

**APPENDIX A: PROPOSAL TO CONSTRUCT NEW
DEVELOPMENT THAT FACILITATES PUBLIC ACCESS EA
SCOPING CONCERN STATEMENTS**

Nonsubstantive Comments

BS1000 – *Beyond the Scope*

Many comments received were beyond the scope of this project and were directed at the price of the ORV permits and commenters general feelings about how the park (especially ORVs) is being managed.

NS1000- *Nonsubstantive Comments*

Comments received were nonsubstantive and not germane to the proposed project or supported or opposed the project.

Substantive Comments

DESIGN – *Project Design*

Several comments received indicated a desire for changes in a proposed project's design including using pervious material and going up and over dunes.

ADDITIONAL AMENITIES –*Comments regarding adding tire inflation stations, signs, and bathhouse.*

Several comments received indicated a desire for tire inflation stations, signs, and bathhouses near existing and proposed ramps, parking lots, or boardwalks.

PRIORITY – *This code applies to comments suggesting priorities for implementation.*

Some comments received stated their general idea of how projects should be prioritized.

PRIORITY01 - *This code applies to comments suggesting ORV ramps as the priority for project implementation*

Several comments received stated they felt ORV ramps should be the first priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY02 - *This code applies to comments suggesting parking lots as the priority for project implementation*

Several comments received stated they felt parking lots should have high priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY03 - This code applies to comments suggesting the IDR as the priority for project implementation

Several comments received stated they felt the IDR should have high priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY04 - This code applies to comments suggesting ADA accessible boardwalks as the priority for project implementation

Several comments received stated they felt ADA accessible boardwalks should have high priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY05 - This code applies to comments suggesting road access projects as the priority for project implementation

Some comments received stated they felt road access should have high priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY06 - This code applies to comments suggesting the elevation of Lighthouse Road as the priority for project implementation

Some comments received stated they felt elevating Lighthouse Road should have high priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY07 - This code applies to comments suggesting the foot trails as the priority for project implementation

Some comments received stated they felt foot trails should have high priority when implementing the proposed projects.

PRIORITY08 - This code applies to comments suggesting which projects should not be priority projects

Some comments received stated they felt certain projects are less of a priority than other projects when implementing the proposed project.

PUBLIC SAFETY01 – This code applies to comments concerned about public safety due to current conditions

Several comments received were concerned about public safety issues with current conditions on the seashore.

PUBLIC SAFETY02 - This code applies to comments concerned about public safety from the proposed access points

Several comments received were concerned about public safety issues with implementing the proposed projects and/or the design of the proposed projects.

AL4000 – *New Alternatives or Elements*

Many of the comments expressed the desire/need for expanding/increasing elements (parking lots, ADA boardwalks, ORV ramps, or foot trails) to some of the projects or a desire/need for additional projects (Parking lots, ADA boardwalks, ORVE ramps, or foot trails) on the National Seashore.

ADDITIONAL AMENITIES – *This code applies to comments regarding adding bathhouses, air stations, or signs to the National Seashore*

Several comments received indicated a desire for adding bathhouses, air stations, or signs to the proposed projects.

COST01 – *This code applies to those comments regarding the cost of implementing and maintaining the projects*

Several of the comments received expressed a concern about the cost of implementing and maintaining the projects on the National Seashore as well as charging permit fees before the projects are in place.

ELIMINATE – *This code applies to those comments regarding removing a project or element of a project from the Final ORV Plan.*

Several comments received indicated a desire for certain projects, elements of projects, or types of projects to be removed from the list of proposed projects because they did not see a need for these projects.

Accessibility – *This code applies to those comments regarding the accessibility of an area on the National Seashore.*

General comments the commenter wants the park to be aware of including handicap access issues and accessibility of sites.

Visual Quality – *This code applies to those comments regarding visual quality concerns.*

Several comments received indicated a concern that the natural beauty of the National Seashore would be impacted by implementing these projects.

Sustainability - *This code applies to those comments regarding the sustainability of the proposed projects due to the dynamic seashore.*

Several comments were concerned with implementing the proposed projects when the coastal environment of the seashore is always changing.

WH4000 – *Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Impacts of Proposal and Alternatives*

Several comments were concerned about the impact these proposed projects would have on wildlife species within the park.

Implementation Schedule– *This code applies to comments requesting a set timeline for the proposed projects.*

Several comments requested a timeline for the proposed projects. Commenters want to know when the proposed projects will be implemented.