



Interim Protected Species Management Plan

Cape Lookout National Seashore

Public Scoping Content Analysis Report

March 2006

CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

 Public Scoping Meetings..... 1

 Public Comment..... 1

Interim Comments Report..... 3

Concerns and Comment Report 9

 AL5030 - Support the No Action Alternative 10

 AL7030 - Support Alternative C 10

 AL9000 - Support Total Prohibition of ORV Use at CALO..... 11

 AL9100 - Support Limiting ORV Use at CALO 11

 AL9200 - Oppose Limiting ORV Use at CALO..... 12

 AL9500 - Support maximum ORV restrictions to preserve protected species 12

 AL9600 - Support Development of a new management plan for the preservation of protected species
 12

 TE1200 - Threatened and Endangered Species: Piping Plover 13

 TE1400 - Threatened and Endangered Species: Sea Beach Amaranth 13

 TE1600 - Threatened and Endangered Species: Sea Turtles..... 13

 VU/VE6000 - Visitor Use and Experience: Impact Of Alternatives..... 13

 WH3100 - Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat (General): Affected Environment..... 14

 WH4800 - Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Alternatives: Sensitive Species (colonial
 waterbird) 14

INTRODUCTION

On November 8th and 9th, 2005, public scoping meetings were held for the Cape Lookout National Seashore Interim Protected Species Management Plan/Environmental Assessment (EA). These scoping meetings were held to begin public involvement early in the planning stage and to obtain community feedback on the initial concepts for protected species at Cape Lookout National Seashore.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

National Park Service (NPS), with the assistance of the Louis Berger Group, held a public scoping meeting for the Cape Lookout National Seashore Interim Protected Species Management Plan/EA on November 8, 2005 from 5:30 PM to 9:00 PM at the Duke Marine Lab in Beaufort, North Carolina. A total of 15 meeting attendees signed in. The November 9th meeting was held at the Core Sound Waterfowl Museum on Harkers Island, North Carolina where 13 people were in attendance. The meetings began with an open house, and the public circulated between information stations. Each station had display boards and other informational materials that described the project background, legislative framework such as the park's enabling legislation, the purpose and need for the plan, objectives of the plan, and preliminary concepts for the Interim Protected Species Management Plan/EA. Park service personnel were available at each station to answer any questions or concerns presented by the community and to record comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The purpose of the public scoping meetings was to solicit input from the community on the purpose, need, objectives, and preliminary alternatives for the Interim Protected Species Management Plan/EA at Cape Lookout National Seashore. The public meeting provided numerous methods for the community to provide input on the proposed actions. Each of the information stations had a flip chart where an assigned staff person could take comment on a particular topic, or any other topic the community member had concerns or questions on. If the commenter did not want to make their comments at the stations, comment sheets were provided that could be filled out and returned. If the attendee chose not to fill out the comment sheet at the meeting, a return address was provided on the sheet to mail back to the park at a later date. Those attending the meetings were also given a brochure that provided additional opportunities for comment on the project. Public comments received are detailed in the following sections of this report.

This page intentionally left blank.

INTERIM COMMENTS REPORT

Content Analysis Report (02/01/2005)

Document ID: 13838

Document Title: Cape Lookout National Seashore Interim Protected Species Plan Scoping Report

Comment Distribution by Code				
Code	Code Description	Substantive	Total	Percentage
PO500	Park Operations and Management: Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
AL1000	Alternatives: Elements Common To All Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
AL3000	Alternatives: Envir. Preferred Alt./NEPA § 101&102	Yes	0	0.00%
AL4000	Alternatives: New Alternatives Or Elements	Yes	26	14.05%
AL5010	Alternatives: Alternative A - No Action: Continues 2004-5 Management	Yes	0	0.00%
AL5030	Support the No Action Alternative	No	140	75.68%
AL5060	Oppose the No Action Alternative	No	0	0.00%
AL6010	Alternatives: Alternative B-Elements of A with Improved Year-round PIPL Protection and Monitoring	Yes	0	0.00%
AL6030	Support Alternative B	No	0	0.00%
AL6050	Oppose Alternative B	No	0	0.00%
AL7000	Alternatives: Alternative C? Elements of A and B with Improved Breeding Season Protection and More Monitoring to Fine Tune Closures	Yes	0	0.00%
AL7030	Support Alternative C	No	2	1.08%
AL7060	Oppose Alternative C	No	0	0.00%
AL8000	Alternatives: Alternative D? Similar to A with More Monitoring and Addition of an Improved Escort System	No	0	0.00%
AL8030	Support Alternative D	No	0	0.00%
AL8060	Oppose Alternative D	No	0	0.00%
AL9000	Support Total Prohibition of ORV Use at CALO	No	1	0.54%
AL9100	Support Limiting ORV Use at CALO	No	2	1.08%
AL9200	Oppose Limiting ORV Use at CALO	No	1	0.54%
AL9300	Support Expanding ORV Use at CALO	No	0	0.00%
AL9400	Support minimal ORV restrictions to preserve protected species	No	0	0.00%
AL9500	Support maximum ORV restrictions to preserve protected species	No	1	0.54%
AL9600	Support Development of a new management plan for the preservation of protected species	No	1	0.54%

Comment Distribution by Code				
Code	Code Description	Substantive	Total	Percentage
AL9700	Oppose the development of a new management plan for the preservation of protected species	No	0	0.00%
CB1000	Coastal Barrier Ecosystem: Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
CB2000	Coastal Barrier Ecosystem: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
CB3000	Coastal Barrier Ecosystem: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
CB4000	Coastal Barrier Ecosystem: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
CB5000	Coastal Barrier Ecosystem: Impact Of Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
CB6000	Coastal Barrier Ecosystem: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
CC1000	Consultation and Coordination: General Comments	Yes	0	0.00%
ON1000	Other NEPA Issues: General Comments	Yes	0	0.00%
PN1000	Purpose And Need: Planning Process And Policy	Yes	1	0.54%
PN2000	Purpose And Need: Park Purpose And Significance	Yes	0	0.00%
PN5000	Purpose And Need: Regulatory Framework	Yes	0	0.00%
PN6000	Purpose And Need: Land Management Laws, Exec Orders	Yes	0	0.00%
PN9000	Purpose And Need: Issues And Impact Topics Selected For Analyses	Yes	0	0.00%
PO2000	Park Operations: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
PO3000	Park Operations: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
PO4000	Park Operations: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
PO4500	Park Operations and Management: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
SE1000	Socioeconomics: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
SE1100	Socioeconomics: Affected Environment (General)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE1200	Socioeconomics: Affected Environment (Economy of Communities within the Seashore)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE1300	Socioeconomic: Affected Environment (Regional Economy)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE1400	Socioeconomics: Affected Environment (Local Commercial Fishermen)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE3000	Socioeconomics: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
SE5200	Socioeconomics: Impact Of Alternatives (Economy of Communities within the Seashore)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE5300	Socioeconomics: Impact of Alternatives (Regional Economy)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE5400	Socioeconomics: Impact Of Alternatives (Local Commercial Fishermen)	Yes	0	0.00%
SE6000	Socioeconomics: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
SS1000	Soundscapes: Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
SS2000	Soundscapes: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
SS3000	Soundscapes: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
SS4000	Soundscapes: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
SS5000	Soundscapes: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
SS6000	Soundscapes: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%

Comment Distribution by Code				
Code	Code Description	Substantive	Total	Percentage
TE1000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
TE1100	Threatened and Endangered Species (General): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
TE1200	Threatened and Endangered Species: Piping Plover	Yes	2	1.08%
TE1400	Threatened and Endangered Species: Sea Beach Amaranth	Yes	1	0.54%
TE1600	Threatened and Endangered Species: Sea Turtles	Yes	1	0.54%
TE2000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
TE3000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
TE4000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
TE4200	Threatened and Endangered Species: Impact Of Alternatives on Piping plovers	Yes	0	0.00%
TE4400	Threatened and Endangered Species: Impact Of Alternatives on sea beach amaranth	Yes	0	0.00%
TE4600	Threatened and Endangered Species: Impact Of Alternatives on sea turtles	Yes	0	0.00%
TE5000	Threatened And Endangered Species: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
WH1000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
WH2000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
WH3000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
WH3100	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat (General): Affected Environment	Yes	1	0.54%
WH3200	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Other Sensitive Species (American Oystercatcher): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
WH3400	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Other Sensitive Species (Wilson's plover): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
WH3600	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Other Sensitive Species (red knot): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
WH3800	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Other Sensitive Species (colonial waterbird): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
WH4000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
WH4200	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat:: Impact Of Alternatives: Sensitive Species (American Oystercatcher)	Yes	0	0.00%
WH4400	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Impact of Alternatives: Sensitive Species (Wilson's plover)	Yes	0	0.00%
WH4600	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Impact of Alternatives: Sensitive Species (red knot)	Yes	0	0.00%
WH4800	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Impact Of Alternatives: Sensitive Species (colonial waterbird)	Yes	1	0.54%
WH5000	Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
WH8010	Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Other Wildlife (invertebrates, predator control etc)	Yes	0	0.00%
WT1000	Wetlands (General): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
WT2000	Wetlands (moist substrate habitat, ephemeral ponds, and other habitat important to protected species): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%

Comment Distribution by Code				
Code	Code Description	Substantive	Total	Percentage
WT3000	Wetlands (Unique and Important Wildlife Habitat): Affected Environment	Yes	0	0.00%
WT4000	Wetlands: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
WT5000	Wetlands: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
WT6000	Wetlands: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
WT7000	Wetlands: Impact Of Proposal And Alternatives	Yes	0	0.00%
WT8000	Wetlands: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
WT9000	Wetlands: Impairment Analyses	Yes	0	0.00%
XX1000	No Comment Provided	No	1	0.54%
XX2000	Duplicate Comment	No	2	1.08%
AL2000	Alternatives: Alternatives Eliminated	Yes	0	0.00%
PN10000	Purpose And Need: Issues Eliminated From Further Consideration	Yes	0	0.00%
PN11000	Purpose And Need: Other Policies And Mandates	Yes	0	0.00%
PN3000	Purpose And Need: Scope Of The Analysis	Yes	0	0.00%
PN4000	Purpose And Need: Park Legislation/Authority	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE2000	Visitor Use and Experience: Affected Environment (Viewsheds)	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE2500	Visitor Use and Experience: Affected Environment (Aesthetics)	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE3000	Visitor Use and Experience: Guiding Policies, Regs And Laws	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE4000	Visitor Use and Experience: Methodology And Assumptions	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE5000	Visitor Use and Experience: Study Area	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE6000	Visitor Use and Experience: Impact Of Alternatives	Yes	1	0.54%
VU/VE7000	Visitor Use and Experience: Cumulative Impacts	Yes	0	0.00%
VU/VE8000	Visitor Use and Experience: Wilderness experience	Yes	0	0.00%
Total			185	100%

Comment Distribution by Correspondence Type

Type	Percentage	Number of Comments
E-mail	0.56%	1
Letter	8.43%	15
Web Form	91.01%	162
Total	100.00%	178

Comment Distribution by Substantive/Non-Substantive

	Percentage	Number of Comments
Substantive	17.84%	34
Non-Substantive	82.16%	151
Total	100.00%	185

Comment Distribution by Status

Status	Percentage	Number of Comments
Coded	100.00%	185
Total	100.00%	185

Correspondence Distribution by State

State	Percentage	Number of Correspondence
FL	0.70%	1
MA	1.41%	2
MP	1.41%	2
NC	85.92%	122
NY	1.41%	2
Not Provided	1.41%	2
PA	0.70%	1
SC	0.70%	1
VA	6.34%	9
Total	100.00%	142

Correspondence Distribution by Country

Country	Percentage	Number of Correspondence
USA	100%	142
Unspecified	0%	0
Total	100.00%	142

[This page intentionally left blank.]

CONCERNS AND COMMENT REPORT

Report Date: 04/03/06

AL4000 - ALTERNATIVES: NEW ALTERNATIVES OR ELEMENTS

Concern ID: 11258
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest new alternatives or elements including the following related to visitor use: 1) make rules available to the public, 2) designate specific campground spots to limit the trash, 3) only allow four-wheelers for fishing or official use, 4) increase number of ramps.
 Commenters suggest new alternatives or elements including the following related to wildlife management: 1) ban net-fishing, 2) utilize Power Squadron spit as a benchmark non-ORV study area, 3) increase monitoring of suitable habitat early in the nesting season, 4) maintain traditional closures through 2006 to collect baseline data on endangered species, then after 2006 close only beach between Mile Marker 41A and 42A to ORVs, 5) buffer area should stop a minimum of 25 feet above the mean high-tide line to permit a corridor for ORV traffic along the shoreline.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135691 **Organization:** DIFF Club
Comment ID: 20897 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: A lot of people visit this island throughout the year and they have never seen, read, or heard any kind of rules that you can or can't do...MAKE these rules available to them and even let them sign an agreement that they understand what they are before they have access to the island...if the rules are broken...fine them.

Corr. ID: 135691 **Organization:** DIFF Club
Comment ID: 20898 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: On south core banks people can go and tent camp anywhere on the island they wish...might take some effort but make you a map and number designated spots that people can go and set up a tent...kind of like in the mountains...you have to register at the rangers office for a disseminated spot for an allotted amount of time...then maybe there would NOT be the amount of trash or abandoned tents left in the dunes by these folks.

Corr. ID: 135691 **Organization:** DIFF Club
Comment ID: 20899 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Do not allow anyone to string a net of any kind within 1-2 miles of the beaches...if they want to net for fish let them go on out into the water or the sound...this island should be for the recreational sports fisherman (fishing from the shore) with a rod and reel...and enforce this rule...

Corr. ID: 135691 **Organization:** DIFF Club
Comment ID: 20900 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: 4 wheelers need to be removed from the island unless it is set up for fishing or personnel use only.

Corr. ID: 135703 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 20847 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Since the Power Squadron Spit has been closed to the public for more than ten years, it should be used as a benchmark for studies regarding off-road vehicle use. Once your studies are complete, the area should once again be opened to vehicular traffic.

Corr. ID: 135731 **Organization:** None
Comment ID: 20828 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: There is a great need to closely monitor suitable habitat early

in the nesting season (and this may include areas where nesting has never been documented before). Undoubtedly, there have been instances in which birds have been attracted to certain sites as potential nesting areas, but have abandoned the sites early in the season, because of disturbance.

Corr. ID: 135998 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 21182 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I propose that areas not be granted permanent closure from ORV, except for the beach between Mile Marker 41A and 42A. The Portsmouth Flats, Cape Lookout Point, and Power Squadron Spit should be closed for year 2006 with symbolic fencing to collect baseline data on endangered species. Beginning with 2007 and going forward, those areas should be managed the same as the remainder of the seashore. There is no reason to arbitrarily close these areas from recreational use.

**CONCERN
STATEMENT:
Representative
Quote(s):**

Some commenters preferred alternative protection measures for sea turtles, and opposed ramp to ramp closures.

Corr. ID: 135998 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 21200 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: The number of beach access ramps needs to be increased to make better use of the back road. Ideally, there should be a ramp at every mile marker. I do not suggest alteration of the established dunes. The growth and redistribution of dunes is part of the landscaping dynamics of these islands. Ramps should be added where the dune profile is suitable. More access ramps along with regular back road maintenance should reduce ORV traffic on the beach.

Corr. ID: 135998 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 21201 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I propose the buffer area stop a minimum of 25 ft. above the mean high-tide line to permit a corridor for ORV traffic along the shoreline. There is no reason the buffer zone must be perfectly circular in shape. A D-shaped buffer zone should be equally effective.

AL5030 - SUPPORT THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Concern ID: 11253

CONCERN STATEMENT: Many commenters support the No Action Alternative, Alternative A.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135673 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Comment ID: 20918 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I would like to register my support for Alternative A, Continuation of Current Management Practices.

AL7030 - SUPPORT ALTERNATIVE C

Concern ID: 11284

CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters support maximum ORV restrictions to preserve and protect threatened and sensitive species.

STATEMENT:

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 133992

Comment ID: 21092

Representative Quote: Tremendous development and population growth along the eastern seaboard has had serious adverse impacts on habitats for numerous plant and animal species and directly on the plants and animals themselves. Documented impacts in recent years to several species of birds dependent upon beach habitats indicate current protection measures are insufficient. I therefore recommend the strongest possible interim protection measures for all rare, threatened and endangered species,

e.g., measures at least as protective as specified for Option C should be implemented.

Concern ID: 12077
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters support Alternative C as the best option for protecting rare, threatened, and endangered species, as well as reducing American oystercatcher chick mortality caused by ORVs.
Representative Quote(s): **Organization:** USGS Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, NC State University
Corr. ID: 135146 **Organization Type:** Federal Government
Comment ID: 20995
Representative Quote: I have conducted research on the factors affecting the survival and reproductive success of American oystercatchers at Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout National Seashores for the past 10 years. During that time we have monitored over 1000 individual nests. Recent studies of the behavior of incubating adults and the survival of radio-tagged nestlings suggest that vehicle traffic is a significant source of disturbance for incubating adult birds, and a potentially serious mortality factor for newly hatched chicks. Of the management options presented in the current plan, Conceptual Alternative C (full beach vehicle closures in the vicinity of nests with young chicks) is the only management option that is likely to reduce these sources of disturbance and mortality).

AL9000 - SUPPORT TOTAL PROHIBITION OF ORV USE AT CALO

Concern ID: 11261
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters support the total prohibition of ORV use at CALO.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135291 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 20965 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: In regards to the interim management plan at the Cape Lookout National Seashore, I believe that off-road vehicles be banned from accessing the beachfront year round, except for those operated by NPS staff for official business. Please work towards keeping ORV use out of our National Seashores.

AL9100 - SUPPORT LIMITING ORV USE AT CALO

Concern ID: 11267
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters support limiting ORV use at CALO
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135244 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 20973 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: The NPS should not put park resources (Flora, Fauna and Physiographic conditions) at risk to satisfy the needs of one special interest group (ORV aficionados). Remember the Cape Lookout National Seashore, like all our National Parks are for everyone to enjoy. Ownership and management of National Parks were intended to be of equal importance for those people that visit these parks on a regular basis and those visitors that view the park from afar. I want to know that this place will be protected and preserved for now and future generations and not managed for short term special interests.
Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135202 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 21010 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I support a more proactive management of all protected species at Cape Lookout that will adequately protect species during all stages of their life cycles, during the breeding and non-breeding season. Management practices should focus on rebuilding populations. Recreational activities should be restricted accordingly. I also support a more active predator management program that will assist protected species recovery.

AL9200 - OPPOSE LIMITING ORV USE AT CALO

Concern ID: 11271
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters oppose limiting ORV use at CALO, especially as this will reduce access for individuals with limited mobility.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 133834 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 21099 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: DEAR SIRS—I wish to keep my rights to drive on Core Bank beaches. I have always respected the rules to protect the wildlife. But time on the bank is my right too. As I get older it is the only way I can get up and down the whole beach.

AL9500 - SUPPORT MAXIMUM ORV RESTRICTIONS TO PRESERVE PROTECTED SPECIES

Concern ID: 11284
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters support maximum ORV restrictions to preserve and protect threatened and sensitive species.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 133992
Comment ID: 21092
Representative Quote: Tremendous development and population growth along the eastern seaboard has had serious adverse impacts on habitats for numerous plant and animal species and directly on the plants and animals themselves. Documented impacts in recent years to several species of birds dependent upon beach habitats indicate current protection measures are insufficient. I therefore recommend the strongest possible interim protection measures for all rare, threatened and endangered species, e.g., measures at least as protective as specified for Option C should be implemented.

AL9600 - SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE PRESERVATION OF PROTECTED SPECIES

Concern ID: 11260
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters noted that the interim protected species management plan should focus primarily on the flora, fauna, and physiographic condition of the seashore, as well as follow relevant laws and regulations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135243 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 20975 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Please give every consideration for the protection of all the flora, fauna and physiographic condition of Cape Lookout National Seashore. Cape Lookout is one of the few places where plovers, oystercatchers, terns, skimmers, sea turtles and seabeach amaranth can thrive. I support and hope that the park will follow to the letter of the law the Endangered Species Act, Organic Act, Redwood Act and all NPS policies which support adequate protection for all park resources and recreational opportunities for all users, not just ORV users, while forming Cape Lookout's Interim Protected Species Plan.

Concern ID: 11272
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters noted that the Park Service is here to preserve and protect our natural resources for future generations.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135230 **Organization:** Columbia Spectator
Comment ID: 20993 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I write to urge you to remember that the Park Service is here to preserve and protect our natural resources for future generations. Please keep in mind the provisions of the Endangered Species Act, Organic Act, and the Redwood Act

when developing a plan for off road vehicles. You don't want the Park Service to be remembered for having given in to those who believe their leisure time activity is more important than the survival of endangered species.

TE1200 - THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES: PIPING PLOVER

Concern ID: 11263
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters preferred alternative protection measures for the Piping Plover, such as a D-shaped buffer zone.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135998 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 21196 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: I propose the buffer area stop a minimum of 25 ft. above the mean high-tide line to permit a corridor for ORV traffic along the shoreline[for PIPL]. There is no reason the buffer zone must be perfectly circular in shape. A D-shaped buffer zone should be equally effective.

TE1400 - THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES: SEA BEACH AMARANTH

Concern ID: 11264
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters preferred alternative protection measures for sea beach amaranth, such as a D-shaped buffer zone.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135998 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 21201 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Amaranth Management: I propose the buffer area stop a minimum of 25 ft. above the mean high-tide line to permit a corridor for ORV traffic along the shoreline. There is no reason the buffer zone must be perfectly circular in shape. A D-shaped buffer zone should be equally effective.

TE1600 - THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES: SEA TURTLES

Concern ID: 11262
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters preferred alternative protection measures for sea turtles, and opposed ramp to ramp closures.

Representative Quote(s): **Corr. ID:** 135998 **Organization:** *Not Specified*
Comment ID: 21200 **Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual
Representative Quote: Ramp to ramp closure is not needed to protect sea turtles. Beach closures should be limited to the areas that are essential to the survival of sea turtles. Signs labeled "Warning", "Beach Closed Ahead", and "No Exit" should be installed at the nearest ramp when beach areas are closed between ramps. This method will provide additional areas for the Surf Fishermen while protecting the turtle nests. The number of beach access ramps needs to be increased to make better use of the back road. Ideally, there should be a ramp at every mile marker. I do not suggest alteration of the established dunes. The growth and redistribution of dunes is part of the landscaping dynamics of these islands. Ramps should be added where the dune profile is suitable. More access ramps along with regular back road maintenance should reduce ORV traffic on the beach.

VU/VE6000 - VISITOR USE AND EXPERIENCE: IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVES

Concern ID: 11273
CONCERN STATEMENT: Some commenters felt that the alternatives would have negative impacts on visitor use and experience.

Representative **Corr. ID:** 136000 **Organization:** *Not Specified*

Quote(s):**Comment ID:** 21208**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: I understand that you are in the process of looking at a new proposal on “Off Road Vehicle” use on Core Banks. I, for one, am not in favor of any drastic changes. Without these vehicles, I would not be able to transport my family, my friends, or the Boy Scouts anywhere except directly in front of the cabins. Without vehicles, there would be no access to the 20-mile beach except at the ferry dock. Having vehicles allows people to spread out and not be in one cramped area. I would miss the real beauty, which is getting away from everyone and enjoying your family and nature. I learned that there was an issue with nesting birds this past season. If there is a portion of the beach area that needs to be closed, then I am in favor of this. We, as a society, need to protect our wildlife and co-exist with nature. This has been done in the past with the turtle nestings. In all my years as a visitor to Cape Lookout, I have found that most visitors obey the rules and regulations of staying out of the dunes and observing the marked areas. Sure, one here and there can’t seem to follow the rules, but don’t punish all because of a few.

WH3100 - WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT (GENERAL): AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Concern ID:

11265

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Some commenters noted that the seashore is of major importance as a resting//roosting/feeding area for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

Representative Quote(s):**Corr. ID:** 135731**Organization:** None**Comment ID:** 20829**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: In addition to nesting birds, the seashore is of major importance as a resting/feeding area for migrating shorebirds (including the piping plover) and other waterbirds. The birds need areas where they are free of disturbance, especially for resting/roosting, during the migration periods.

Likewise, the seashore is of importance to over wintering shorebirds (including the piping plover). Wintering birds also need areas where they are free of disturbance.

WH4800 - WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT: IMPACT OF ALTERNATIVES: SENSITIVE SPECIES (COLONIAL WATERBIRD)

Concern ID:

11266

CONCERN STATEMENT:

Some commenters preferred alternative protection measures for colonial waterbirds, such as a D-shaped buffer zone.

Representative**Quote(s):****Corr. ID:** 135998**Organization:** *Not Specified***Comment ID:** 21198**Organization Type:** Unaffiliated Individual

Representative Quote: Avian Nesting Management CWB Provide 150 ft. diameter buffer from all nests, except the buffer zone ends 25 ft. above the mean high-tide line to provide for an ORV corridor.

a. Commentary: I propose the buffer area stop a minimum of 25 ft. above the mean high-tide line to permit a corridor for ORV traffic along the shoreline. There is no reason the buffer zone must be perfectly circular in shape. A D-shaped buffer zone should be equally effective.