest males, because they make the best trophies. The weak and sick animals will still die, but now the population will be unnaturally reduced. The animals will attempt to compensate for this by mating much more than they otherwise would have. One male deer can impregnate 20 or more females. This means that killing male deer is almost never going to help the deer population. This is not only a theoretical consideration, but there is research that has shown this exacerbating effect that hunting has on populations to be true.

**Corr. ID:** 6      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220339      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I am a concerned citizen and I think it is a big mistake to attempt to control animal populations through hunting. It is not the best method of environmental stewardship, and your purposes can be better achieved through other means.

**Corr. ID:** 7      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220345      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The decision to allow hunting in Morristown National Park is misguided at best, and unnecessary at worst. The deer kills in surrounding areas--which only help to increase deer populations--have sent the animals to seek refuge in the park. None of these kills serves its stated purpose, but does provide additional deer and areas for hunters to ply their "hobby." Deer populations will only increase under these conditions: temporary reduction in numbers spurs increased birth rates to take advantage of the increase in habitat.

**Corr. ID:** 13      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220368      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Considering lifting the hunting ban in the Morristown park is a despicable and very bad idea.

**Corr. ID:** 21      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220390      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Please do not allow a small minority of hunters to dictate and manipulate land management policies to create artificially high deer birth rates and overpopulation in the parks and residential areas of New Jersey. Please oppose the so-called "conservation coalitions" when they rationalize and promote hunting as the only method to solve the problem which they have created to satisfy the desire of hunters to kill wildlife.

**Corr. ID:** 51      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220528      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** (M) I am concerned that local hunters, running short of deer to hunt in some communities, see deer "management" at Jockey Hollow as a convenient and ongoing hunting opportunity.

**Corr. ID:** 51      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220516      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** (A) Killing wildlife does not inspire the public, a stated mission of MNHP.

**Corr. ID:** 80      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220733      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The NPS is required to maintain natural resources "unimpaired" according to Congress. Deer hunting is not unimpaired. Both of our Senators are very animal friendly. They would not support deer hunting, especially when it's revealed that hunting never reduces deer fertility rate.

**Corr. ID:** 144      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 226286      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I think the public needs to be made aware of the efforts of Fish and Wildlife to maintain or increase the number of deer on public land for the purpose of sport hunting.

## ***AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness***

**Concern ID:** 33128



**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Some commenters feel that lethal reductions within the park would be ineffective because:

- hunting in the surrounding communities will continue to increase the number of deer within the park
- state agencies are working to increase deer populations
- killing deer results in increased birthing rates

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID: 2**

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220325 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Deer have been responding to this stress of hunting in the Lewis Morris Park by having more offspring, sometimes three at a time!

**Corr. ID: 3**

**Organization:** West Milford Environmental Commission

**Comment ID:** 220330 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The annual deer hunt in New Jersey is often futile - with trophy hunters only going for bucks with valuable antlers. As a result, the female deer continue to give birth to more deer than ever before. And all of suburban New Jersey is a farm for them, ripe for the picking.

**Corr. ID: 8**

**Organization:** Sierra Club Group Chair

**Comment ID:** 220349 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** One is how culling of herds will only stimulate unnatural increases in deer birth rates. From my perspective, we need to protect the flora and fauna of these parks and it is inhumane to allow the deer population to grow to the point they must starve to become infertile, or, rather, stable.

**Corr. ID: 16**

**Organization:** Civitas-USA

**Comment ID:** 220374 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In the long run killing deer by hunting or other means DOES NOT REDUCE their population,. INSTEAD, by stimulating the birth rate, it serves to increase the population. That's what "scientific game management" is all about. It's purpose is to provide people who consider killing a sport with the maximum number of deer that the habitat will support, tempered by the amount of damage motorists, farmers and gardeners will endure.

**Corr. ID: 35**

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220438 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Hunting will drive deer into the few unhunted areas left: residential properties and roadways. The deer population has remained stable so lethal population control is not necessary and dangerous.

**Corr. ID: 68**

**Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220685 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** \* In response to killing programs, DOES INCREASE THEIR HOME RANGE BY AN AVERAGE OF 30% (Henderson, Warren et al 2000).

\* The Morris County Parks Commission has held deer hunts in the following county parks:

\* Baudenhausen Tract \* Jonathan's Woods

\* Bamboo Brook and Willowood Arboretum \* Knight, Allen, Luce Property

\* Black River County Park \* Loantaka Brook Reservation

\* Central Park of Morris County \* Mahlon Dickerson Reservation

\* Elizabeth D. Kay Environmental Center \* Mount Hope Historical Park

\* Flanders Valley Golf Course \* Mount Paul Memorial County Park

\* Frelinghuysen Arboretum \* Old Troy Park  
\* James Andrews Memorial Park \* Pyramid Mountain Natural Historic Area  
\* Schooley's Mountain Park \* Toume Park

**Corr. ID:** 138      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220875      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 3. Stop hunts in surrounding communities, which bring deer numbers up and cause them to refuge in the park.

**Corr. ID:** 139      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220837      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Deer are a native species, but because of deer management programs employed by the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife, their fertility is artificially kept higher than what is natural.

**Corr. ID:** 144      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 226283      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I do not think killing the deer will be effective in restoring vegetation because the Division of Fish and Wildlife wants a large deer herd.

### ***AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods***

**Concern ID:** 33132

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that if lethal deer reduction methods are implemented at the park, the following should be considered:

- use of humane methods (not bolting)
- donation of deer meat to local food banks
- consumption of meat by the hunters
- use of lead shot, which can poison other wildlife, air, water, and/or soil
- management of hunters by experienced professionals

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 30      **Organization:** NEW JERSEY BEACH BUGGY ASSOCIATION

**Comment ID:** 220413      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Allow sportsmen to shoot and eat deer or donate them to a food bank.

**Corr. ID:** 38      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220456      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 11. LEAD SHOT IS HORRIFIC AND NEEDS TO BE COMPLETELY DISCONTINUED FROM ALL USE IN NJ. IT IS CLEAR THAT IT POISONS OTHER WILDLIFE AND THAT IT DISINTEGRATES INTO THE AIR/WATER AND SOIL AND CREATES HAZARDOUS SITE CONDITIONS. IT SHOULD NEVER BE ALLOWED IN ANY WAY ON THIS SITE.

**Corr. ID:** 39      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220462      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 5. LEAD SHOT IS DELETERIOUS TO AN AREA. LEAD SHOT DETERIORATES IN AIR/WATER AND SOIL AND MAKES A SITE A HAZMAT SITE. LEAD SHOT ALSO POISONS BIRDS WHO EAT THE SHOT, AND OTHER ANIMALS WHO GET LEAD IN THEIR STOMACHS FROM LEAD SHOT. THE LIVER IS HORRENDOUSLY DAMAGED FROM LEAD SHOT.

**Corr. ID:** 85      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221378      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Discourages the use of bolting. It is inhumane.

### ***AL3000 - Support No-Action***

**Concern ID:** 33139

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Some commenters are in favor of a no-action alternative which would allow deer populations to stabilize naturally.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 7 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220346 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** If the deer were left to multiply at their natural rate, without hunting pressure, the populations would stabilize to fit the available environment.

**Corr. ID:** 13 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220369 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** If one seeks to properly "manage" wildlife successfully, leaving them a place to exist without the encroachment of humanity would be a fine place to start. It's a brilliant idea, and just think. you folks could be the first in New Jersey to figure it out! Congratulations. I am certain you are doing the absolute right thing, especially with that karma thing and all...

**Corr. ID:** 14 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220370 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The deer population has remained stable for many years minus deer hunts.

**Corr. ID:** 89 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220924 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Leave the animals alone. Let nature takes its course. Thank You

**Corr. ID:** 129 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221087 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** So it defies credibility to see managing invasive species and deer browsing as the way to ensure a specific outcome on the type of plants that dominant this entire park landscape over a prolonged period of time. At the very least, this approach will require a constant interference with the natural evolution of plants and animal behaviors, which is constantly changing due to other outside influences, whether they be climate changes, acid rainfall, hunting pressure on deer in surrounding towns, or the feeding habits of birds, to name just a few. Also, in interfering with these two aspects of the complex ecology of the park, other unintended consequences will occur, many of which will remain unnoticed and perhaps become irreversible, again to the detriment of the park.

### ***AL3100 - Support Action***

**Concern ID:** 33143

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Some commenters feel that the deer population within the park must be controlled by the National Park Service.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 11 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220366 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Stop pandering to the women who believe in Bambi. The truth is that deer are nothing more then "wood rats" and the destruction they inflict on nature, when left to multiply like rats by the Bambi Believers, is both ecologically and financially irresponsible! It time to tell them to shut up and sit down, our forests can't wait any longer!

**Corr. ID:** 27 **Organization:** UBNJ

**Comment ID:** 220406 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** If left unchecked, animals can create extreme damage to the ecosystem and often affect other indigenous animal species in a negative way.

**Corr. ID:** 32

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220427 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The long term effects aside, I have yet to fathom how, to the deer were here first people, rather than culling, it is better to let the deer starve to death. What ever those people want done is either impossible or impractical and is not happening for either one of or both of those reasons. What is happening is the destruction of the forests and the starvation death of the deer herd. The forests can take care of themselves if they are rid of deer, deer that can't take care of themselves.

**Corr. ID:** 42

**Organization:** UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA

**Comment ID:** 220492 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It seems the belief that some maintain that letting nature take it's course in a situation such as you are experiencing has been proven to not be affective in the least and will result in an overabundant deer herd in very poor physical condition, as well as an ecosystem in shambles with no resemblance to it's origins, such as is the case currently.

**Corr. ID:** 42

**Organization:** UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA

**Comment ID:** 220490 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** It has been proven many times over that the only way to balance an ecosystem that contains an overpopulation of whitetail deer and is in critical condition, is to control the population so that it remains in balance with the natural habitat. Then, and only then, can a reintroduction of native species be performed without fear of being consumed by the local deer population.

**Corr. ID:** 42

**Organization:** UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA

**Comment ID:** 220494 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Unfortunately, the well intentioned, but highly miss-informed folks who advocate allowing deer herds in public areas to remain uncontrolled and unmanaged, now must face the fact that the very condition they helped create now must be addressed at the crisis level instead of a steady, controlled and ongoing maintenance program.

**Concern ID:**

33145

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Some commenters feel that a combination of both vegetation and deer management efforts are necessary to achieve native plant regeneration.

**Representative Quote(s):**

**Corr. ID:** 49

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220508 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** As far as deer culling goes, 60 per acre is quite unsustainable. A proposed removal of the Japanese Barberry with its contaminated soil and a bi-annual or tri-annual deer hunt would allow native shrubbery to come back. If, you ONLY remove the Barberry, native plants will flourish and the deer population will increase. If you only reduce the amount of deer, the barberry and norway maple will still continue to flourish and strangle the native flora. Both the removal of the invasive flora and culling of the deer herd are necessary at the same time to ensure that the native species get the upper hand.

**Corr. ID:** 135

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220905 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** As the deer population is controlled, certain vegetation management should be instituted on a trial basis to speed forest recovery.

***AL4000 - New Alternative Elements: Deer***

**Concern ID:** 33151

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should consider additional alternative elements in their analysis, including:  
- introduction of predators such as bears, coyotes, or bobcats  
- placement of predator scents throughout the park  
- termination of deer management strategies once desired conditions are achieved

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220317 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** If allowed to hunt, man becomes the primary predator of deer in the Park, although his reason for harvesting deer escapes me in most cases. Perhaps other predators of two centuries ago need to be re-introduced into the park. I presume there are black bears who "harvest" some young deer. Could other predators contribute to a more natural environment of the 1700s? Coyote, bobcats, even diseases (mad cow?) could be considered. Many of these still exist but have themselves been driven to near extinction in our relatively urban environment. Although the NPS (and the public) may be unwilling to share their park with dangerous predators, predator scents could be strategically placed around the park to redirect deer to areas of other, less palatable vegetation.

**Corr. ID:** 3 **Organization:** West Milford Environmental Commission

**Comment ID:** 220331 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** According to Emile DeVito, a wildlife expert with a doctorate in Ecology, before settlers from Europe came to the region that is now New Jersey, the average deer population was 3-5 per square mile. Today, in my hometown of West Milford that average is around 70.

**Corr. ID:** 33 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220432 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Historically, deer had successful predators in the form of wolves, large cats and humans. Their population was naturally checked. This is no longer the case.

**Corr. ID:** 78 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220723 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Can we re-introduce natural predators (those which do not become targets of public fear/retribution) to control the number of young deer reaching maturity?

**Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 221383 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Should stop management strategies when appropriate levels are reached

***AL4100 - New Alternative Elements: Vegetation***

**Concern ID:** 33152

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should consider liming soils within the park to regenerate vegetation.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 68 **Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220669 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** \* Agree - Soil Amendments. Dr. Sharpe recommends addition of lime to soil. Attached article "Penn State Expert Blames Forest Problem On Acid Rain, Not Deer," states:

"Sharpe, however, said without all of the acid in the soil, plants and trees would grow enough that the number of deer browsing would not make a difference.

...Liming of areas may increase the ability of the soil to regenerate plant and tree life but KILLING THE DEER WILL NOT."

**Corr. ID:** 118 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221806 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Decades of acid precipitation have removed alkalinity and lowered the pH of the forest soil. Liming is necessary to improve soils and grow new trees, particularly acid-sensitive species such as sugar maple and red oak. In addition, liming has been shown to increase the number and diversity of forest birds and wildflower species.

Liming of areas may increase the ability of the soil to regenerate plant and tree life, but killing the deer will not.

### ***CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties***

**Concern ID:** 33165

#### ***CONCERN STATEMENT:***

Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should involve stakeholders in the planning process, including coordination with:

- Lewis Morris County Park
- Essex County Commissioner
- New Jersey Audubon
- adjacent municipalities
- adjoining property owners
- applicable interest groups

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 4 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220337 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Every neighbor is really fed up with this problem. I wish you could come to our neighborhood gatherings and listen to the comments about our State and local wildlife control.

**Corr. ID:** 5 **Organization:** Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum

**Comment ID:** 220338 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I hope you are working in conjunction with the arboretum and other knowledgeable groups on this problem.

**Corr. ID:** 51 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220532 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The forests and the deer of MNHP "reside" in New Jersey, are surrounded by numerous municipalities and are impacted by actions at the Federal, State, County and local levels here. Each of these separate entities do or don't have deer management plans of varying design and result, which likely impact the deer populations in the Park.

**Corr. ID:** 82 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220740 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** HAS THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MORRIS NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK APPROACHED THE NEW JERSEY DIVISION FISH & GAME AND REQUESTED THAT THE DEER MANAGEMENT POLICIES IN NEW JERSEY ALL BE FOR POPULATION DECREASE AND THAT NO POPULATION INCREASE

BE SUPPORTED IN ANY AREA OF NJ BY POLICIES OF THE NJ DIV FISH & GAME.

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221432    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Shared stakeholder involvement

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221452    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Initiate a panel with NPS, County Park Commission, adjacent municipalities, New Jersey Audubon, etc. Morristown and adjacent sites affect each other. There should be coordination among all stakeholders.

**Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221749    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Reach out to surrounding land holders and animal/wildlife groups and consider the opinions of many varied interest groups.

**Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221741    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Land managers need to work together to address the issues

**Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221752    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** ? Complete agreement between managing land agencies or land holders - general movement in right direction of reducing deer and invasives.

**Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221761    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Investigate if others in the area are managing for an increasing deer population.

**Corr. ID:** 121                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220653    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** This is what should happen. A real study should be done by representatives of different interest groups. Public meetings should be held to allow full disclosure and debate. The EIS represents only one very narrow viewpoint which profits from hunting. Decisions should not be made by this approach.

**Corr. ID:** 154                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 226296    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** i note that s. predl participated in a science advisory team teleconference and discussed strategies for "managing" the forest at morristown natl historic park. i want to state for the record that this is a public park. this is not a park for the nj hunting club known as the njdfgw. the national taxpayers support this park, not the hunting community so your private, secret conference with the hunting division of the nj dep is not appreciated and in fact this is a complaint about this.

THE FIRST PEOPLE TO BE APPROACHED ABOUT NATIONAL SITES IS THE PUBLIC - THE GENERAL AMERICAN PUBLIC. NOT STATE PUBLIC SERVANTS WHOSE JOBS DEPEND ON THEIR FOMENTING THE HYSTERIA OF HUNTING AND WILDLIFE MURDER. I FIND THESE PRIVATE CONVERSTION, SECRET, DECEPTIVE, AND CUTTING OUT THE TAXPAYER/CITIZENS OF THIS STATE NATION. PLEASE ALWAYS PUT THE PUBLIC FIRST.



THAT IS WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM TO OPERATE THIS PARK. YOUR INSIDER CONVERSATIONS WITH THE STATE public servants - and let me emphasive that - public servants with an idiology which is not the idiology of the general nj public, is distressing and deceptive.

### ***CC1100 - Consultation and Coordination: Current Coordination***

**Concern ID:** 33167

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [One commenter is concerned about the park's consultations with a particular state biologist.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 63 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220658 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I HAVE SEVERE ISSUES WITH A BIOLOGIST AND PARK STAFF WHO DO NOT CONSULT LEADING SCIENTISTS ON WHAT IS TRULY HAPPENING WITH FORESTS ALL OVER AMERICA - THEY ARE DYING AS THIS REPORT AND BOOK PROVES.

### ***GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used***

**Concern ID:** 32626

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [Some commenters feel that the vegetation and deer management plan and associated decisions must be supported by unbiased, logical, accurate, and science-based resources.](#)

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 8 **Organization:** Sierra Club Group Chair

**Comment ID:** 220348 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** While I understand the need to protect the area from habitat destruction due to deer over-population, my hope is that you can allay the concerns of animal right's activists. I am not talking about the rigid and unyielding types but those who can be reasoned with. Can you prepare research that refutes their arguments.

**Corr. ID:** 31 **Organization:** NRA, NJOA

**Comment ID:** 220417 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Don't let the Anti-hunting irrational agenda to influence an issue that requires a sound, logical and science based solution.

**Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221450 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - NPS needs to better communicate with Lewis Morris. Need consistent methods to identify the number of deer per square mile among different sites.

**Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221407 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Get the fertility rate of deer at other parks that have implemented management plans

**Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221504 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Before proposing any lethal measure to reduce the deer, the NPS must present fertility rates at all surrounding parks and WMAs (Wildlife Management Areas) and the effects on Jockey Hollow. Morris County officials have advised the public that they do not collect or provide reproductive rates on White-tailed deer. Deer managed for increased and sustained yield for hunting.



## **IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation**

**Concern ID:** 32496

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters believe that the deer are improving the vegetation at Morristown National Historical Park, including aiding in the dispersal of native plant seeds.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 68 **Organization:** League of Humane Voters  
**Comment ID:** 220672 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Important facts from the attached, Connecticut "Deer Exclosure Study - 2005 - 2008 Survey Results," state that:

\* EXCLUSION from deer did NOT necessarily increase plant species DIVERSITY.

\* Smaller subcanopy tree species seem to BENEFIT FROM BROWSING DEER.

**Corr. ID:** 76 **Organization:** Rutgers University

**Comment ID:** 220703 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** A 2008 Connecticut Extension Service study reported that "smaller canopy trees seemed to benefit from deer browsing." (some larger do not) Species diversity was generally higher outside of deer exclosures.

**Concern ID:** 32497

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that there are factors other than deer that are impacting vegetation within the park, including:

- canopy changes
- pollution
- gypsy moths and other insects
- black bears
- human presence
- wildlife habitat incentive programs

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220313 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The major intrusion in the park is the Human Visitor. How is NPS planning to manage their contribution to landscape changes AND to disturbances that make browsing species, e.g., deer, dependent on "palatable" species.

**Corr. ID:** 1 **Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220311 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** NPS addresses the changes in landscape, i.e., the change in the vegetative canopy. But before deer are blamed for major changes, NPS must demonstrate that canopy changes - due to normal change as well as the claimed "invasive" species - are not major contributors. In fact, there probably are other browsing species in the park who also may be contributing to change by eating "palatable" plants. For example, the black bear is an omnivore that gorges on berries, shoots, etc. These and their effects need to be assessed for the EIS.

**Corr. ID:** 57 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220583 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** i want to comment on the absence of animal/bird insect noise at morristown park. it is very quiet in the woods there indicating that there must be pollution in that park. i recently passed near a park in flemington nj in the morning about 7 am. the noise from crickets, and insects of various kinds was deafening. absolutely deafening. it is clear that

morristown park does not have that kind of life there.

**Corr. ID:** 68

**Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220692 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** \* To reduce effects of browsing: Mitigate edge surrounding park:

\* Gradually cease habitat manipulation on the many private park and public lands surrounding Jockey Hollow creating NATURAL REGENERATION. (using deer to disperse native seeds)

\* Wildlife Habitat Incentive Programs and hunting clubs are creating early succession as never before.

**Corr. ID:** 76

**Organization:** Rutgers University

**Comment ID:** 220701 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** A recent 2010 Yale University study found that deer are not a leading factor in determining variation in vegetation impacts across western Connecticut: "The empirical basis for presumptions that white-tailed deer cause forest regeneration failure is limited."

**Corr. ID:** 76

**Organization:** Rutgers University

**Comment ID:** 220702 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Recent studies in Virginia found that deer affect "only the smaller stage classes of trees likely to die due to other limiting factors" and do not, as the Service plan says, affect forest canopy diversity unless other disturbances, many proposed by the Service, are present.

### ***IS10000 - Issue: Soundscapes***

**Concern ID:** 33230

#### ***CONCERN***

**STATEMENT:** One commenter is concerned that hunting will impact soundscapes in the park.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 61 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220624 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Please do not destroy the peace and quiet of our parks with the sounds of guns and death.

### ***IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species***

**Concern ID:** 32505

#### ***CONCERN***

**STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that the deer are eating native plant species, allowing the spread of invasive plants. The sale of invasive plants at nurseries throughout New Jersey, and the resulting planting of these species in area gardens, further facilitates the spread of invasive plants.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 2 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220322 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Nothing grows around here except invasive, non-native plants that the deer don't eat.

**Corr. ID:** 19

**Organization:** Ecological Solutions, LLC

**Comment ID:** 220384 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** In their place, invasive species that are unpalatable to deer have proliferated (e.g., Japanese Barberry, Japanese Stiltgrass)--replacing many dozens of native plants with a handful of weeds. The Park is also serving as a source of new invasive species that are yet uncommon in

New Jersey (e.g., Siebold's Viburnum, Hardy Kiwi, Black Swallowwort) - this is also the result of continuing degradation at the Park, but with negative ecological consequences to surrounding lands.

**Corr. ID:** 26

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220400 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Much of it was caused by the white tail deer destroying the native vegetation which allowed nonnative invasive species to take root and crowd out other native species. The wild grapes formed canopies which blocked the sun light. The barberry invaded and took over much of the lower story of the park lands. The garlic mustard, and multiflora rose also invaded the marginal areas preventing native grasses and other low growing species which feed small animals and provide cover for them as well as nesting areas for some native song birds.

**Corr. ID:** 68

**Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220671 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Non-native species of plants were recommended by President John Quincy Adams in "a letter on September 6, 1827 to all consulate officers to PROCURE FOREIGN PLANTS of known or probable utility. for cultivation in the United States." (Details of this request are contained in Report 564 of the 25th Congress).

\* However, today many of these non-native invasive plants are sold in nurseries and garden centers throughout NJ.

\* They are planted in gardens surrounding Jockey Hollow by humans.

\* Their seeds are dispersed by BIRDS and small animals like rabbits - NOT DEER.

**Corr. ID:** 76

**Organization:** Rutgers University

**Comment ID:** 220705 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** J. barberry is highly invasive in the absence of deer; its seed is spread by birds." Its roots are shallow but tough, and it shades out other native plants. The plant is still sold as an ornamental in New Jersey and Morris County. J. barberry was present inside enclosures, and outside, in above Connecticut study. "

**Corr. ID:** 76

**Organization:** Rutgers University

**Comment ID:** 220704 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The white-tail deer has co-evolved with forests for 3.5 to 3.9 million years. Kill proponents blame deer for the spread of Japanese barberry in the understory. The indictment: native deer do not eat non-native barberry.

**Corr. ID:** 80

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220735 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I propose mechanically removing the invasive species which will spread even if there are no deer. Also, sow native seeds and enclose while they are growing. Deer spread native plants. Birds leave seed rain that spreads the invasive plants that they are worried about.

**Corr. ID:** 83

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220751 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** -The white-tail deer has co-evolved with forests for 3.5 to 3.9 million years. Kill proponents blame deer for the spread of Japanese barberry in the understory. The indictment: native deer do not eat non-native barberry.

**Corr. ID:** 83

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220752 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** -J. barberry is highly invasive in the absence of deer; its seed is spread by birds." Its roots are shallow but tough, and it shades out other native plants. The plant is still sold as an ornamental in New Jersey and Morris County. J. barberry was present inside enclosures, and outside, in above Connecticut study. "

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221475    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Native vegetation will out compete nonnative vegetation if allowed to survive, if deer are removed.

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221501    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Invasive species have come into the park because deer have destroyed competing native species.

**Corr. ID:** 139                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220840    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 2. Stop selling invasive plants throughout NJ.

### ***IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat***

**Concern ID:** 32513

#### ***CONCERN***

#### ***STATEMENT:***

**Representative Quote(s):** [Some commenters would like the EIS to consider the role deer play in the ecology of Morristown National Historical Park.](#)

**Corr. ID:** 33                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220435    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** That understory provides the habitat that would support other species of animals and birds and permit them to exist in the Park. The presence of a protected habitat in the Park has allowed the deer a safe haven from which they can invade and destroy the forest understory in other parts of the region with near complete impunity.

**Corr. ID:** 66                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220626    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Deer overbrowse is destroying our forests and causing plant and wildlife species to go locally extinct. You've got all of the science behind you, and most of the public sentiment. I look forward to hiking a freshly abundant and beautiful Jockey Hollow a few years from now!

**Corr. ID:** 78                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220722    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The destruction of the undergrowth not only destroys native plants we can visually appreciate but the habitat that large and small animals and insects require for their existence. Also if the existing trends continue in another few decades there will be no new large trees, as tree seedlings are consumed along with other plants, and the mature trees die. Control of the deer population is a requirement for a diverse and robust environment. Before there can be any successful efforts to maintain or reintroduce native plants which have been "browsed to death" and or crowded out by invasive species, we must control the deer population.

**Corr. ID:** 91                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220927    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** New Jersey is a state rich with nature, which is the reason so many people come to live here. Yet as the state draws more and more people every year the wildlife habitat is shrinking and with no natural predators the deer population is expanding and threatening our forests.

**Corr. ID:** 135      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220912      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** The native forest is dying and so is the very history and ecology the park is meant to protect.  
**Corr. ID:** 135      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220909      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Many species of songbirds that should be abundant are absent and there is a striking lack of diversity in the understory.

***IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting***

**Concern ID:** 32516

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters are concerned about the safety risks associated with hunting in the park, including:  
- potential for shooting into homes  
- increased deer/vehicle collisions  
- increased risks to park visitors within hunting areas

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 39      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220460      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** 3. WILDLIFE MURDERERS KILL EACH OTHER IN HIGHER NUMBERS THAN MOST EVER HEAR ABOUT. IT IS NOT A SAFE ACTIVITY AT ALL. IN READINGTON NJ, ONE HUNTER KILLED ANOTHER LAST YEAR. IN SOUTHJERSEY, ANOTHER HUNTER SHOT A FELLOW HUNTER AND LEFT HIM ON THE GROUND TO DIE. IN PENNSYLVANIA, A HUNTER SHOT A DEER HUNTER THIS PAST SEASON. WILDLIFE MURDERING HUNTERS ALSO ENDANGER PEOPLE WHO ARE SIMPLY DRIVING ON THE HIGHWAY. A MOTHER WITH TWO KIDS WAS RIDING IN HER CAR IN NJ AND A HUNTER SHOT ACROSS THE ROAD, ALMOST KILLING HER TWO KIDS IN THE BACK SEAT. A KID WITH A BOW AND ARROW SHOT A YOUNG GIRL IN BRIDGEWATER IN THE HEAD, AND SHE ALMOST DIED. TWO YEARS LATER SHE IS STILL HAVING OPERATING TO TRY TO SAVE HER. HUNTERS SHOOT INTO HOMES, DAYCARE CENTERS, FACTORY YARDS. THE TESTS GIVEN TO HUNTERS CAN BE DONE ON LINE AND THE INSPECTORS HAVE PUBLISHED LETTERS IN THE DAILY RECORD THAT SHOWS THAT MOST WHO COME OUT FOR SHOOTING TESTS CANT SHOOT WORTH A DAMN. THEY GET APPROVED FOR HUNTING LICENSES ANYWAY. I CAN SHOW YOU THE LETTERS FROM A HUNTING INSTRUCTOR IN THE DAILY RECORD WHICH SHOWS THAT LACK OF MARKSMANSHIP IN THE AVERAGE HUNTER.

**Corr. ID:** 39      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220466      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 9. BOWHUNTING DISTANCE IN NJ HAS BEEN REDUCED TO THE LOWEST DISTANCE OF ANY STATE IN THE UNION - 150 FT. WHICH MEANS A HOME CAN BE HIT BY A BOWHUNTER MUCH EASIER.

**Corr. ID:** 39      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220467      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** AS TO GUNS, IN READINGTON NJ A FAMILY IN THEIR HOME WERE ON THE SECOND FLOOR WITH THEIR TWO KIDS LAST YEAR WHEN TWO SHOTS CAME INTO THE SECOND FLOOR BEDROOM, ALMOST KILLING ONE OF THE FAMILY

MEMBERS WHERE SHE STOOD. IN CLINTON NJ, A HUNTER SHOT INTO A CONDO IN A CONDO COMPLEX. THE POLICE NEVER FOUND THE HUNTER.

**Corr. ID:** 39                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220465    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 8. HUNTING CAUSES DEER TO RUN ONTO ROADS TO SAVE THEIR LIVES. INSURANCE COMPANIES SHOW THAT CAR ACCIDENTS INCREASE ON THE FIRST DAY OF HUNTING SEASON. LET THE DEER LIVE IN THE WOODS, WHERE THEY BELONG. HUNTING IS A VIOLENT, DANGEROUS, CRUEL ACTIVITY.

**Corr. ID:** 50                      **Organization:** Delbarton School

**Comment ID:** 220510    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** As a neighbor of the park, I drive regularly along its Sugar Loaf Road boundary and have narrowly avoided collision with white tailed deer emerging suddenly from the park. The NPS' vision for the park and the means proposed to realize that vision are eminently suitable.

**Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221758    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Concerned with use of public spaces by non-hunters in areas where hunting occurs

**Corr. ID:** 119                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221820    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Today, more people are driving and owning vehicles, there is more development that fragments wildlife habitat and more highways and roads are being built that bisect wildlife territory. Killing and eliminating some deer does nothing to prevent the surviving deer from crossing the exact same roadways at the same "deer hot spots." Sometimes, removing deer gives residents a false sense of security that less deer means much less probability of an auto-deer collision. It has also been suggested in research that hunting seasons have a disruptive effect by startling deer and putting them "on the run" as they seek refuge from hunters.

### ***IS4100 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Deer***

**Concern ID:** 33207

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that the presence of deer reduces visitor conflicts and improves safety within the park by:

- reducing the risk for fires
- reducing the risk of Lyme disease

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221524    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Deer eating understory reduces risk of fire

**Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221525    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Deer eating understory reduces ticks/Lyme disease

**Corr. ID:** 118                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221792    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 4)

Lyme Disease

And please don't tell me that you are afraid of the deer causing Lyme

Disease.

Killing deer does not help to prevent Lyme Disease. In fact, killing deer can increase the chance of people getting Lyme Disease for several reasons. Yes, ticks feed on deer, but if they don't have deer to feed on, they feed even more on humans and dogs, raccoons and striped skunks, etc. More importantly, if ticks don't have deer to feed on, they spend more time on mice and thereby increase their chances of becoming infected, since mice cause the infection. It's the mice that infect ticks.

]

Dr. Rick Ostfeld, an ecologist in Millbrook, NY, said that a reduction in biodiversity limits other animals that the ticks may feed on. Therefore, if we kill off other wildlife such as deer or foxes, the ticks will then feed mostly on mice, increasing their chances to become infected with *Borrelia burgdorferi*. Dr. Ostfeld also said that cases of Lyme increase when there are no deer to attract the ticks and the ticks therefore land on people. (2)

**Corr. ID:** 118

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221818 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Ground Cover

Yes, the people from "conservancies" want ground cover in the parks. This merely causes more ticks, since the mice will be there due to the ground cover!

In areas in the Mendhams, where I live, where the deer ate the low-lying vegetation, the Centers for Disease Control researchers could not find many ticks. There were not many ticks because the mice left the area since there was no ground cover! One CDC researcher said, "The deer are doing our job for us in getting rid of ticks."

On the other hand, in the Mendhams, where people had fences and deer could not enter, there was lots of low-lying vegetation, BUT there were also many, many tick due to the low-lying vegetation!

#### ***IS4200 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Vegetation***

**Concern ID:** 33208

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter is concerned about trail hazards caused by overgrown invasive plants.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 143

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 226260 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Brambles, Thorns & Stiff Grass are taking over significant parts of trails. Most of my time as a trail volunteer is spent pruning so as to maintain the trails in passable condition.

#### ***IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience***

**Concern ID:** 32556

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters are concerned that the vegetation and deer plan would impact the visitor experience at the park, and they would like to see these impacts analyzed in the EIS.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 128

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221080 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Within such a densely populated region, residents and visitors alike find great appeal in walking the peaceful trails of the park, in encountering the wildlife that lives there, and in reflecting on the historical events that took place here in the past. I have visited this park many times to enjoy the many recreational activities available here and to



find peace outside of my sometimes hectic lifestyle. I accept the forest for what it is, and I am extremely grateful that it has not fallen victim to development or that the peace I experience here is not interrupted by the sounds of gunshots in the distance. The many bird songs I hear each spring, and the different wildlife I see do not suggest to me that this ecosystem is in need of altering, or that we can do great things to make it better.

**Corr. ID:** 129

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221092 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Another consideration only tangentially mentioned in the proposed project is the impact on the enjoyment of people who use this park. This national park is situated in the most densely populated state in the nation, in an area of the state that is itself densely populated and quite close to major metropolitan areas as well. It is a refuge for many people on a daily basis, people who are there to enjoy the serenity of the landscape, the changing foliage, the wildlife sightings, and the opportunities for solitude as well as the chance to exercise their pets, keep fit, and also learn about the historic events that took place here.

### ***IS6000 - Issue: Water Resources***

**Concern ID:** 32557

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter feels that the park's water quality would not be harmed by any of the EIS alternatives.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 85

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221482 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Water quality is not harmed by any EIS suggestion. Should focus on a zero deer population if culling is selected, in the long run. Should focus on deer population outside the park, to prevent infiltration.

**Concern ID:** 33213

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter feels that the presence of deer contributes to water pollution.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 32

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220425 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The deer in this area, at the very least will be or are ,in part, responsible for erosion which will eventually pollute our water supply.

### ***IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions***

**Concern ID:** 32657

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that retaining 18th or 19th century vegetation and animal composition in the park is not an achievable or desirable goal.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 1

**Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220310 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Retaining 18th century vegetation (and animals) is simply not achievable; what NPS calls invasive species may simply be the maturation and EVOLUTION of the parcel. Attempting to revert may not be possible nor desirable. Change is normal.

**Corr. ID:** 1

**Organization:** public

**Comment ID:** 220315 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** If attempting to create an 18th century snapshot, I presume the troops would quickly have eliminated or chased all wildlife.



Should that be the NPS goal?

**Corr. ID:** 38

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220446 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 1. REFLECTING 18TH CENTURY IS A NICE IDEA BUT THIS IS 2011 AND THE CLIMATE HAS CHANGED SO THAT IT IS NOW MORE REPRESENTATIVE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, SO THAT THE PLANTS THAT USED TO GROW AND THRIVE IN THIS CLIMATE CAN DO SO NO MORE. TO SPEND A LOT OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS TO VAINLY ATTEMPT TO GROW THEM WHEN THE CLIMATE HAS CHANGED, THE GLACIERS ARE MELTING AND SPRING IS COMING EARLIER SHOWS A LACK OF REALITY. HOW MUCH DO YOU WANT TO CHARGE TAXPAYERS FOR THIS WASTED EFFORT. WE HAVE MASSIVE CLIMATE CHANGE TAKING PLACE. SEAS RISING, ETC. GET WITH REALITY PLEASE. TAXPAYERS CANNOT AFFORD TO FIGHT THIS ON THIS LEVEL.

**Corr. ID:** 38

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220451 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 6. PARK MGT CANNOT BRING BACK 1860 IN 2011. CLIMATE CHANGE FORCES WHAT CAN GROW HERE. THE SPECIES MUST RESPOND TO THE FACT THAT ACID RAIN HAS FALLEN, LEAD DEPOSITION FROM THE AVIATION FUEL USED AT MORRISTOWN AIRPORT IS FALLING ALL OVER THE AREA, ALONG WITH MUCH AIR POLLUTION. THE AIR/WATER AND SOIL AT THE PARK IS HIGHLY COMPROMISED. ONE HAS TO WONDER WHY WE HAVE NO REPORTS OF INVESTIGATION BY PARK MGT OF THE CONDITION OF THE AIR/WATER AND SOIL AT THE PARK. IS THE WATER COMPROMISED BY BISPHENOL A WHICH KILLS PLANTS? IS THE WATER FULL OF LEAD OR OTHER TOXIC CHEMICALS. WHAT TOXIC HERBICIDES HAVE BEEN SPRAYED LIKE RODEO WHICH KILLS?

**Corr. ID:** 39

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220463 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 6. THIS IS NOT 1860 ANYMORE. THIS IS NOT THE WILD WEST WITH GUNS ABOUNDING AND IT SHOULD NOT BE IN THIS HIGHLY CONGESTED STATE OF NJ, WITH THE HIGHEST CONGESTION RATE IN THE ENTIRE AREA. LEAD SHOT CAN CARRY NEAR A MILE. AN ARROW CAN CARRY A HUGE DISTANCE AS WELL. AND SUCH USE REPRESENTS A DANGER TO EVERY PERSON OR CHILD IN THIS AREA. IT ALSO REPRESENTS A DANGER TO EVERY HORSE, DOG, CAT IN THE AREA, ALL OF WHICH HAVE BEEN SHOT IN NJ BY HUNTERS. THE DISTANCE THAT A SHOT CAN CARRY IS IN FACT MUCH FURTHER THAN THE ENTIRE DISTANCE OF JOCKEY HOLLOW.

**Corr. ID:** 68

**Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220677 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** How then can the NPS "manage" Jockey Hollow back to 18th century George Washington's time, when over 200 years of pollution, chestnut blights and insects have destroyed forests?

**Concern ID:**

32658

**CONCERN  
STATEMENT:**

Some commenters are in favor of the park retaining 18th or 19th century vegetation and animal composition in the park.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 50

**Organization:** Delbarton School

**Comment ID:** 220509    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I strongly support the NPS' efforts to manage appropriately both the vegetation and the deer population at MNHP. As a teacher of history, I can readily understand and endorse the NPS' desire to create a historically accurate and environmentally sustainable vegetation setting.

**Corr. ID:** 78    **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220721    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** There will be those citizens who feel we must protect the deer population. I do not disagree with that sentiment as long as that population is similar to levels that occurred decades ago. At levels of say 50-60 years ago browsing did not result in the almost total destruction of the forest undergrowth.

### ***IS8000 - Issue: Air Quality***

**Concern ID:** 33221

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** *Some commenters feel that pollution and increased ozone are damaging the plants, insects, and wildlife within the park.*

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 68    **Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220680    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Rutgers plant scientists report that in New Jersey at this time a heavy accumulation of OZONE in the atmosphere is CAUSING MORE DAMAGE TO PLANTS THAN ANY OTHER atmospheric pollutant.

**Corr. ID:** 68    **Organization:** League of Humane Voters

**Comment ID:** 220682    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** "Newsday" July 17, 2005, "Meg McGrath, plant pathologist at Cornell University's Horticultural Research Center:"

"We know the OZONE IS HURTING PLANTS...plants respond by closing up their stomata...it shuts down the system that circulates water throughout the plant... Scientist know that exposure to OZONE SHUTS DOWN PHOTOSYNTHESIS... smog sensitive plants include many types of fruit and NUT TREES."

Therefore, OZONE pollution, gypsy moths, blights - NOT DEER - are the causes of forest decline in Jockey Hollow.

**Corr. ID:** 69    **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220694    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** NJ DEP SAYS THERE ARE 5 INSECTS KILLING TREES IN NJ. CAN YOU PLEASE SEND ME THE NATIONAL PARKS REPORT ON HOW MANY OF THESE 5 INSECTS ARE PRESENT EATING TREES IN MORRISTOWN HISTORIC PARK. I KNOW YOU WANT TO FIND THE TRUE KILLER OF TREES, AND IT IS NOT DEER. YOU ARE USING THIS AS A DECEPTIVE POINT TO FIND SOME REASON TO KILL THEM AND ALLOW GUN WACKOS TO RUN LOOSE IN THIS PARK. I FIND THAT ABOMINABLE. ALSO THERE ARE MORE DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS THAN THE 5 LISTED BELOW. PLEASE ASK ROBER MASSON TO SEND ON ANY REPORTS ON WHAT HE HAS FOUND AS TO TREE

DAMAGING INSECTS IN MORRISTOWN HISTORIC PARK.

**IS9000 - Issue: Socioeconomic Resources**

**Concern ID:** 33226

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that cost effectiveness is an important factor in achieving the plan objectives.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 39 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220459 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 2. WILDLIFE WATCHING IS HUGELY MORE PROFITABLE THAN A SITE WHERE WILDLIFE IS KILLED. AMERICAN PEOPLE SPEND MONEY TO WILDLIFE WATCH. THEY OUTSPEND HUNTING AREAS BY 20 TO 1. THE HUNTING POPULATION IS VERY TINY IN NJ - LESS THAN 1/2 OF ONE PERCENT OF ALL NJ RESIDENTS ARE HUNTERS AND THEIR NUMBERS ARE DECLINING EVERY SINGLE YEAR. THE PEOPLE IN THIS FIELD FINANCIALLY ARE SCARED TO DEATH BECAUSE THE NUMBERS WHO HUNT ARE SERIOUSLY DECLINING. DOWN MORE THAN TEN PER CENT IN LESS THAN 5 YEARS.

**Corr. ID:** 78 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 231582 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 1. Cost effectiveness: It is obvious we are going to be living in a period of constrained financial resources for some time. Therefore population reduction efforts should focus on achieving the goal with the lowest initial and continuing costs. The effort should be sustainable. There is no sense spending dollars today if we do not have the means to maintain/increase the effort in a self sustaining/low cost mode. Should we encourage more hunting? Should culled deer be butchered and the meat donated to food banks, helping to reduce the cost of feeding Americans?

**Corr. ID:** 78 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220724 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** 2. Timeliness: This plan should be implemented as soon as possible. The destruction is self evident and growing. Delaying it only increases the destruction and cost of remediation.

**Corr. ID:** 86 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 221763 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Cost effectiveness is an important factor in achieving objectives

**MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document**

**Concern ID:** 32598

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters are concerned about the impact to humans from wildlife other than deer, including:

- pigs  
- coyotes

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 8 **Organization:** Sierra Club Group Chair

**Comment ID:** 220350 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Of course, in south jersey, I understand the pig population is becoming a nuisance. I hope you can encourage the state to address this before the feral pig population explodes.

**Corr. ID:** 51 **Organization:** Not Specified

**Comment ID:** 220530 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** (O) Do not give credence to campaigns likely to

emerge maligning coyotes. These animals are part of the natural landscape and have been for years. Usually out of sight and rarely of any harm to humans. That they prey on fawns and thus reduce the deer population should be in their favor, not lead to their killing because they are reducing local hunting opportunities.

**Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221770    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Include looking at trophic levels, such as actions of other management agencies to decrease coyote populations.

**Concern ID:** 32600

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter feels that Madison officials should have a deer and vegetation management plan for the Borough of Madison.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 17                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220377    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Madison officials should also have such a program for the Borough of Madison.

**Concern ID:** 32604

**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters are concerned about wildlife deaths caused by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, farmers, and ranchers.

**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 58                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220600    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** When is it okay to kill an animal?

I have great admiration for farmers, and I understand that there are times when predators can get out of control and cause a lot of damage. Coyotes can get into the chicken coop and kill your chickens, so on most farms and ranches, coyotes are considered live target practice at every opportunity. That's why nearly all U.S. ranchers own rifles as tools which are used for sniping at groundhogs and moles which tend to take more than their fair share of garden vegetables.

I know one rancher who was trying to plant an orchard and woke up one morning to find his newly planted trees had all been destroyed by a small band of hyperactive beavers. Needless to say, those beavers ended up right in the crosshairs of a utility 22 rifle.

**Corr. ID:** 58                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220602    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** But since when did sparrows, starlings and blackbirds ever pose a real threat to anyone? They're not going to fly off with your cow, and to blame these birds for eating the grain being fed to the cows is ridiculous in the first place because cows aren't supposed to eat grain.

Cows are supposed to eat grass. If you are running a cow operation where the birds are eating your grain and you think the birds are the problem, the real problem is that you're feeding cows the wrong food! If you raise your cows on grass, the birds don't get into the grain and you don't have to poison the birds.

**Corr. ID:** 58                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220606    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Personally, I am ethically and morally opposed to my money being used for such destructive purposes. And even though I continue to pay my taxes, I do so under strong protest to the reality that my

own government is committing an avian holocaust -- a crime against nature -- with the help of the dollars I reluctantly send to Washington.

**Corr. ID:** 58

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220594 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** ...plus tens of thousands of crows, doves, ducks, falcons, finches, gulls, hawks, herons, owls, ravens, sparrows, swallows, swans, turkeys, vultures and woodpeckers, among other animals.

The chart even shows that the USDA "unintentionally" euthanized one Bald Eagle.

Also murdered in 2009 by the USDA are victims of other species:

27,000 beavers, 1700 bobcats, 81,000 coyotes, 2,000 gray foxes, 336 mountain lions, 1900 woodchucks, 130 porcupines, 12,000 raccoons, 20,000 squirrels, 30,000 wild pigs, 478 wolves.

See the list yourself at: <http://www.naturalnews.com/files/US...>

**Corr. ID:** 58

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220604 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Then again, we are talking about the U.S. Department of Agriculture here. And while the USDA has a great number of truly useful programs (such as their USDA organic label, which is a high-integrity program), the agency as a whole remains steeped in the conventional agricultural mythology of pesticides, GMOs and "poisoning varmints."

**Corr. ID:** 58

**Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220593 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** (NaturalNews) The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is engaged in what can only be called an avian holocaust through its Bye Bye Blackbird program that has poisoned tens of millions of birds over the last decade. The USDA even reports the number of birds it has poisoned to death in a PDF document posted on the USDA website.

Anticipating the USDA possibly removing that document, we have posted a copy on NaturalNews servers at:

<http://www.naturalnews.com/files/US...>

The original source URL of this file was:

[http://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife\\_...](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife_...)

This document shows that, just in 2009, the following bird populations were poisoned and killed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, using taxpayer dollars:

(Listed as "Intentional" and "Killed / Euthanized")

Brown-headed cowbirds: 1,046,109

European Starlings: 1,259,714

Red-winged blackbirds: 965,889

Canadian geese: 24,519

Grackles: 93,210

Pigeons: 96,297

**Corr. ID:** 58                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220599    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** But if you work for the USDA, you can murder animals by the tens of millions and virtually no network news outlet even covers the story. It's not enough, apparently, that humans have already caused widespread destruction of animal habitat across North America; now our own government is actively murdering literally millions of animals every year.

And for what? What is the justification for these actions? According to the USA, these animals are a "nuisance" to farmers.

**Corr. ID:** 58                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220601    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** I also understand that wild pigs (feral swine) can root up valuable crops in their search for food. There are times when certain types of animals can become very difficult for ranchers and farmers to deal with. Although I personally don't enjoy the thought of it, I can at least understand that there might be an economic justification in the minds of farmers and ranchers to kill certain animals which are destroying their crops (or chickens, or orchards). I've never met a farmer or rancher who simply killed animals for the fun of it. The ammo is too expensive, and farmers don't have that kind of time to waste in the first place. Most farmers, by the way, have a very high respect for life and only kill when they feel they have no available alternative.

**Corr. ID:** 58                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220597    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** Keep in mind that the numbers shown above are only for 2009. A similar number of animals were killed by the USDA all the other years, too, going all the way back to the 1960's when the "Bye Bye Blackbird" program was first initiated.

By my estimates, the USDA has actively murdered at least 100 million animals in America over the last four decades, putting this on the scale of an animal holocaust and a crime against nature.

#### ***NI1000 - NEPA Issues: Process***

**Concern ID:** 33245  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [One commenter feels that the planning process should be compressed.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 85                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221458    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - The whole process is too long, should be compressed

#### ***NI2000 - NEPA Issues: Public Coordination***

**Concern ID:** 33246  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** [One commenter would like public comments related to this plan/EIS to be accessible to all members of the public.](#)  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 86                      **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221747    **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Make comments accessible to other members of the public

**Concern ID:** 33247  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** One commenter is opposed to the break-out group format used at the public scoping meetings.  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221495 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Format of meeting - break out groups don't make it possible to learn from each other and educate others.

### ***NI3000 - NEPA Issues: Analysis***

**Concern ID:** 33248  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters feel that the National Park Service should conduct a comprehensive analysis of natural and cultural resource topics as part of the EIS, including factors that contribute to the affected environment within the park. Metrics should be used to identify and analyze impacts and goals.  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 85 **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221405 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - The plan should have measurable or quantitative goals.  
**Corr. ID:** 86 **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 221778 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** - Important to use metrics to summarize and assess success.

### ***PN1000 - Purpose and Need***

**Concern ID:** 32651  
**CONCERN STATEMENT:** Some commenters question the initial assumptions and hypotheses in the description of this project, including:  
- deer are damaging the understory and the landscape  
- deer are prohibiting native forest regeneration  
- there is a large deer population within the park  
- deer, not short sighted management policy, are causing overpopulation and subsequent habitat destruction in the park  
**Representative Quote(s):** **Corr. ID:** 27 **Organization:** UBNJ  
**Comment ID:** 220404 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** The true problem is over development of land.  
**Corr. ID:** 38 **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220449 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** 4. THERE IS NO LARGE "DEER POPULATION". I HAVE HEARD NO REPORTS OF DEER STARVING TO DEATH ON THE LAWN IN THE PARK. WHERE DOES THIS OUTRAGEOUS SUPPOSITION, LIE COME FROM? I HAVE WALKED THE TRAILS IN THIS PARK AND NEVER SEEN A DEER THE WHOLE TIME. BESIDES, I LIKE DEER. I LIKE TO SEE LIFE IN THE PARKS.  
**Corr. ID:** 51 **Organization:** *Not Specified*  
**Comment ID:** 220525 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Representative Quote:** (J) I am not convinced that killing deer results in the desired forest regeneration. Indeed, the Park's exclusion tests were reported at the July 28th scoping meeting to have produced inconsistent results.



**Corr. ID:** 62      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220649      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** before you pick one species as guilty of hurting vegetation in jockey hollow, one has to wonder what investigation you have done in relation to roof or norway rats. roof rats particularly eat seeds, as you can see from the following information. they can certainly infect that area and their eating takes place in the summer when growth of vegetation would be needed, so that their eating surge takes place when growth would be taking place. if you have not investigated all species, it is wrong to pick one when you dont have the information

**Corr. ID:** 75      **Organization:** Fed. of Sportsmans Clubs/New Jersey Falconers

**Comment ID:** 220633      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** The overpopulation and subsequent habitat destruction in this park is the direct result of a short sighted management policy.

**Corr. ID:** 76      **Organization:** Rutgers University

**Comment ID:** 220700      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** With natural fluctuations over the last 35 years, the Morristown National Historical Park deer population remained stable without the need for a hunt. Deer damaging the understory is an erroneous claim.

**Corr. ID:** 85      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221489      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Regarding the EIS, why conduct EIS now? Deer problem has been long standing.

**Corr. ID:** 85      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221561      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** - Deer abundance is unrelated to your study

**Corr. ID:** 118      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221807      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** Although deer are a part of the forest equation, the issues involving forest ecology and regeneration are complex with many contributing variables. Deer are constantly villainized, but forest soils are a far bigger problem than the deer.  
Trees are dead and dying across hundreds of thousands of acres. And it's obvious deer are not killing large trees.

**Corr. ID:** 121      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 220652      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** There are so many flaws with the EIS which justifies this planned hunt, I won't waste my time pointing them out. Suffice it to say that no independent qualified ecologist would ever accept it.

**Corr. ID:** 129      **Organization:** *Not Specified*

**Comment ID:** 221084      **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Representative Quote:** I am not in favor of the goals or methods proposed for this project and object to the use of taxpayer funds to promote it in any way. To begin with, I would question the initial assumptions and hypotheses in the description of this project. They are based on a narrow understanding of the complexity of the ecosystems involved, ignore the impact of human behaviors in surrounding areas, and have as a stated goal what amounts to turning back the clock on an evolving landscape to reflect the ecology of the 18th century.



## APPENDIX A: INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE REPORT

## **Index By Organization Type**

For privacy purposes, individual commenters who provided their names and are not associated with a particular organization are grouped together below as “public”. Commenters who did not provide either a name or an organization are grouped together below as “N/A” because more specific information is not available.

### **Recreational Groups**

Warren Blue Ridge Sportsmen - 36; MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document.

### **State Government**

State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection - 150; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting.

### **Town or City Government**

Township of Harding- Wildlife Management Committee - 149; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting.

### **Unaffiliated Individual**

public - 1; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS6000 - Issue: Water Resources. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions.

Animal Defense League - 110; IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131; AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions.

Civitas-USA - 16; AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness.

Delbarton School - 50; IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions.

Drew University - 52; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

East Hampton Group for Wildlife - 108; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species.

Ecological Solutions, LLC - 19; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.

Fed. of Sportsmans Clubs/New Jersey Falconers - 75; PN1000 - Purpose and Need.

Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum - 5; CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties.

God's Creatures Ministry - 93; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation.

Great Swamp Association - 20; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation.

League of Humane Voters - 68; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. AL4100 - New Alternative Elements: Vegetation. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. IS8000 - Issue: Air Quality. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document.

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. PN1000 - Purpose and Need.

N J Trappers Association - 72; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction.

NEW JERSEY BEACH BUGGY ASSOCIATION - 30; AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction. AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods.

NJ Hunter - 24; MT2000 - Misc. Topics: General Comments.

NRA, NJOA - 31; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used.

Rutgers University - 76; AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. PN1000 - Purpose and Need.

Sierra Club Group Chair - 8; AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document.

UBNJ - 27; AL3100 - Support Action. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. PN1000 - Purpose and Need.

UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA - 42; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods. AL3100 - Support Action. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used.

West Milford Environmental Commission - 3; AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. AL4000 - New Alternative Elements: Deer. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions.

N/A - 2; AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. 4; CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 6; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 7; AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. AL3000 - Support No-Action. 9; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction. 11; AL3100 - Support Action. 13; AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. AL3000 - Support No-Action. 14; AL3000 - Support No-Action. 17; MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 21; AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 25; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. 26; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. 29; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. 32; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL3100 - Support Action. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS6000 - Issue: Water Resources. 33; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL4000 - New Alternative Elements: Deer. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 34; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. 35; AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. 37; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 38; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 39; AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. IS9000 - Issue: Socioeconomic Resources. 41; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 43; AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction. 44; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. 45; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 48; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 49; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL3100 - Support Action. 51; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 54; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. 56; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 57; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 58; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 59; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 60; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 61; IS10000 - Issue: Soundscapes. 62; PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 63; CC1100 - Consultation and Coordination: Current Coordination. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 65; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 66; IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 69; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS8000 - Issue: Air Quality. 71; AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction. 78; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL4000 - New Alternative

Elements: Deer. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. IS9000 - Issue: Socioeconomic Resources. 79; MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 80; AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. 81; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 82; CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 83; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 84; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 85; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. AL2000 - Support Lethal Reduction. AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods. AL4000 - New Alternative Elements: Deer. CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS10000 - Issue: Socioeconomic. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. IS4100 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Deer. IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience. IS6000 - Issue: Water Resources. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. IS9000 - Issue: Air. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. NI1000 - NEPA Issues: Process. NI2000 - NEPA Issues: Public Coordination. NI3000 - NEPA Issues: Analysis. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 86; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management. CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. IS9000 - Issue: Socioeconomic Resources. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. NI2000 - NEPA Issues: Public Coordination. NI3000 - NEPA Issues: Analysis. 87; GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. 89; AL3000 - Support No-Action. 91; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 95; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 97; AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 99; IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 100; IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 107; MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 111; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 113; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 114; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 116; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 118; AL4100 - New Alternative Elements: Vegetation. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. IS4100 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Deer. IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience. IS6000 - Issue: Water Resources. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 119; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. 121; CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 124; IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 128; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 129; AL3000 - Support No-Action. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 130; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. 133; IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. 135; AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods. AL3100 - Support Action. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 136; IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 137; AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 138; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management. AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions. 139; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management. AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive

Species. 140; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. 141; IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience. 142; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species. IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting. IS4200 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Vegetation. PN1000 - Purpose and Need. 144; AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park. AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness. IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat. 145; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 146; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 153; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 154; CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties. 155; AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods. 156; MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document. 160; AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management. IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation. IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species.

## APPENDIX B: INDEX BY CODE REPORT

## **Index By Code**

For privacy purposes, individual commenters who provided their names and are not associated with a particular organization are grouped together below as “public”. Commenters who did not provide either a name or an organization are grouped together below as “N/A” because more specific information is not available.

### **AL1000 - Support Non-Lethal Methods**

East Hampton Group for Wildlife - 108

League of Humane Voters - 68

N/A - 6 , 37 , 41 , 48 , 51 , 85 , 91 , 95 , 111 , 116 , 119 , 130 , 138 , 139 , 140 , 142 , 145 , 146 , 153 , 155

### **AL1100 - Oppose Non-Lethal Methods**

N J Trappers Association - 72

State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection - 150

UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA - 42

N/A - 9 , 25 , 29 , 38 , 44 , 45 , 51 , 56 , 78 , 85 , 86 , 128 , 135

### **AL1200 - Support Vegetation Management**

public - 1

League of Humane Voters - 68

N/A - 25 , 26 , 32 , 33 , 38 , 49 , 54 , 81 , 85 , 160

### **AL1300 - Oppose Vegetation Management**

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131

N/A - 86 , 97 , 137 , 138 , 139

### **AL2100 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Hunting Within the Park**

public - 1

State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection - 150

N/A - 6 , 7 , 13 , 21 , 51 , 58 , 80 , 85 , 135 , 144

### **AL2200 - Oppose Lethal Reduction: Effectiveness**

Civitas-USA - 16

League of Humane Voters - 68

Rutgers University - 76

Sierra Club Group Chair - 8

West Milford Environmental Commission - 3

N/A - 2 , 35 , 138 , 139 , 144

### **AL2300 - Lethal Reduction Methods**

NEW JERSEY BEACH BUGGY ASSOCIATION - 30

UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA - 42

N/A - 38 , 39 , 85

### **AL3000 - Support No-Action**

N/A - 7 , 13 , 14 , 89 , 129

**AL3100 - Support Action**

UBNJ - 27

UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA - 42

N/A - 11 , 32 , 49 , 135

**AL4000 - New Alternative Elements: Deer**

public - 1

West Milford Environmental Commission - 3

N/A - 33 , 78 , 85

**AL4100 - New Alternative Elements: Vegetation**

League of Humane Voters - 68

N/A - 118

**CC1000 - Consultation and Coordination: Consulting Parties**

Friends of the Frelinghuysen Arboretum - 5

N/A - 4 , 51 , 82 , 85 , 85 , 86 , 86 , 121 , 143 , 154

**CC1100 - Consultation and Coordination: Current Coordination**

N/A - 63

**GA1000 - Impact Analysis: Scientific Data Used**

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131

Drew University - 52

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132

NRA, NJOA - 31

Sierra Club Group Chair - 8

UBNJ - 27

UBNJ, NJSFSC, SCFGPA, QDMA - 42

N/A - 34 , 38 , 56 , 58 , 60 , 85 , 86 , 87 , 118 , 119 , 130

**IS1000 - Issue: Vegetation**

public - 1

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131

Drew University - 52

East Hampton Group for Wildlife - 108

Ecological Solutions, LLC - 19

God's Creatures Ministry - 93

Great Swamp Association - 20

League of Humane Voters - 68

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132

Rutgers University - 76

State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection - 150

Township of Harding- Wildlife Management Committee - 149



West Milford Environmental Commission - 3

N/A - 2 , 4 , 26 , 32 , 33 , 41 , 56 , 57 , 59 , 60 , 63 , 65 , 69 , 78 , 81 , 83 , 84 , 85 , 86 , 97 , 113 , 114 , 118 , 119 , 129 , 130 , 135 , 136 , 137 , 140 , 160

**IS10000 - Issue: Soundscapes**

N/A - 61 , 85

**IS2000 - Issue: Invasive Species**

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131

Drew University - 52

East Hampton Group for Wildlife - 108

Ecological Solutions, LLC - 19

League of Humane Voters - 68

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132

Rutgers University - 76

N/A - 2 , 26 , 38 , 69 , 80 , 83 , 85 , 86 , 97 , 99 , 113 , 114 , 118 , 119 , 124 , 128 , 129 , 130 , 135 , 136 , 137 , 138 , 139 , 143 , 160

**IS3000 - Issue: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat**

Animal Defense League - 110

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131

Drew University - 52

Ecological Solutions, LLC - 19

League of Humane Voters - 68

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132

N/A - 33 , 51 , 66 , 69 , 78 , 83 , 84 , 85 , 86 , 91 , 95 , 97 , 114 , 118 , 119 , 133 , 135 , 144

**IS4000 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Hunting**

Delbarton School - 50

State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection - 150

Township of Harding- Wildlife Management Committee - 149

N/A - 39 , 85 , 86 , 118 , 119 , 133 , 143

**IS4100 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Deer**

N/A - 85 , 118

**IS4200 - Issue: Visitor Conflicts and Safety: Vegetation**

N/A - 143

**IS5000 - Issue: Visitor Experience**

N/A - 85 , 118 , 128 , 129 , 141

**IS6000 - Issue: Water Resources**

public - 1

N/A - 32 , 85 , 118

**IS7000 - Issue: Historic Conditions**

public - 1

Animal Protection League of New Jersey - 131

Delbarton School - 50

League of Humane Voters - 68

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132

West Milford Environmental Commission - 3

N/A - 21 , 37 , 38 , 39 , 59 , 63 , 78 , 83 , 85 , 97 , 99 , 100 , 113 , 118 , 124 , 128 , 129 , 136 , 137 , 138

**MT1000 - Misc. Topics: Comments Outside the Scope of this Document**

League of Humane Voters - 68

Sierra Club Group Chair - 8

Warren Blue Ridge Sportsmen - 36

N/A - 6 , 17 , 38 , 45 , 51 , 56 , 58 , 79 , 82 , 85 , 86 , 107 , 118 , 156

**NI1000 - NEPA Issues: Process**

N/A - 85

**NI2000 - NEPA Issues: Public Coordination**

N/A - 85 , 86

**NI3000 - NEPA Issues: Analysis**

N/A - 85 , 86

**PN1000 - Purpose and Need**

Fed. of Sportsmans Clubs/New Jersey Falconers - 75

League of Humane Voters of New Jersey - 132

Rutgers University - 76

UBNJ - 27

N/A - 38 , 51 , 62 , 85 , 118 , 121 , 128 , 129 , 143