

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 1

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: jean publiee  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
flemington, NJ 08822  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-1  
Date Sent: 01/30/2016 Date Received: 01/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

there should be no permanent facilities on the island. it should be wilderness. all hunting and trapping should be banned on this island. totally and completely. the ponies should get off the island before they die in the rising sea. please put me on the list for further notification of any changes in the plans. I also think the public commenting should be able to see all of the comments from the public instead of your keeping them sedcret for your own uses and perversions of what the public tells you. when you keep them secret you can get away with a lot of sneakiness. and that goes on in this courrupt govt we have right now. particularly when we have a usfws managed by a wildlife murderer instead of a balanced person without a gun and killing fixation to wildlife. we are all being taken for a ride on this kind of thing. we need balanced people in management instead of all members of the nra in govt agencies on wildlife and birds. this comment is for th epublic rcord. we have no balance in govt right now. and the sneakiness you employ is not appreciated. put the public comments out in full on the web.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 2

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ivy Wells  
Organization: Town of Berlin  
Organization Type: T - Town or City Government  
Address: 14 S. Main Street  
Berlin, MD 21811  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: iwells@berlinmd.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-2  
Date Sent: 02/02/2016 Date Received: 02/02/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I fully support the National Park Service's recommendation to support Alternative 3: Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaption.

Thank you,  
Ivy Wells  
Director, Economic & Community Development  
Town of Berlin  
14 S. Main Street  
Berlin, MD 21811  
410-629-1722

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 3

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Teanna L. Byerts  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Dover, PA 17315  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-3  
Date Sent: 02/02/2016 Date Received: 02/02/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

It's Marguerite Henry's fault, her Misty books evoked perfectly the wild, windswept barrier island and its inhabitants. I've been coming to Assateague Island since the early 70s; put up a tent in the dunes, propped up a tent in rain (when we'd left the poles at home), backpacked, kayaked, galloped through the bayberry on a local horse in the fall roundup no tourists knew about, snorkeled the back bay, attended many park programs.

I come to Assateague because it is a real island, a natural island, not a line of shops with sand in front like Ocean City.

I truly want it to be here, and accessible for all future generations.

The nature of a barrier island is change. East coast beach cities ignore this with their jetties and rebuilding of beaches. They suffer the loss of the rich, diverse ecosystem that is a barrier island.

I have always thought Assateague was well managed: accessible for the casual beachgoer, for a family with kids, for those requiring different means to enjoy beach or bay or program, for kayakers and backpackers and surf fishermen, RVs, tents, or oversand vehicles.

Climate change will require the Park Service and the public to change too.

It seems to me that Alternative 3 is your most sensible solution.

Certainly technology will evolve to create Park Service structures that can move and flex with the changes, and be sustainable.

For me, the main attraction is Assateague's wild nature: native wildlife, endangered species, and the "wild" ponies, remnants of the first equine bloodlines to come to these shores, part of genetic diversity of the horse, and part of our colonial history.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

I feel strongly that the Park Service interpretive/educational programs are critically important to show visitors why barrier islands and their inhabitants are vital to the continued health of the planet and of our own species. They're also a lot of fun!. I've done some educational programs for local wildlife rehabbers and can see the difference contact with the wild makes.

I like the idea of alternative ways to get to the beach (shuttles etc) BUT there are some of us who could not fit our stuff on a shuttle. Think of the family with several kids and picnic coolers and umbrellas and diaper bags and beach toys, the family toting a wheelchair, or me with my kayaks and cameras and backpacks and coolers and snorkeling gear and... Yeah, some kind of parking lot is wonderful, though I see your problem: barrier islands move out from under things like parking lots. Hopefully some driving access will continue to be available.

I applaud the idea of bayside access. You would probably get a gazillion kayakers, many willing to paddle right out to Assateague. The question is then; how do we get to the beach? Where do we safely tie up our boats (and lock them, yes, we have security cables)? Are we landing in the marsh in a cloud of bloodsucking vampiric horses? (been there done that). But other access points would indeed expand opportunities for the adventurous, and the casual visitor, to go to sea.

Keeping access affordable is one of my concerns: I stretch the budget driving there, so additional fees for ferries and shuttles and such would be a royal pain in the patootie. Hopefully, this can be simplified.

On the Maryland end, one of the best things is being able to throw your tent up behind the dunes and hear the sound of the sea. And have ponies wander through the camp at dawn. Hopefully this campsite will continue to be functional ( I realize this is the MD state park zone).

Assateague is my favorite beach in the world, has been for most of my life. Hopefully it continues to make connections between people and the natural world of a barrier island.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 4

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John R. Tinsley  
Organization: Independentbfrom bull island  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Kensington, md 20895  
Kensington, MD 20895  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-4  
Date Sent: 02/06/2016 Date Received: 02/06/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

U should let the island be. The natural process of erosion is just going to happen. We need to just adapt to the reality

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 5

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Tim 2. ONeill  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Severna Park, MD 21146  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-5  
Date Sent: 02/09/2016 Date Received: 02/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I Vote for Alternative # 1.

I enjoy driving 12 miles down the beach and setting up to stay for the day with my wife, children, dogs, friends and extended family. Anything that hinders OSV access will not be tolerated. I am contacting Jon at your main office with a plan to reopen the back road on the island. There will be limited Environmental impact to re open an existing roadway. The old asphalt will be removed to protect the environment from the effects of leaching oils/petroleum products. The proposed roadway/will be called the "Access trail". The A.T. will be nothing but sand. Educational pull offs will be positioned to bring the Park user to the back country and learn about it's history and wildlife. This "Access Trail" will allow access to the "Active Beach Recreation Subzone" through a network of ramps. The ramps will be positioned in a manner to bypass the seasonal bird closure areas. This plan should be a win for everyone.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 6

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David M. Harvey  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Girdletree, Md 21829  
Girdletree, MD 21829  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-6  
Date Sent: 02/11/2016 Date Received: 02/11/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I'd like to know if the NPS has developed a response to a break/washover in Assateague Island from natural causes, and if so, what the response will be. Will it be repaired, or could it be allowed to divide the island, with the possibility of enhancing the break and making it permanent?

As you know, over the last two decades, the water quality of Chincoteague Bay has deteriorated significantly in almost all water quality measures. Of all the Maryland coastal bays, Chincoteague Bay has the poorest flushing rate, allowing a concentration of pollutants to accumulate, creating conditions for algae blooms (especially for brown tide), reduced dissolved oxygen, excessive levels of phosphorous, and unsafe water quality, particularly in shoreline areas.

A breach of the island between the Ocean City inlet and the Chincoteague inlet could potentially make a significant impact in providing the flushing effect so necessary if we are to ever see an improvement in the water quality of Chincoteague.

Does the NPS have a planned response to such an event?

Has there been any study done of the potential impact that might occur as a result of a significant breach?

Have there been discussions with various governmental agencies, federal, state and local about a response to such an event?

Should consideration be given to creating more flushing by burying large pipes under Assateague to create such an exchange to help the recovery of the water quality in Chincoteague Bay? Have any such discussions been held?

I would appreciate a response to my queries, if possible.

Thank you.

David M. Harvey

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 7

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: charles d. willingham  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
ocean city, MD 21842  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-7  
Date Sent: 02/12/2016 Date Received: 02/12/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

please try to keep assateague island as it stands now any change from the current set-up would be disheartening



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 8

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Roger E. Fitzgerald  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-8  
Date Sent: 02/14/2016 Date Received: 02/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My preference is for the NPS Alternative 3. This seems the best way to manage the park going forward. I have some serious reservations about instituting a commercial shuttle system. Instead of that just post a sign like the NPS does now for the OSV: "Parking area full- one on one off until further notice". This would eliminate a huge overhead of the shuttle system and keep the people on the beach to a reasonable number. If people want to be on a crowded beach they can just go to Ocean City.

The unique character of Assateague Island National Park is the reason I moved to Berlin. Any diminishment of the access would make this a less attractive place to live. One of the most promising things about Alternative 3 is the plan to increase mainland access to Sinepuxent and Chincoteague Bays. This bay access would eliminate some of the congestion now seen for visitors entering the park on weekends. There are many families with small children who prefer the calm, shallow, warm waters of the bay instead of the ocean beach. The existing bayside beach at Bayside Drive is rapidly washing away and there is no plan to replenish that sand. Pumping sand onto the Bayside Drive beach would enhance and maintain a very useful part of the park.

Most of the money spent in this area (many millions of dollars) is used to pump sand in front of the hotels in Ocean City and points north. A large portion of this is federal taxpayer money. Efforts should be made to get some percentage of this funding to enhance the bayside portion of the Assateague Island National Park instead of leaving it in a sand starved condition. The Army Corp of Engineers recently built some small sand islands in Sinepuxent Bay. What is the purpose of these islands? That sand could have been easily transported to the beach at Bayside Drive to enhance that area. Little additional funding would be needed- just the NPS to negotiate in advance for this preferred dredge spoil site.

Please consider eliminating the proposed shuttle bus system and instead concentrate on developing mainland bayside access points to take some of the load off of the existing island based parking areas. Many visitors want to enjoy the bay and would then not make the trip across the bridge which will save time and money. If the bridge is eventually eliminated the mainland bayside access points can be used for ferry access to the island.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 9

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Joseph W. Lee  
Organization: PO BOX 382  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Deale, MD 20751  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-9  
Date Sent: 03/04/2016 Date Received: 03/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been camping and fishing on Assateague Island for almost thirty years. The experience is like no other beach. I can drive out till I am alone and enjoy a natural and quite beach. No matter the activity, shelling, fishing, swimming or just sitting in the sun with my friends. Access to the OSV area is important to me and many others. I hope for continued use of this area for years to come.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 10

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Howard D. Quillen  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-10  
Date Sent: 03/08/2016 Date Received: 03/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Option 3 (The preferred option) is the best overall option for long term management of the island. I would prefer to see the Wilderness Designation proposal removed from the plan. A wilderness designation would render 2/3 of Assateague Island largely unaccessable by the general population and put unnecessary costs and burden on the NPS to mange it. Public land is supposed to be enjoyed by the public. A wilderness designation would would prevent public access.

The beach is largely well managed adhering to the current ESA protection guidelines for the various wildlife species on the island. The current management operations has already effected changes over the years that have had adverse reactions to the public use of the island such as removing the back road (rural path west of the dunes line) that was used to provide vehicle access to the bay front, ship wreckage, island graveyard, etc, while providing safe passage in unexpected weather as well as removing beach traffic when people desired to access the south end of the island. This access was removed in the name of wildlife/habitat conservation and costs (which the park service did not maintain).

I hope the park service will abolish the Wilderness Designation permanently and allow local management to manage the island based on local knowledge and changing local conditions as option 3 allows.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 11

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Elizabeth Byrne  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Newark, DE 19711  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-11  
Date Sent: 03/08/2016 Date Received: 03/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Sirs: I would like to submit my opinions on the GMP on the proposed fixes for Assateague Island National Seashore Park. As a land owner in Ocean City, MD., tax payer, and frequent visitor to the park, I believe that I have a right to make my wishes and thoughts known to all. I think that the proposal in the GMP would best for all if they chose Alternative 3. Please be advised that these are my personal thoughts and opinions about a place I really enjoy and love visiting. Thank you. Sincerely Elizabeth Byrne

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 12

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: James McWhinney  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berline, PA 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-12  
Date Sent: 03/15/2016 Date Received: 03/15/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The seashore is one of the few publicly accessible coastal environments in the densely populated northeast United States where visitors can experience unspoiled beaches, tranquil bays and marshlands, natural sounds, quiet, dark night skies, and solitude. Please maintain it as it is forever. Protect the dunes, beach and horses by any/every means possible. Do not let it go natural and disappear.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 13

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Rose M. Weber  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-13  
Date Sent: 03/20/2016 Date Received: 03/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I strongly support the NPS alternative four. I began visiting Assateague a number of years ago to tent-camp for two weeks at the State Park at the end of the season. The last few years, however, have been overrun with a great many people, radios, and similar "Ocean City" behavior even at the end of the summer season. Since I now live full-time in Berlin, I am a frequent day-use visitor to the National Park to birdwatch, determine what frogs I can hear calling, and generally enjoy a barrier island in an undeveloped condition. Sadly, I have noticed that "Ocean City" behavior has clearly descended on the National Park as well as the State Park in any season including, for example, dunes being trampled and other behavior that clearly disregards the ecosystem.

Ultimately, it is the NPS' responsibility to respect this barrier island's natural and inevitable processes. For too many years the NPS has attempted to "repair" what is, in fact, not damage but, instead, is the inevitable result of this barrier island's dynamic existence. Although these processes and the results may not have been understood in years past, they are well-understood now - as are the costs of attempting to repeatedly "repair" what simply is not damage. If the NPS does not act to allow Assateague to remain a dynamic barrier island, the losses in the future will be far greater than anyone can anticipate.

Alternative three is a weaker alternative although clearly preferable to alternatives one and two. I strongly disapprove of both alternatives one and two and urge the NPS to reject both alternatives.

As for the town of Ocean City's position, we can all see the tremendous damage that the Ocean City has done and continues to do to its own formerly dynamic coastline. We all know that eventually Ocean City will have to face the facts - the ocean is not to be controlled, the beaches will continue to erode, the inlet will continue to fill with sand preventing larger fishing boats from use, and the financial costs to "repair" will become prohibitive.

Finally, I emphasize that alternative four is the wise, appropriate choice for managing Assateague. The NPS knows that as well as I do.

Rose Weber

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 14

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Paul W. Lojewski  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-14  
Date Sent: 03/23/2016 Date Received: 03/23/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

Assateague Island National Park, happens to be one our (wife included) parks. We daily go to the park to walk, jog, surf our just to enjoy the environment by sitting and observing everything. I realize that global warming causing the intensity of storms battering our island, along with the rising ocean level have made keeping the island user friendly a difficult job. We also appreciate all the effort the park service has done to allow us to enjoy it. We would just like to thank you for all your efforts. We support any effort possible go keep the island open for public use while trying to keep it's natural integrity.



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 15

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ty Wintermoyer  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Hagerstown, MD  
Hagerstown, MD 21742  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-15  
Date Sent: 03/24/2016 Date Received: 03/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This comment is different than E-15 submitted by the same person.

### Correspondence Text

Hello,

I am the father of a "young" family and have recently (past 5 years) started enjoying the pleasures of Assateague Island (State and National Parks). I strongly support to OSV section of the Nation Park and I hope that your efforts are aimed at preserving our OSV access along with the many wildlife areas and their protection.

Thank you for your support.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 16

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Chris Payton  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Morgantown, WV 26508  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-16  
Date Sent: 03/24/2016 Date Received: 03/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As an out of state user of the recreation areas, my primary concern is for the OSV use for fishing the many miles of secluded land available on the island. We visit the area several times through the year, both in and off season, to fish from the surf. Access to public fishing areas becomes more and more limited each year all over the country. I would hate to see any of the new GMP plans impact that valuable resources availability, much less the financial impact to the local economy.

Thank you for considering my thoughts,

Chris Payton

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 17

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John C. Kostyak  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Lansdale, PA 19446  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-17  
Date Sent: 03/24/2016 Date Received: 03/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

RE: AI GMP  
To Whom It May Concern:

Assateague island is my favorite place on earth. It allows me to connect with nature in a way that those who have never experienced AI cannot understand. The feeling I have when alone on AI is indescribable. I want my two children to have this experience. Often, I have driven the length on AI and seen horses, eagles, seals, ghost crabs, foxes, deer, turkeys, and myriad shore birds. You'll notice that humans are not on that list. I have driven the length of the OSV zone on AIMD many times without seeing another human. There are precious few places left on the east coast where one can have this experience. For that reason, the OSV zone must not only be available, but it must be maintained.

Alternative 2 of the ASIS GMP draft would turn AI into just another beach. That experience can be had at any number of beach towns up and down the east coast. I strongly object to alternative 2, as it would eliminate that which makes AI unique. Similarly, alternative 4 of the GMP does not allow for island maintainance in the event of a breach or is island access is lost. It also precludes the possibility of exploring alternative access points to AI. Therefore, I strongly object to alternative 4. I am a proponent of alternative 3, which states that recreational use of the island will be maintained and even promoted in the event of damage to current access points. Most of that alternative management plan is fine. However, there are a few points that need to be addressed.

- 1) Include verbiage that allows the NPS to explore alternative routes around nesting shore birds, as one nesting pair can close the entire OSV zone for 6 weeks.
- 2) Include a specific plan to maintain the OSV access point after coastal flooding. The access point drains poorly and may need to be either raised by adding sand, or drained using machinery.
- 3) The NPS needs to explore the wisdom of allowing 145 vehicles onto 1-2 KM of beach during the busiest parts of the summer (due to beach closures for nesting shore birds).

I appreciate your consideration,  
John C Kostyak, PhD

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

[REDACTED]  
Philadelphia, PA  
19140  
[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 18

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael W. Schomody  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Haymarket, VA 20169  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-18  
Date Sent: 03/24/2016 Date Received: 03/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please support Alternative 3 with Guaranteed OSV access

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 19

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David T. Adams  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pine Grove Mills, PA 16868  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-19  
Date Sent: 03/25/2016 Date Received: 03/25/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This is a different comment than E3 submitted by the same person.

### Correspondence Text

I hereby give my support to Alternative 3 for the Assateague Island National Seashore General Management Plan. Please keep OSV access open as is. I love the island and respect the need for the birds to be protected. Humans need to be respected, too. I work in a psychiatric hospital and on those days that are the worst of the bad days, visions of a vacation including driving on the beach keep me going. Please keep this resource accessible. Please.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 20

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kara Smit  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Crete, IL 60417  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-20  
Date Sent: 03/26/2016 Date Received: 03/26/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I agree with the National Park's preference that option 3 of the EIS is the most viable one for continuing visitor use in the face of an immanently changing climate. Climate change will be the biggest factor the NP will have to deal with. Moving core operations onto the mainland as the island buildings fall into disrepair or a changing island-scape make it necessary seem like the best long term management plan. However, I am concerned about funding and the cost of operations. It is encouraging that the projected costs of plans 1 and 3 are very similar, so if funding stayed the same, option 3 should be feasible to carry out in the short term. What if in a future with a severely changed island, the Assateague Island National Seashore effectively ceases to exist or be accessible to visitors, though? Funding might dramatically dwindle for the park, making these plans impotent. Are there contingency plans for a scenario like this?

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 21

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William R. Lowe  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Middleburg, VA 20117  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-21  
Date Sent: 03/27/2016 Date Received: 03/27/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This is a different comment than E-48 by the same person.

### Correspondence Text

We own a home on Chincoteague Island. We will comment later on which proposal we like best, but for now wish to inquire why the Virginia portion of Assateague Island no longer has the snow fencing and dunes? Maryland has great dunes and Chincoteague used to. It seems like the demise of the beach and parking lots are related to the loss of the dunes. We heard some years ago that the NPS had a new policy of letting "nature take its course" and removed the snow fencing. We hope that is not true. We are not scientists and could be incorrect, but it looks like Maryland's beach is holding up better than Virginia's and it could be the result of allowing the dunes to fade away.  
If there is any way to comment on this question, please do so.  
Thank you,  
Rick and Karen Lowe



## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 22

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: wayne holland  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
salisbury, MD 21801  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-22  
Date Sent: 03/28/2016 Date Received: 03/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

My input regarding management plan would be to PLEASE leave currant osv status in place!! and not to designate AI as a wilderness area. I love being able to travel the beach when I can squeeze in time to do so. It is a place where I can meet friends I only get to see sometimes once a year. Also one of the reasons I moved to Salisbury was to be closer to AI. Now that I am getting closer to a time in my life where I can visit the park more often, I just hope that it will be the osv zone will be open to do so. thank you, Wayne Holland

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 23

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lee Savage  
Organization: AMSA  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-23  
Date Sent: 03/29/2016 Date Received: 03/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My family has been enjoying the Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS) since the old ferry system era. Now at 63yrs of age and with family members lost but with 2 married sons, 5 grandsons and 1 granddaughter to carry on, it would be a terrible loss to them not to be able to enjoy 'our' Assateague beach and attributes as I have. The AINS is as much of a treasure to us as is the lakes, mountains, streams, desert sands and skies that this beautiful country has to offer.  
THANK YOU, Lee Savage

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 24

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Tony Weeg  
Organization: Tony Weeg Photography  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
SALISBURY, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-24  
Date Sent: 03/30/2016 Date Received: 03/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello there, and thank you for taking my comment.

I would first like to say that I believe that Assateague Island, the OSV zone, the Nature Trails, the horses, the piping plovers, and all of us conscientious Assateague Island lovers can exist in harmony for many more years to come. There is nothing quite like this gem of an Island, wildlife habitat and place to go for locals - anywhere around. This is truly an exquisite gem of a National Park.

Please do everything you can to keep it open and available to the residents and visitors of our area for many more years to come!! Thank you, from my family and I.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 25

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: robin e. tomaselli  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-25  
Date Sent: 03/30/2016 Date Received: 03/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I would like to cast my vote for Plan #3.

My family has enjoyed Assateague Island National Seashore for many years and would be heartbroken if unable to enjoy all that this seaside park and nature preserve has to offer. Plan 3 would allow for continued public access while protecting the natural habitat and breeding ground of it's natural inhabitants.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 26

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jerome Denk  
Organization: ESIMBA  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Ocean Pines, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-26  
Date Sent: 03/30/2016 Date Received: 03/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please keep Assteague open. We love the island and do not want to see it closed to the public.


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 27

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Ethel R. Eaton, Ph.D.

Organization: Dept of Historic Resources, Virginia  Official Rep.

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: 2801 Kensington Avenue  
Richmond, VA 21811  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-27, H-2 and E-2

Date Sent: 03/17/2016 Date Received: 03/17/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Thank you for your letter of February 12, 2016 requesting our review of the draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Assateague Island National Seashore. The Department of Historic Resources supports Alternative 3, Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation, the National Park Service (NPS)' preferred alternative for the future management of the seashore lands and waters under its management. We note the Conclusions section on page 4-198 states: "Under all alternatives cultural resources would continue to be exposed to unavoidable adverse impacts associated with natural coastal processes and the effects of climate change/sea level rise". We appreciate the challenges facing the Seashore. However, we strongly encourage including in the future management strategies in the GMP effective ways to address these unavoidable impacts. We offer the following comments for your consideration:

Archaeological Sites. On page viii the draft GMP acknowledges the absence of archaeological survey data for most of the island. The challenge in identifying these sites is illustrated by the attached photos courtesy of Darrin Lowery. Some shorelines have an erosive season (or phase) and a stable season (or phase). In our comments on the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges Comprehensive Conservation we brought to the attention of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service a prehistoric site eroding out of the shoreline on Metomkin Island, 44AC0138. Although located on the Nature Conservancy portion of Metomkin Island (not the Service' portion), the site illustrates both the potential for prehistoric resources and the threat of erosion to the cultural resources on the refuges. Stating that occasional discoveries of aboriginal projectile points in the ocean surf zone constitute the only physical evidence of Native American use of Assateague Island (or presumably on other barrier islands within the jurisdiction of the NPS) ignores the

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

critical need to collect baseline data about these sites spatial, historical and cultural contexts, followed by periodic monitoring of identified resources in order to more effectively manage them.

The section, Assessing Impacts, on page 4.1.3, states: "The NPS is an agency with a "conservation" mandate and identifies fundamental resources and values in its GMPs". In section 1.4.3 of the GMP/EIS, Cultural Resources are included under Other Important Resources, ranging from historic structures to archaeological objects and sites. We strongly encourage NPS not to drop archaeological resources from consideration in the GMP but to include archaeological resources together with other Cultural Resources (Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes). We recommend that Section 2.6.5 Cultural Resource Management (NPS Preferred Alternative) includes a management strategy of conducting baseline archaeological survey and monitoring. Failure to do is in our opinion may be considered an adverse impact, and inconsistent with the directives of Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, as well as Bulletin 28.

We also encourage the NPS to include as a management strategy partnering with the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges in the Service' wreck monitoring program, which will serve both as a useful monitoring tool for cultural resources as well as assessing the movement of the barrier islands.

Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station. The Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station and its Cultural Landscape are considered eligible for both the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Under alternative 3, management actions would protect and maintain the Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station in situ until the site and/or structures are no longer sustainable... Page viii states that the Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station sits vacant and underutilized due to problems with access. We do not see any management strategies to address the access problem. We are pleased to see, however, that Section 2.6.5 Cultural Resource Management (NPS Preferred Alternative) that NPS would seek partners to rehabilitate and reuse the station, perhaps including an historic lease or with commercial service providers to provide access ... We encourage the NPS to explore partnerships, such with the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges, potentially including the Station as a venue for environmental education. The NPS might also schedule occasional interpretive tours with local partners to encourage an understanding the Station's place in the history of Assateague Island, enhancing Visitor Use and Experience in addition to the kayak tours from Toms Cove that include a stop at the site.

We look forward to working with the NPS under section 106 of the NHPA and the Servicewide 2008 Programmatic Agreement among the NPS, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers as plans progress. Tribal consultation will need to be considered in the Section 106 process. As you know, the Virginia Council on Indians no longer exists. Virginia now has its first resident federally recognized Indian Tribe, the Pamunkey Tribe. If NPS has not already done so, we encourage initiating consultation with the Pamunkey Tribe on the GMP/EIS.

Thank you for offering us the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions concerning our comments, or if we may provide any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me (for archaeology) at (804)482-6088; e-mail [ethel.eaton@dhr.virginia.gov](mailto:ethel.eaton@dhr.virginia.gov), or M. Amanda Lee (for architectural issues) at (804) 482-6092; [amanda.lee@dhr.virginia.gov](mailto:amanda.lee@dhr.virginia.gov).

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Sincerely,  
Ethel R. Eaton, Ph.D., Senior Policy Analyst  
Division of Resource Services and Review



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 28

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Frederick Traut III  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Abingdon, MD 21009  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-28, H-16, E-4, and E-56  
Date Sent: 03/23/2016 Date Received: 03/23/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 23, 2016

Debbie Darden  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7260 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811  
Deborah\_darden@nps.gov

Congressman Andy Harris M.D.  
212 W. Main Street  
#204B  
Salisbury, MD 21801  
Bill.reddish@mail.house.gov

Subject: GMP/EIS Comments

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my concern over the changes that the NPS is requesting to Assateague Island National Seashore through the GMP/EIS.

First a bit of my family history, my Grandfather first introduced his love of the National Seashore to my Father, who then introduced his love of the National Seashore to his children, who then introduced their love of the National Seashore to their children. As a grandfather of 6, I have introduced my love of the National Seashore to my grandchild, who have all fallen in love with the National Seashore. (I hope you are getting the picture.

For many generations the National Seashore has not only been enjoyed by my family, past and present, and hopefully future, but by tens of thousands of those like me.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

I am a fisherman and enjoy the freedoms that the Over Sand Vehicle Access allows. Not just for fishing, but for hiking, nature photography, discovering island history, family recreation, meditation, cookouts, and the satisfaction of watching my children and grandchildren share the same love I have for the National Seashore.

Now for my opinion, I see no reason to change from the current GMP. I see no reason to fix what is not broken. As one who served to protect our freedom, a citizen and taxpayer of this great country, and a conservative conservationist, I am FED UP with the Federal Government's continued plan to seize and control land owned by the people of the United States of America. Hopefully I did not misread the Gettysburg Address by President Lincoln, which states, "We are a Government of the People, For the People and By the People". I could not find any statement that dictates the government controls the people. I also believe that the Constitution of the United States starts with "We the People".

I am not a proponent of the liberal interpretation of our Constitution. I am also not a proponent of the Federal Government's use of small liberal organizations who have developed guidelines to control the majority of the population who for generations have enjoyed and respected what God has given us.

In closing, If a decision needs to be made my choice would be to stay with Alternative 1, and do not fix what is not broken.

My second choice would be to postpone any discussions and decisions until after the general elections.

Thank you for your time and understanding and May God Bless America.

Frederick Grandon Traut III

[REDACTED]

Abingdon, Maryland 21009

[REDACTED]

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 29

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Deb Griffin

Organization:

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address:

[REDACTED]

Ambler, PA 19002

USA

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-29

Date Sent: 03/30/2016 Date Received: 03/30/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

Is The ORV going to stay open

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 30

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David Moore  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-30  
Date Sent: 03/30/2016 Date Received: 03/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

I choose number 3 I feel it is suited for the general publics best interests. I love the island and the ability to drive on the beach to escape the crowds and enjoy nature at its best.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 31

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: tom wilson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-31  
Date Sent: 03/31/2016 Date Received: 03/31/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am a frequent visitor to AINS and many of my summer houseguests are also frequent visitors.

I generally support Option 3 of the draft plan and particularly support the concept of alternate access to the island via ferries. I believe there are many alternatives for ocean beach access in the area, including state parks in Delaware and the large, developed beach in Ocean City which is free to visitors. The bayside access which AICS provides is relatively rare in the area and thoughtful expansion would be welcome.

I would encourage consideration of ferry access from points in Maryland further south, such as Public Landing. This would have the beneficial effect of providing access to parts of the island that are relatively inaccessible now and also 'spreading out' the tourist impact in Worcester County by attracting tourists to the lower part of the county.

One of the most valuable aspects of other national parks is the network or availability of trails to move off of the roads and explore nature more fully. Much of the emphasis of your plan seems to be focused on vehicular access including the OSV access. While I agree these are important, I would encourage additional facilities to encourage exploration of Assateague by foot.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 32

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Pamela G. Gadd  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Uniontown, PA 15401-5349  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-32  
Date Sent: 03/31/2016 Date Received: 03/31/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My family has a decades-long connection to Assateague National Park in Virginia. We believe that your studies and plans to develop a change in the management of the Park are misguided and should not be considered for another minute. It is feasible to fight against the "inevitable" changes that climate change brings. Yes, it's expensive, and every dollar spent is well spent to maintain the Park as it is. We DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THE OPTIONS as we can see that the Town of Chincoteague and its residents will be negatively affected. To sever ties with the local populations will create a LOT OF NEGATIVE PUBLICITY for the Park Service and create an atmosphere of animosity. You all have already wasted a great deal of money that could've been used for the Park.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 33

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dan Davis  
Organization: Captain Dan's Tours  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-33  
Date Sent: 03/31/2016 Date Received: 03/31/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

There is a long tradition of working and living on the water in this area. My family has made their living on/in the waters around Chincoteague and Assateague since the 1700's.

Locally, we would prefer the NPS to be less restrictive with their policies and plans. The NPS does not own the water column around Assateague, but rather they have a "concurrent jurisdiction" of that water column. Running concurrent with the state of Virginia. As a resident, a fisherman, and a charter boat operator, I take exception to the idea that the NPS wants to dictate who can and cannot use the waterways around Assateague Island.

Virginia granted that concurrent jurisdiction in good faith in the 90's. Kicking out the clammers and oystermen, and telling charter boats to stay out of the water during the government budget sequester, is not in keeping with that good faith.

Please remember that our livelihood, our families meals, our mortgages, all depend on people visiting this area for recreation. There is no reason to limit any access, or recreation, especially if it's not adversely affecting anything at this time.

We aren't asking for anything. We don't want money, more services, or a handout. We just need to maintain the status quo, so we can continue supporting our families, and assisting visitors with their rural, coastal, vacations.

Dan Davis  
Captain Dan's Tours  
Chincoteague Island Resident

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 34

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: james g. daniel  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-34  
Date Sent: 03/31/2016 Date Received: 03/31/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As a close resident and frequent user of the Assateague Island National Seashore I feel that Alternative 1 is the best approach at this time. I feel that the NPS will have to continue to be resilient and adaptive in the future as it has in the past. I think NPS has been aware from the very beginning of how changeable the barrier island is and has obviously considered this with recent building replacements that they have moved westward. Using clam shells to replace parking lots is a good idea. Cheaper and quicker to replace storm damaged parking. Alternative transportation such as shuttles and ferry service will likely see limited usage. Ferry service on the Maryland side will be difficult at best without considerable dredging. We know the island will continue to change in the future but, since we don't know when or how, I feel the best approach is to react to these changes as they occur rather than spend a lot of tax money make changes for something that may or may not happen in the near future. Thirty years will go by quicker than we think and then a new GMP will be required to address some of the same old problems and some that no one imagined.

Sincerely, Jim Daniel



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 35

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: thomas w. mccurdy  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Lutherville, MD 21093  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-35  
Date Sent: 04/03/2016 Date Received: 04/03/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I access the park via an anchored boats off of the north end of the island. I have done this for 40 years since as a summer job I participated as a surveyors assistant to the estate of the gentleman who generously donated the North End to the NPS. For the past three years, I have watched the use of the bayside exponentially grow by locals, and with it come enforcement by rangers of what they perceive to be the regulations of the north end.

I want version three to be the version of choice. I also want walk on access from the bayside in a more organized fashion as the boat on crowd is deserving of a walk through to the ocean that doesn't involve walking all the way to the inlet, as I stated I surveyed the place, and there are spots where the old Baltimore Ave is easily accessed from the bayside. I also want the existing leash laws for dogs to apply to the north end it makes no sense to have rangers on four wheelers blasting through the wetland to tell me that my dog can't come out of the water onto land because I am on the upper end of the island, not the lower. If the exchairman of scott paper knew the ranger would treat people this way thirty years later, I wonder if he would have gone through with his gift.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 36

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Diane D. Fisher  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-36  
Date Sent: 04/04/2016 Date Received: 04/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am against moving the beach North let it stay where it is and build dunes and all the other methods that were done in previous years till they decided to just let it wash over. Up north is to many bugs and we do not want a shuttle system. When this whole process started our community sent letters to our representatives and all the fish / wildlife groups, why is no one rereading them ? Plus all the years after ? This article states only 30 comments were made well people are getting tired of this poor process that is going on, how many letters do we need to write and trips to Washington , DC ? This has dragged on for years , so someone should pull the files and see the comments from the passed and how many. Protect our beach the way it is , ponies and aquaculture but number one that island protects Chincoteague and we need it build up.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 37

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Daniel L. Tobin  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pittsburgh, PA 15201-1733  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-37  
Date Sent: 04/04/2016 Date Received: 04/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I agree with the NPS selection of alternative 3 as the preferred plan for the future. This takes current use into account, as well as planning for the the future regarding potential climate issues as well as adaptability for the long term. The island has to be considered a resource but a natural resource first and foremost.

## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 38**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail:

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-38  
Date Sent: 04/04/2016 Date Received: 04/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### **Correspondence Text**

I believe that no area within the OSV zone should considered wilderness area

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 39

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: J Zajac  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-39  
Date Sent: 04/05/2016 Date Received: 04/05/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The information supplied by the NPS would be enhanced if it included a table to compare the alternatives as the wording is similar between them. Also, no plan can be seriously evaluated without addressing budgetary requirements in some comparative form.

I live on Sinepauxent Bay and frequently visit Assateague Island. I encourage the NPS to maintain existing visitor access including the ORV section for fishermen.

A major part of Alt 3 commentary centers on developing visitor access from the mainland. I must confess that I believe 'ferry' access would not be needed for a generation or more. But, if necessary, I would strongly object to any part of South Point being used as a staging area as was initially the case decades ago. The intersection of South Point road with the Rte 611 curve is becoming more congested with each season making exiting more difficult. The peninsula is residential in nature with a single access road (not State maintained) that simply could not handle the traffic that 'ferry' access would generate through the community.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 40

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Gainesville, GA 30501  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-40  
Date Sent: 04/05/2016 Date Received: 04/05/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am opposed to harvesting horseshoe crabs in the national seashore. Knots depend on them and they have been overfished already. The fact that a fisherman needs this to make a living is not a reason to deplete a resource.

If aquaculture results in water pollution and escaped GMO fish, it should be banned.

People come to the seashore to see wildlife. There are more of them than duck hunters who want blinds there. And the problem with this is not just shooting what most visitors want to see, there is also a safety issue.

This is a national seashore. Local concerns should not outweigh others.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 41

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Paul Hartwick  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Middletown, DE 19709  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-41  
Date Sent: 04/05/2016 Date Received: 04/05/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have a keen interest in this plan because I am a homeowner on Chincoteague Island and am a regular visitor to Assateague. My wife and I hope to retire to the area and intend to take a more active role in the community as volunteers in the future. We are annual passholders at the refuge and we are members of the Chincoteague Natural History Association.

Assateague is a wonderful place that seems to, in most cases, balance the significant challenge of being a wildlife refuge that's primary priority is wildlife conservation and a national park that's primary priority is recreational activities for humans. I would hope that any plan would continue to focus on both of those priorities.

I also think it is critical that this plan also take several other things into account. It is one of the most visited national parks for good reason. Do not initiate changes that fly against the many reasons that thousands visit the park every single year. Along those lines, it is also critical that plans work in some coordination with Chincoteague Island. Both places have a significant interdependency on each other and by working in a cooperative fashion, the results will be better than either entity could gain on its own. And finally, I think the history of Assateague - - the settlement, the ponies, the lighthouse, the hunting/fishing/waterman-culture - - should continue to be celebrated, respected and supported.

So with all of that context, I would offer these specific comments related to the plan:

-I support relocating the beach, if the experts believe it will be in a better long-term location. I fully understand the challenges of keeping the beach where it is and trust that experts will be able to find a more optimal place for it.

-I support regular beach re-nourishment and management. I understand that comes at a high cost. But I believe some of that cost could be recouped through higher pass fees, and perhaps in working more closely with the Chincoteague Island community. On a related note, I would like to see more coordination with whatever government entities are working at the NASA facilities. Perhaps some of that work and the costs could be shared across the refuge, the beach and the base. Perhaps those entities could be an example of government entities working more smartly and efficiently!

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

-I support beach parking. As appealing as park-and-ride shuttles could be for a wide variety of reasons, it's simply not practical. People bring lots of things to the beach - - chairs, tents, fishing poles, surfboards, toys and so on. Additionally, the first time a severe storm hits, any shuttle plan would implode. I would consider beach parking a necessity and build a plan and budget for maintaining it. I'd be curious to know if there are any national seashores that use a park-and-ride system. I would most compare Assateague to the beaches of Cape Cod - - and all of them offer beach parking.

-I support continued flexibility with watermen, as stated above. I would like to see continued access for watermen, hunters and anglers. I believe that access has been managed extremely appropriately for years and it should continue.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I urge you to build a future refuge and park that stays true to the things that have allowed it to be so successful for decades.



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 42

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Stephen E. Pagano  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
NORTH EAST, MD 21901  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-42  
Date Sent: 04/05/2016 Date Received: 04/05/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I think it stink's that the NPS is taking away a great vacation spot. I have land in Horn town VA. and was ready to build my Retirement home and move there to in joy the town of Chinqoteaug VA and the fishing on A.I.VA. But now i'm selling the land and will look at living at the Delaware shore. I think it's a disservice to the town, the people. But Latelty , that's all our government dos'e is a disservice to the people. I have been following this for month's now, and it seem the government for the elite has already made up there mind's. Thank you.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 43

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Cynthia Wilder  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague Island, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-43  
Date Sent: 04/06/2016 Date Received: 04/06/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello,

I have some comments and suggestions regarding the proposed plan:

1. There is currently a \$10 annual parking fee for visitors using the Seashore parking lots who enter with a Federal Duck Stamp. I hope it is going directly toward maintenance and repairs of beach parking. Should repairs and maintenance at any point become too expensive to maintain under the current fee structure, please add a parking fee to -all- those who plan to use the parking lots. It is not fair that the FWS gathers all the revenue from beachgoers and the NPS does all the work. Should both agencies lack funding to continue maintenance and repair of the parking lots, please let the Town of Chincoteague step in. They have ample tax revenue and- - as your plan states- - the residents of Chincoteague initially formed the Beach Authority and then handed it over to the NPS to care for in perpetuity. They would be more than willing to step in to help, as the beach is the lifeblood of our island home.
2. Though the FWS plan calls to move the recreational beach north, and your agency would need to follow their lead per the Memorandum of Understanding, I feel that responsible management of the area currently designated for recreational use has fallen by the wayside. When we had a healthy dune line, complete with snow fences, dune grass, and properly built walkways (STAIRS) to allow access, our parking lots were not washed out with every storm. In fact, it took a whopper of a storm to even penetrate the dune line! Please rebuild the dunes and foster environmentally friendly ways of preserving them- - notably snow fences, dune grass, and DESIGNATED points of entry only. Tramping feet will kill the grass. Should the recreational beach move north at some point in the future, these measures should still be put into place on the Southern end to ensure that Chincoteague and Wallops are not left exposed to the wrath of the Atlantic.
3. The whole argument that Horseshoe Crab harvesting should no longer be allowed based on the fact that they are technically arachnids is complete and utter nonsense. An across-the-board exemption should be granted, permitted harvesting continues in a responsible manner as per the VMRC, given the historic significance of this industry, and the miniscule impact it has on the purposes of the NPS and FWS missions. It is ludicrous to destroy a necessary and historic industry- - along with many livelihoods- - just for the sake of semantics.
4. Please make an increased effort to get the word out about your programs! I handle social media as part of my job, and

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

information from the NPS about the VA side of Assateague is rather skimpy. FWS has told me on multiple occasions that they do not have the personnel to get out the word out. It would only take a few minutes a day, and the response would be huge! Perhaps the two agencies could work together to get the word out about activities and goings-on. One specific suggestion would be to work with CTG, a radio station with coverage in both VA and MD, on an Assateague program like NASA's "NASA in a minute" segment. That way, instead of a facebook post like today's (The OSV zone will be completely closed until further notice.) you could have a park representative talk about the high tides making it difficult to safely navigate vehicles. Or, perhaps, mention that a rogue Piping Plover has arrived earlier than expected and consequently the OSV is off-limits until fall. Or perhaps FWS has discovered a Spanish Galleon washed up and uncovered by the high tides, and they don't want anyone disturbing the barnacles on its hull. All of the above have been mentioned with varying degrees of seriousness in my friend circles in the short hours since the announcement was posted.

Point being, a little more transparency would be excellent and foster confidence in the agencies controlling our livelihoods. I would very much love to see the NPS increase and bolster its resources and programs on the Virginia side of Assateague, and am willing to help in any way I can.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 44

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mark C. Kirby  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Muskegon, MI 49441  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-44  
Date Sent: 04/06/2016 Date Received: 04/06/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I was born and raised in Ocean City Maryland and have been going to Assateague Island all my life. It has been a very important place for me and is one of the real reasons that I am in the process of moving back to the Eastern Shore. I am I am in opposition option 3 after reading all the options provided. I am in support of Option 1 and feel that the island should be left alone as it is now and it as it has been since 1982. Option three seems to be more costly and limits access not only to tourists but to locals who have used the island for Generations. The fact that Chincoteague has made very little changes based on their environmental impact statements is basis for my being against option 3 and for Option 1. It seems to me that the state and federal government has made their decision and at least comments will not be taken seriously. I am also appalled at the fact that the powers-that-be have been sneaking around planning behind the Public's back. Again Option 1 is my choice for what it is worth.

Sincerely,  
Mark C Kirby

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 45

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Phillip Rodden  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Bishopville, MD 21813  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-45  
Date Sent: 04/06/2016 Date Received: 04/06/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

It is important to remember that Assateague Island is a Barrier Island and many of the current and past changes are a result of that more than Climate change. Barrier Island Migrate and are constantly shifting quite often toward the mainland.

As a person who was born and continues to live near the Barrier island of Ocean City I have witnessed the effects of storms and erosion on the beaches, dunes and bayside waterways.

Assateague Island is a time capsule of what was and what will be. The Park service has been doing an amazing job of stewardship on the island. Balancing the resources for our guests that travel from all over the world to visit and enjoy the natural experience. I have been always pleased to see how the Park Service have been making improvements based on low impact that is proving to be overwhelmingly successful. I would like to see this continue.

If I had to pick a plan, I would think a combination of Plan 1 and Plan 2 would be successful with further studies. My feeling is that any change that may limit the access by guests would be a great loss that will reach far beyond the local community.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 46

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David L. Wenbert  
Organization: Chincotech Corp.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague Island, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-46  
Date Sent: 04/06/2016 Date Received: 04/06/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Allowing breaches to open - much less remain open - is inconsistent with your mission of "Coastal Resiliency", and poses a long term catastrophic danger to the human population in the vicinity of the Refuge. Accepting breaches in the name of "nature" goes beyond Gross Negligence, imperiling life and property, and raises serious questions about the legitimacy of your entire planning process.

Not only must NPS begin to proactively protect the beach - and dunes to the end of the Tom's Cover "Hook", through continuous dredging and renourishment, but also with the planting of traditional beach dune vegetation sufficient to prevent erosion of the dune line in the future. NPS does this aggressively in the vicinity of Cape Canaveral, and has for over 30 years. We require that you protect the dunes on our barrier island as completely, consistently, and continuously as you do in Florida.

Moreover, the resiliency of our coast demands forward preparation in your plan, for the eventual closing of the inlet to Chincoteague Bay, through an aggressive Dredge & Fill program to seal off the Bay from the ocean, permanently.

ONLY with the construction of a permanent, substantial, filled embankment (encompassing hard seawalls) between the south end of Assateague Island and the north end of Wallops Island, will the populated island of Chincoteague be preserved in the face of sea-level rise.

This must become your dominant, overriding priority in the 30 years plan for Assateague; given the risk to the human population and built environment, all other NPS priorities must be rescinded.

If this concern as to the breaches, dune replenishment and vegetation, and forward planning for eventual inlet closure by Dredge & Fill is not sufficiently addressed in your Final Plan, the people of Chincoteague will have no alternative but to seek federal relinquishment of Assateague and its associated Refuges to the State Park System of Virginia.

It should be noted that it was the Town's official request which got you jurisdiction here in the first place; Times Change -

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

and so does the Climate.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 47

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Myfe W. Moore  
Organization: Homeowner 26 years in Chincoteague  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
San Antonio , TX 78212  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-47  
Date Sent: 04/06/2016 Date Received: 04/06/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

1. Horseshoe Crab harvesting should STOP! Immediately! No phasing out! I know the harvesters and they have no respect for the Earth.
2. The beach dunes at their current location should be rebuilt and grassed and fenced and all traffic kept off always. There were 20' dunes there until 10 years ago when USFW wrecked them, allowed traffic all over them, and allowed them to be destroyed. I dislike USFW VERY much.
3. The beach should never be traveled by any vehicle ever. And no horse back riding or ATV or OSV or any other. Ever.
4. Chincoteague sea harvesters should follow strict rules for protecting the environment. Many abuse the sea around Chinc and then complain when stopped.
5. Native Chincoteaguers should be given free passes to go to Assateague or the beach. It is their ancestral land and they should be allowed to access it for free.
6. Aquaculture and protecting/rebuilding/owning the oyster-guard shacks should be allowed but the watermen should not be allowed to pollute or damage the environment.
7. U.S. Park Service should stand up and take care of their jurisdiction, and quit bowing down to USFW. You have done a great job up North in Maryland but have fallen down on the job in Virginia.
8. Finally, the USFW and Parks Service should require the pony herd to be cut in half, as Maryland Assateague Park Service already did. USFW is trying to destroy Chincoteague's economy by not taking care of the grazing range of the Virginia ponies and the resulting damage of too many ponies there, so THEY CAN FORCE ALL THE PONIES OFF ASSATEAGUE VIRGINIA..... But, Parks should stand up to the USFW and do their job protecting our environment. And the pony removal from Assateague will destroy the economy of Chincoteague. USFW has ONCE AGAIN damaged a beautiful refuge and run the natives off of it. DO YOUR JOB, US PARKS SERVICE!!!!!!



## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 48

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Howard L. Sribnick  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
BERLIN, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: p-48  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

I agree with the Park Service recommendation that Alternative 3 is the most favorable alternative for dealing with the future of Assateague Island National Seashore.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 49

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mandi Hariton  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Gambrills, MD 21054  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-49  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

I like things the way they are. I do understand about the evolution of the environment though. I have been coming since the early 80's and I have seen a lot of changes over these years. I also do know that the park service wants nothing to do with the ponies really. The funny thing is part of the reason people don't mind paying the money to get in is not only the beach and other wild life but those famous ponies. I am pretty sure part of the plan that is not being released is that later on down the line all access to the refuge will be stopped and no one will see any of it anymore. That would be a total shame. A lot of us are generations down the line coming there. We are continuing it with our kids. How sad that the government yet again does not think of the people but of how much work the government does not feel like doing. To close off the beach to everyone along with the other beautiful wildlife and the famous ponies would be a travesty.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 50

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Marge Jackson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-50  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Our waters are our livelihoods nd the reason for many visitors which keep our economy growing nd alive please dont take that from us....our waterman having been doing this for years nd duckhunting is another's means of food on our table

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 51

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-51  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I totally dis agree with this plan, it seems to be un-American. The government doesn't own the waterways. I hope the town of Chincoteague will annex the Island and kick off the mismanagement of Assateague.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 52

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ashley Mann  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Midlothian , VA 23113  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-52  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

hello,

I am against this plan as written as it does not preserve the history, environment, livelihood and open usage of Assateague island. I visited the area last week and was blown away by the nature, access and history thriving in Assateague. The oyster homes and duck blinds are amazing structures rich with history and natural purpose and still serve us up today. The water surrounding the island, the island land and sky were so filled with gently visited nature and wildlife, it was such a joy to explore the water ways and land and be so close to such natural, pristine public areas. These parks are a true treasure to the area, residents and visitors alike. Please consider this and rework the plan to protect the area. Thank you

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 53

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Melissa Hottenstein  
Organization: Chincoteague Legacy Group  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Aston, PA 19014  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-53  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Save Assateague-don't destroy the local income and public access to this national treasure

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 54

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kimberlee Morrow  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Rutland, MA 01543  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-54  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I like many are concerned with the changes suggested between Assateague and Chincoteague waterways. The livelihood of many will be affected by these proposals. The people of Chincoteague have evolved throughout the years as the government has imposed more and more rules and regulations upon this resilient town. Many residents have gone from Waterman to entertaining tourists. They are losing more and more of their waterways as well as their way of life passed down thru generations. Due to multiple limitations by the federal government of their Waters. When will the federal government stop taking away from many who served this country and kept it's Coast safe, just to have their coasts and ways of life destroyed.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 55

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Belva J. Parsons  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Saint Marys, WV 26170  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-55  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please don't destroy Assateague and Chincoteague Islands as we know them. The changes you are proposing will be very detrimental to this little bit of Heaven on earth. I have been visiting Chincoteague since around 1987 and feel as though it is a second home. There are very few places where one can go and experience the type of atmosphere as on Chincoteague...it is like a page out of a 1940's magazine. Please, I beg you...leave it alone. Leave the waters alone and leave the people alone. Thank you.



# **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

## **Correspondence: 56**

### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-56  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### **Correspondence Text**

Please do all you can to preserve all life on Assateague AND the unique community of Chincoteague. Family traditions, history and culture are as important to preserve as the wildlife. Please help us maintain balance here on the Eastern Shore.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 57

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Lincolnton , NC 28092  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-57  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please do not make changes to the Assateague Island and Chincoteague Island area that do not protect the area. Assateague barrier island needs to be preserved, do that it can protect Chincoteague Island from the ocean. The duck blinds and hunting shacks all add to the wonderful appearance of the area, along with preserving the history of the area. Please don't do anything that doesn't help preserve the area.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 58

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William Taylor  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Accomac, VA 23301  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-58  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I don't think you should close and/or restrict areas of water around Assateague, or remove the historic oyster watch houses or the duck hunting blinds.

I think you should protect the beach on the southern end of Assateague so that will help protect Chincoteague.

I live in Accomac but I travel to Chincoteague and Assateague at least one time a week. I visit the shops, stores, restaurants and the beach. I also love being able to take a boat ride all around Chincoteague and Assateague.

Don't take these thing away from us.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 59

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Falls Church, VA 22044  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-59  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I've visited Chincoteague and Assateague only a handful of times, but from the second I arrived for the first time I fell in love. The National Park Service was created to conserve the area, the wildlife, the history and the future of the land and in completing your plan that you have laid out for the future of Assateague, and in turn Chincoteague, you do not uphold what you were create to do.

Removing historic oyster houses and duck blinds would remove the history of the islands; I've taken many tours when I have visited and the people who run the tours and live year round there can tell us exactly who has run those oyster houses and for how long. Removing access to certain areas and activities would hinder the way of life in Chincoteague; everything there relies on the peak seasons when people come to visit the ponies. Limiting what can be done and where it can be done puts such a strain on the life of everyone who lives and visits there.

Please protect the areas, the wildlife and the history of Assateague to ensure that there is a future for generations after me can enjoy it just as much as I have. Save Assateague to Save Chincoteague!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 60

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Sharon Defibaugh  
Organization: 1956  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
James Creek, PA 16657  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-60  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please save the southern part of the beach in Virginia at Chicoteague. You are making big changes. How about adding preserving the beach to the list.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 61

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: JOANN C. Carmean  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Millsboro, DE 19966  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-61  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

"Save Assateague to Save Chincoteague"

## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 62**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mark N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Accomack, VA "23303  
USA  
E-mail:

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-62  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### **Correspondence Text**

The oyster watch house have been passed down for generations they are part of the area history, the oysters planted help purified the water the watch houses pose no threat to the environment,

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 63

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dan Davis  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-63  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This comment is not the same as P-33 by the same person.

### Correspondence Text

If the plan is to allow the Virginia re recreational beach area to erode away. Maybe now would be a good time for the USACE and VMRC to work together with NPS and FWR, to lessen the coastal impacts to chincoteague. If we start a rock breakwater, along the current beach, then once that sand washes away, we will have a parrell stone groyne that's should break the ocean waves before the hit chincoteague.

Our economy is important, but our land and lives are worth more.



## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 64**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: April D. Conner  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Brockway, PA 15824  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-64  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### **Correspondence Text**

Please save Assateague to save Chincoteague. It is like a slice of Heaven there. Thank you!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 65

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
cochranville, PA 19330  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-65  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As a long time visitor to the area, I have seen many changes. some good and others not good. The practice of allowing the rollover of the beaches to erode the protection of Chincoteague and the loss of shore line is wrong. Dunes offer more protection from the ocean. Moving the beach is costly in money and loss of trees which hold the sand in place. Why take trees down while the pine bark beetle is destroying other parts of the forest. One only has to look at nearby resorts to see the benefits of sand replenishment and dunes protecting the shore line. Limiting the waterways would destroy jobs for many people. NPS should let the states control this as they have in the past.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 66

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Thelma Duston  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-66  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please understand that by allowing the southern side (the hook) of Assateague island go, you will be greatly endangering the southern side of Chincoteague island. Chincoteague desperately needs it's God given barrier to protect it from the excessive flooding and the brunt of any storms. Also, I don't quite understand why the government is choosing to focus on changing "rules" in the surrounding water ways. These water ways are restricted already and allow for things like tourist boat tours (which in no way harm the wildlife and further promote what you do there.) There are other industries which again do not harm the wildlife that you want to take away such as the horse shoe crab industry. The horse shoe crabs are caught, limited amounts of blood is extracted (for cancer research) and they are released! This is a valuable industry that allows our wildlife to help us find a cure for one of the most deadly diseases in our lifetime. The aquaculture and fishing is also vital to maintain homeostasis in our environment. Please reconsider this draft. It will do so much harm rather than good.

## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 67**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Mechanicsville , MD 20659  
USA  
E-mail:

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-67  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### **Correspondence Text**

This plan hurts the people of Chincoteague, and could adversely affect Assateague. More time is needed for a more in depth study. Nothing should be changed until all avenues have been studied. This is NOT the best solution.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 68

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Joel L. Bussard  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Greencastle , PA 17225  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-68  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Save Assateague, and save Chincoteague

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 69

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jennifer A. Holland  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Erie, PA 16506  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-69  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My family has been coming to Chincoteague and Assateague for years as our summer get-away. Chincoteague is one of the friendliest and peaceful places that I've been. It is my happy place as a well as my retirement dream. But without Assateague there will eventually be no Chincoteague. Assateague is probably the most serene place I can think of. The beaches are pristine, the ponies well managed, as well as all other wildlife. If you allow Assateague and all of its history and beauty to just disappear...National Seashore, remember?...then Chincoteague and it's way of life and people too. It would be a true shame to let that happen.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 70

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Linda J. Kantjas  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Middletown, NY 10941  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-70 and P-71  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This is the same as P-71. The person commented in P-71 that there is a typo in the email entered in P-70.

### Correspondence Text

I travel to Chincoteague about 6 times a year. I photograph and paint the ponies and have several publications there by Schiffer Publishing. The thought of closing off the waterways so the pontoon boats and others no longer have viewing access to much of Assateague is horrible! To close down the oyster industry and to affect the tour boat business is to take away the culture and livelihood of Chincoteague families. Restricting access for people will also affect the tourist industry which will effect the entire town!!! I love everything about Assateague and will be first in line to want the area to be protected. BUT the island belongs to ALL of us and not just the government who manages it. To restrict access to people like myself and destroy the livelihood of some in Chincoteague would be sad and destructive emotionally to so many of us who live in or come to visit. People matter too!

## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 71**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Linda kantjas  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Middletown, NY 10941  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-70 and P-71  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This is the same comment as P-70. The person is correcting her email address.

#### **Correspondence Text**

I just sent in my comment but see that my email address was wrong. Corrected one is here



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 72

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dean M. Warrenfeltz  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Martinsburg, WV 25403  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-72  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Steps need to be taken to save southern Assateague Island and preserve the way of life on Chincoteague. My family and I have enjoyed visiting Chincoteague regularly for over 30 years. We own property in Chincoteague that we use, along with family and friends, as a vacation home.

Please SAVE ASSATEAGUE TO SAVE CHINCOTEAGUE.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 73

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Pamela S. Foley  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Port Carbon, PA 17965  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-73  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

With all the attention to saving the waterways, oyster beds, and returning Assateague to a state it has not seen for over 400 years since settlers first came, what are you doing to save Chincoteague & the people who live there? If you do not address the loss of Assateague's beach, you doom Chincoteague. I suggest you might like to return Delaware to the Delaware tribes, end the Delaware beaches, Maryland beaches and generally undo 400 years of history. These waters around Chincoteague and Assateague contribute to Virginia's economy. I find it hard to imagine that the General Assembly will approve this plan. Please save Assateague Island, Virginia, to save Chincoteague, my birthplace and the home of my family for centuries. Please do not destroy for the sake of some natural ideal you have been made to believe is lost.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 74

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Richard G. Russell  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Levittown, PA 19055  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-74  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

save Assateague as a recreational area for everyone. Also the oyster beds and water areas around the island are used for citizens' livelihoods. This plan is ridiculous and Chincoteague economy will be greatly affected.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 75

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Sue Thistle  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23333  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-75  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Shame on you.....sinful.m are you trying to totally destroy these precious gems...Assateague and Chincoteague?

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 76

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kathleen A. Zullo  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Hazleton , PA 18201  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-76  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please consider doing something to save our beaches before the ocean eats them away and then starts eating the island. There will not be anything there to preserve. If it isnt broken dont fix it. All the other things you propose to do in no way are harmful or affect the island. Fix what is wrong..the erosion so then you can preserve the island for the future..

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 77

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Grant Weed  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Flemington, NJ 08822  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-77  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Let me start off by saying I own no real estate and have no financial interest in any of this or either island. However, I have been visiting the island since about 1980 on the Virginia side. In reading through this I keep seeing climate change as the driver to all of this. Climate Change is based on speculation so I'm not sure how that could cause such a drastic change in policy that you are proposing. The questions I have are what's wrong with the current state of island and the location of the beach? Move the birds a mile north. Build up the dunes again that were once there. If they get knocked down build them again. The money you make in entrance fees has to more than cover it. This beach is the most beautiful, soft, clean beach I've ever walked on. It seems to me the problem with the current location is that there isn't a plan to keep replenishing it. You just keep creating the shell parking lots over and over. At some point we gave up on the dunes. It just seems like we are trying to recreate the wheel here. And here is a link to the latest development in climate change.  
<https://www.yahoo.com/news/climate-forecasts-may-flawed-says-study-184006557.html>

I just question the real driver of this. Are you trying to create more revenue? The birds? In my opinion you are ruining one of the natural wonders of our nation. Please leave the beach. You are literally breaking the hearts of my entire family. And I heard talk of a shuttle? Well if you can't drive to the beach that pretty much would destroy Chincoteague Island. So I hope you scrapped that idea. I would love to have a conversation with the person who thought that was a good idea.

Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge is one of a kind. It has a raw natural allure to it. No houses, salt marsh, bike trails and beautiful wildlife. I hope the NPS can understand that certain things cannot be put through a scientific study to decide what's best for it. Sometimes it's best to leave it alone. Storms will come and storms could also not come for the next 10 years. You can't base decisions on that. And I hope the ones making this policy are the ones that actually visit the beach and not the ones sitting in an office. There's nothing like it and if you haven't bring your family in July and stay a week. It's the greatest beach in the US.

Sincerely,

Heartbroken in Flemington

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 78

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Faye D.  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Macclesfield , NC 27852  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-78  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I want you to know that the National Parks and service should leave this Island alone. The people are taking care of this land just fine without your input. You need to leave things alone. People all over this country love this island and expect to see that it stays the same. You should be asking the people what they want ..... not telling them that you are going to change this awesome place to meet what you want. Please leave them alone..... I love going to this little island that has historical features that needs to stay..... I don't understand why you are trying to change this awesome place that loves all the visitors from all over this country..... I am going to make sure that this is shared by many.....



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 79

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Elizabeth A. Wray  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pulaski, VA 24301  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-79  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been coming to Chincoteague Island for over 20 years and now own a place there. The natural beauty and history is what drew me in originally, but since I have gotten to know the people there I am even more involved. I have watched the changes over time, some good, some bad.... But the new proposals will threaten the very lives and future of those people who make their homes and living there. The teaguers have depended on the fishing and hunting on these islands for generations, passing down the skills, knowledge and respect for nature's bounty for generations. They have adjusted and adapted as forces both natural and man made have forced them. Tourism has become a vital part of the island's survival and the attraction of the beautiful beaches and scenery on Assateague along with the Chincoteague ponies are a vital part of all of that. Without access to Assateague beaches and adequate parking this opportunity will be taken from those of us who appreciate and enjoy it. I respect nature and am aware that certain allowances need to be made to preserve the local flora and fauna, but there has to be a way to do that in collaboration with we humans!! The watermen need access to the fishing areas, as well as areas for hunting. Some of the oyster beds have been tended by descendants of original inhabitants before the government was involved.

I ask that you truly listen to these wonderful people and hear what they are saying. Find a way that is beneficial to all involved. Consider the rich history of these lands and preserve that and the way of life here. Do not take away what so many hold dear...

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 80

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Christopher L. King  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Newport News, VA 23601  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-80  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I continue to be disappointed by the Federal Government's approach to managing Assateague in these past few years. There seems to be a high level push to ignore the local community's concerns, these very people whos lives and livelyhood depends upon this island. NPS/FWS should maintain the island as it currently is...no beach movement, no closing of waters, no acquisition of additional lands in the bay, no removal of oyster houses/duck blinds. Listen to the people, not a select few with an agenda.

thank you

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 81

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-81  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The heritage of our island is being lost. Shrewd members of supposed helpful agencies are trying to take many family businesses and decrease the amount of recreational and business opportunities for residents and visitors of our island! Please save our beach at Assateague to Save our island of Chincoteague!

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 82

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Diane Wallace  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Medford, NJ 08055  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-82  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

As a frequent tourist to Chincoteague, I would hate to see more areas closed off to the public. In trying to balance the needs of wildlife and visitors, you need to remember, visitors vote and our tax dollars support your refuges. If you limit our access, you limit our emotional attachment to an area. Then we won't give a crap when your funding gets cut.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 83

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jan N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Newark, DE 19713  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-83  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am very concerned about the proposed limits being outlined in this plan. I although my home is in Delaware I have a vacation home on the mainland off the islands. My family has vacationed there for over 20 years. It truly is one of the most beautiful places you would find. Rich with history, culture, resources, a step back in time, and a tranquility that i find in few other places. The Eastern Shore area is unique and its people are strong and proud.

The proposed limits of waterways is to deny the watermen their livelihood the heritage and legacy they pass from generation to generation. The removal of historical oyster houses, generationally owned duck blinds, and other historical building on Assateague which many have devoted time and resources to preserve as they show the history, culture and beauty of this unique area is quite frankly unacceptable.

Many families, generations whoses forefathers pioneered and weathered the natural elements of a time long ago where survival would have been a hard road, but no the less they endured and preserved, have loved ones buried in the historical cemetery on Assateague, they have a right to be able to continue to honor them. Assateague was a community, it's village well documented and some of the old structures still on Chincoteague after rolling them over the waters, although the horses and the mAny species of birds are the only who call it there homes, it was home to many ancestors of those still called this area home.

The community of Chincoteague has always valued Assateague. All respect its value, implementing policies to to insure the preservation and survival of Assateague. It's natural beauty is always important and will remain important.

Assateague Island VA is the home of the ponies, permitted to graze there, but supported, cared for without compromising their "wld" existence. There are important to the community, vital to the tourist industry which supports the island.

THE EXISTANCE OF ASSATEAGUE IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE SUVIVORAL OF CHINCOTEAGUE

There are valid reports that clearly show that global climate effects and previous studies of this have been substantially flawed. This is a driving factor sited to comply these changes and limits.

Every water based community, island or mainland, accepts the WILL OF THE SEA as a factor that must be accepted and there is little we can do to change the LAWS OF NATURE. As the long timers in this area so vividly remember and know the sea gives and the sea takes, topography of affected by the ebb and flow.

To make such devastating and dramatic changes in this area without the concerns of those impacted and without INPUT AND THE VALUE OF THEIR THOUGHTS, IDEAS AND CONCERNS is not right

Stop these proposal now, involve those who live there, work there and love there. I respect the work you do but do not feel all the necessary consideration and plans have been considered....I for one am unwilling to stand back and allow this to just happen!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 84

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Cindylou McLean  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Lake Worth, FL 33462  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-84  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Save Assateague to Save CHINCOTEAGUE !!! Everyone in my family was born in Chincoteague but me.... but I got to visit as child more than most, cause of all my relatives and Grandmom and I still visit. I have seen Assateague Beach from Chincoteague be built up so many times and then washed away from storms. I would like to know why they can't put jetties to help keep dunes. Why hurt the people who have lived there all their lives and live off the waters to make a real living... Don't take their oyster grounds away and hunting is a way to eat also....

## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 85**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
White Haven , PA 18661  
USA  
E-mail:

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-85  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### **Correspondence Text**

I have been to chincoteague many times in my pretty short life and these people deserve to be protected by the NPS as they have preserved through a lot of hardship to save the wildlife and the community and the economy of this region.



# **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

## **Correspondence: 86**

### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lisa K. Jones  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Parsonsborg, MD 21849  
USA  
E-mail:

### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-86  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### **Correspondence Text**

We need to save away of life. We can not just sit back and watch this island system disappear. There are ways to save this. The money can be raised, I'm sure that fees can be increased and unnecessary jobs can be cut. These islands are many things to many people and it can not just be let to disappear.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 87

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Eileen M. Clark  
Organization: Armstrong  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
West Frove, PA 19390  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-87  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been going to Chincoteague and Assateague Island for over 40 years. I love this little town, it's people, and the natural island wildlife refuge. The magic of this place I feel will be in jeopardy and will no longer be as charming as it is today. More and more people visit Chincoteague because it is a natural wildlife refuge, and visitors enjoy seeing the wild ponies too.

It makes me a little sad to view a lot of the modern hotels along the waterfront, as well as the many commercial buildings that have been built over recent years.



Please don't continue down the path of building big hotels and motels. It will take away the charm of the entire island for the sake of making more revenues.

I'm not in favor of the big plans for changing Chincoteague and Assateague Island.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 88

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Janice M. Foster  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:   
Anita, PA 15711  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-88  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

We are a home owner on the island and am concerned about the erosion that has been happening on the island.  
We are not only concerned about our property but the impact this will make on the island. We are seeing less and less natural habitat over the last 5 years and your plan will not encourage wildlife Please think about the residents of this wonderful  
Jewel that we call our summer home and protect the heritage of the island

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 89

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Cara L. Cole  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Ridgely , MD 21660  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-89  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The future of the island of Chincoteague and it's residents would be seriously put in jeopardy if this plan goes forward. My family has owned property on this island for several decades. The blood sweat and tears that have been devoted to purchasing and maintaining that property or any other property on the island should not have been in vain. Doing nothing to the hook of Assateague and simply letting it erode away would be irresponsible and a very callous decision. Restricting waterways and destroying parts of history are also not acceptable means of change. Tourism is a vital part of the economy in the area and your actions would destroy that on the island. Please make necessary changes to this proposal to bring more balance with residents, tourism and the environment.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 90

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Richard P. Bondi  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Venetia, PA 15367  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-90  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please don't go ahead as planned. The plan as it stands will ruin generations of history, jeopardize the City of Chincoteague, ruin livelihoods. There has to be a middle ground. Not saving Assateague will jeopardize Chincoteague and other areas inland.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 91

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Cynthia Elmore  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Georgetown , DE 19947  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-91  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I hope to see the selection of Alternative #1 keeping Assateague as it is now and fully available to the public. This should be treated as a national treasure and I as a tax payer would love to continue to enjoy time there. Also I believe the protection of Assateague Island as a Barrier Island protects Chincoteague Island and the residents there. I will look to see information posted involving this process and hope to be able to attend the hearings.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 92

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Christopher Yocum  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pittsburgh, PA 15234  
USA  
E-mail:

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-92  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:


#### Correspondence Text

We haul our boat 400 miles every year from PGH PA to Chincoteague for a week, just to fish the surrounding water ways. That's how much we love it. Leave the Assateague water ways alone and focus on saving the beach. We and a lot of people just like us SPEND a LOT of money there supporting the local economy every year and really don't want to find a new place to fish once you ruin it.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 93

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Morgan P. Ross  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:   
Chincoteague , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-93  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

No to plans 3 & 4! Keep the waterways open!



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 94

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Linda L. Reece  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
odenton, MD 21113  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-94  
Date Sent: 04/08/2016 Date Received: 04/08/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Without some advantage to Assateague I'm unclear why this beautiful barrier island strip should just wash out to sea which is what will happen. My family has been visiting this area for over 40 years. I find it totally absurd that NOS needs or want a to change these islands.

Please reconsider the following:

Jobs  
Quality of Life  
Taxpayers vacations  
Economy that will just become another depressed area

I urge you to reconsider.

Respectively  
Linda L Reece

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 95

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Linda Wolfe  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Mount Airy, MD 21771  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-95  
Date Sent: 04/09/2016 Date Received: 04/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am opposed to the proposal of:  
closing areas of water surrounding Assateague that have always been open to the public;  
the loss of the southern beach (moving it north with restricted/limited parking;  
the removal of oyster watch houses; and  
the removal of duck hunting blinds.

I feel these proposals are ridiculous. Again, another act of too much Government! The people of Chincoteague Island and others depend their liveihoods on these waters surronding Assateague.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 96

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: A Scully  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague Island , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-96  
Date Sent: 04/09/2016 Date Received: 04/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

What about preserving the southern end of Assateague to keep it as a barrier island to protect Chincoteague Island?? Why are you limiting access to water around Assateague, removing duck blinds and taking down historic houses? How does this do anything to preserve/improve the park?? As the old adage states, "If it isn't broke, don't fix it!" People flock to our park because of the easy access to the beautiful beach - why not invest in saving what has worked for decades???

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 97

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Tiffany Nash  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21801  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-97  
Date Sent: 04/09/2016 Date Received: 04/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please protect Assateague Island and control its erosion. This beautiful island is crucial to protection of Chincoteague Island, VA. It is also an important economic driver for Chincoteague and the Delmarva Peninsula. Assateague Island contains a significant ecosystem for native and migrating species. We need federal help to protect Assateague and prevent it from eroding away.

Please do not close waters around Assateague. We need the public to use and enjoy the waters so we can all learn about and preserve its significant ecosystem.

# **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

## **Correspondence: 98**

### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Angelique I. Kinney  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
[REDACTED]  
Chincoteague , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-98  
Date Sent: 04/09/2016 Date Received: 04/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### **Correspondence Text**

SAVE ASSATEAGUE TO SAVE CHINCOTEAGUE!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 99

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kenneth B. Lewis  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Cockeysville, MD 21030  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-99  
Date Sent: 04/09/2016 Date Received: 04/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I support Alternative 4 of the Draft GMP that calls for natural island evolution and a primitive island experience.

I support discontinuing horseshoe crab harvesting in Chincoteague and Sinepuxent Bays and Tom's cove

I oppose continuing the North End Restoration Project that mitigates the effect of the Ocean City jetty on natural sand transportation southward by pumping offshore sand onto the island.

I oppose the creation of a new beach and parking lot on Assateague Island's southern end north of Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

I strongly recommend that the implementation plan acknowledge the potential impact of climate change on the island as objectives are prioritized and before funding is requested or becomes available

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 100

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Linda Hobbs  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Queen Creek, AZ 85142  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: 100  
Date Sent: 04/09/2016 Date Received: 04/09/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

This is one of my favorite memories with my children, who are in their 50's now, going to the island and the wild pony roundup. Keep the beauty for future generations.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 101

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kyle Krabill  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
stockton, MD 21864  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: 101  
Date Sent: 04/12/2016 Date Received: 04/12/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I wish to voice my opinion on the changes proposed to Assateague. While it is good faith to update the 34 year old plan to include sea level rise I worry that options 2 3 and

4 may go too far with government control. First options 2, 3 and 4 will each cost much more to implement than maintaining the current plan. In these options I see a few

standout points with which I do not agree.

Reduction of camping / rv's - Assateague camping has long been a past time. We should not reduce camping opportunities for our future generations.

"Most hunting, fishing, and recreational shellfishing would continue in accordance with state and federal laws" - the term "most" is quite a blanket and should be defined.

It seems option 2,3 and 4 want to push the public toward using shuttles in the future to access the seashore, I am sure we all prefer not to use a shuttle.

All the oyster watch houses will have to follow modern sewage rules. These houses of history to which there are only a few left do not impact the environment enough to

warrant these forced laws. Some have been standing for upward of 80 years they do not pose a threat to the seashore. I feel that the NPS wants them all removed without concern

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



for the history of these houses. I do not see any talked about in the cultural resource management section though many of them are the source of great history stories.

Lastly banning horseshoe crab harvest will directly put people out of a job. Horseshoe crabs are quite protected in many other coastal areas and the permit holder who fishes

for these locally has built a livelihood doing so. The public will not see any benefit to stopping a horseshoe crab harvest in the area.

Thank you for hearing my comments, I would voice my option on choosing option 1 for the new plan.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 102

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Greenbackville, VA 23356  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: 102  
Date Sent: 04/12/2016 Date Received: 04/12/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I wish to voice my opinion on the changes proposed to Assateague. While it is good faith to update the 34 year old plan to include sea level rise I worry that options 2, 3 and 4 may go too far with government control. First options 2, 3 and 4 will each cost much more to implement than maintaining the current plan. In these options I see a few standout points with which I do not agree.

Reduction of camping / rv's - Assateague camping has long been a past time. We should not reduce camping opportunities for our future generations.

"Most hunting, fishing, and recreational shellfishing would continue in accordance with state and federal laws" - the term "most" is quite a blanket and should be defined.

It seems option 2,3 and 4 want to push the public toward using shuttles in the future to access the seashore, I am sure we all prefer not to use a shuttle.

All the oyster watch houses will have to follow modern sewage rules. These houses of history to which there are only a few left do not impact the environment enough to

warrant these forced laws. Some have been standing for upward of 80 years they do not pose a threat to the seashore. I feel that the NPS wants them all removed without concern for the history of these houses. I do not see any talked about in the cultural resource management section though many of them are the source of great history stories.

Lastly banning horseshoe crab harvest will directly put people out of a job. Horseshoe crabs are quite protected in many other coastal areas and the permit holder who fishes for these locally has built a livelihood doing so. The public will not see any benefit to stopping a horseshoe crab harvest in the area.

Thank you for hearing my comments, I would like to voice my opinion on choosing option 1 for the new plan.

Plan 1 ensures people still have a fighting chance at the life styles we have been living. With better education and public involvement I know we can eventually come up with a plan that does not involve a gov't take over of our beaches, as well as cutting jobs and costing so much money. PLEASE hear me loud and clear when I say for SO many reasons we MUST CHOOSE OPTION 1!!

Thanks again.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 103

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
WARFORDSBURG, PA 17267  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-103  
Date Sent: 04/12/2016 Date Received: 04/12/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I wish to voice my opinion on the changes proposed to Assateague. While it is good faith to update the 34 year old plan to include sea level rise I worry that options 2, 3 and 4 may go too far with government control. First options 2, 3 and 4 will each cost much more to implement than maintaining the current plan. In these options I see a few standout points with which I do not agree.

Reduction of camping / rv's - Assateague camping has long been a past time. We should not reduce camping opportunities for our future generations.

"Most hunting, fishing, and recreational shellfishing would continue in accordance with state and federal laws" - the term "most" is quite a blanket and should be defined.

It seems option 2,3 and 4 want to push the public toward using shuttles in the future to access the seashore, I am sure we all prefer not to use a shuttle.

All the oyster watch houses will have to follow modern sewage rules. These houses of history to which there are only a few left do not impact the environment enough to

warrant these forced laws. Some have been standing for upward of 80 years they do not pose a threat to the seashore. I feel that the NPS wants them all removed without concern for the history of these houses. I do not see any talked about in the cultural resource management section though many of them are the source of great history stories.

Lastly banning horseshoe crab harvest will directly put people out of a job. Horseshoe crabs are quite protected in many other coastal areas and the permit holder who fishes for these locally has built a livelihood doing so. The public will not see any benefit to stopping a horseshoe crab harvest in the area.

Thank you for hearing my comments, I would like to voice my opinion on choosing option 1 for the new plan.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 104

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Paulette G. Hammond  
Organization: Maryland Conservation Council, Inc.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 401 Westshire Road  
Baltimore, MD 21229-2237  
USA  
E-mail: phamm001@earthlink.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-104  
Date Sent: 04/12/2016 Date Received: 04/12/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The Maryland Conservation Council, Inc. submits these comments for the record on the Assateague Island National Seashore Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

The Maryland Conservation Council, Inc. is a nonprofit environmental organization incorporated in 1969 for the purpose of preserving, protecting and appreciating Maryland's natural biological diversity and insuring the wise use of its natural resources.

The Maryland Conservation Council, Inc. supports Alternative No. 4 of the Draft GMP, which calls for natural island evolution and a primitive island experience.

We do not support the continuation of the North End Restoration project that mitigates the Ocean City jetty's adverse effect on natural sand transportation southward by pumping new sand onto the island from an offshore deposit.

We also do not support the creation of a new beach and parking on Assateague Island's south end north of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

We believe the implementation plan should prioritize the objectives and recognize that climate change will impose many changes to the island before funding is requested or becomes available

We support immediate discontinuation of horseshoe crab taking for any reason in Chincoteague and Sinepuxent Bays and Tom's Cove

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Paulette Hammond  
President  
Maryland Conservation Council

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 105

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Charles R. Yaukey  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chambersburg, PA 17202  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-105  
Date Sent: 04/13/2016 Date Received: 04/13/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

I wish to voice my opinion on the changes proposed to Assateague.

While it is good faith to update the 34 year old plan to include sea level rise I worry that options 2, 3 and 4 may go too far with government control. First options 2, 3 and 4 will each cost much more to implement than maintaining the current plan. In these options I see a few standout points with which I do not agree.

Reduction of camping / rv's - Assateague camping has long been a past time. We should not reduce camping opportunities for our future generations.

"Most hunting, fishing, and recreational shellfishing would continue in accordance with state and federal laws" - the term "most" is a blanket statement and should be more clearly defined.

I feel the taxpayer's money is not being spent in a productive manner with options 2,3 and 4. Nearly one billion dollars has already been spent on the Piping Plover study. A bird that is already known to not propagate their best in a seaside environment but instead prefer the salt marsh or bayside environments. While one billion dollars is being spent on a study, the protected predator population is allowed to decimate the nesting birds at will. In my opinion, continued poor management of the wildlife on Assateague Island is more detrimental than a population of people trying to utilize the beachfront in a civilized manner for recreational activities. The one billion dollars could have and should have been spent more wisely.

It seems option 2,3 and 4 want to push the public toward using shuttles in the future to access the seashore, I am sure we all prefer not to use a shuttle. Again, shuttles are more taxpayer money being wasted. Forgive me, but I am not reading the entire document. Has anyone considered the upkeep and replacement costs on these shuttles?

All the oyster watch houses will have to follow modern sewage rules. These houses of history to which there are only a few left do not impact the environment enough to warrant these forced laws. Some have been standing for upward of 80 years they do not pose a threat to the seashore. I feel that the NPS wants them all removed without concern for the history of these houses. I do not see any talked about in the cultural resource management section though many of them are the source of great history stories.

Lastly banning horseshoe crab harvest will directly put people out of a job. Horseshoe crabs are quite protected in many other coastal areas and the permit holder who fishes for these locally has built a livelihood doing so. The public will not see any benefit to stopping a horseshoe crab harvest in the area. Once again, this will only continue the poor wildlife management.

Thank you for hearing my comments, I would like to voice my opinion on choosing option 1 for the new plan.

Charles R. Yaukey & Family

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 106

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: john j. abbott  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
pocomoke city, MD 21851  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-106  
Date Sent: 04/13/2016 Date Received: 04/13/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I Believe things should be left the way they are.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 107

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carroll D. Mauzy  
Organization: 1981  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Snow hill, MD 21863  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-107  
Date Sent: 04/13/2016 Date Received: 04/13/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

Option 1 the other options are just ridiculous an going to limit us more of the freedom we have left. The other options are going to cost more money to enforce and really no gain. The national seashore is for everybody to enjoy as they want to.



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 108

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Floyd Morton  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Georgetown, DE 19947  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-108 and E-8  
Date Sent: 04/13/2016 Date Received: 04/13/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern,

I am commenting on the 2016 GMP for Assateague Island Md.

For generations families, businesses and the local economy has depended on Assateague Island to be there for them. Campers, OSV beach goers, fishermen, wildlife photographers, shell hunter, honeymooners, hikers and many more hobby groups use this Island for an escape from the daily riggers of every day life. This Island must remain open to all of these user groups and I just named a few.

I am a fisherman, but also a conservationist and a preservationist. I understand the importance of protecting our Wildlife, but at what expense? The Outer Banks just went through a change to the beach access and it has DEVISTATED the economy. There are businesses closing, homes in foreclosure and tourism is down 60%. would hate to see that happen here in Maryland. I am hoping that the NPS and the public can come to an mutual agreement on how Assateague Island can be managed that is fair to everyone and help the local economy grow.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

The four alternatives that were offered to the public in the GMP seemed to be one sided with a lot of "could be's" , "maybe's" and "if the appropriate funds are available". The OSV access was not guaranteed in any of the alternatives. I would like to see the OSV access a guarantee not only for the future generation of fishermen/women, but for the local economy, not to mention the revenue for the NPS.

My vote will be for Alternative #3 with the following considerations.

- 1) I am totally opposed to the idea of a "wilderness designation". Reasons for that is because the Island is in a constant state of change as the Island "rolls over itself". With Climate Change (Global Warming) and Sea Level Rise eventually there will be no beach access for OSV's once the ocean level has reached the "wilderness designation". There is no consideration for the OSV access with Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming).
- 2) If a "wilderness designation" is created, there must be some consideration for the future of OSV access for generations to come. As the Island "rolls over itself", the carsonite markers must move West as well. If there is a "wilderness designation" created it should be located 300 yards West of the current position of the carsonite markers to account for Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming) to guarantee OSV access. The carsonite markers must be relocated West every year for maximum OSV access.
- 3) The bridge that connects Assateague Island to the mainland needs to remain in the sole custody of the state of Maryland without a cooperative agreement with the NPS.
- 4) The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to " OSV will continue until there is irreversible natural causes and OSV driving becomes unsafe"
- 5) The GMP states a "passenger ferry" is to be used to in the future for transportation to the island from the mainland. The wording needs to be changed to or add the wording "vehicle passenger ferry".

Thank you for allowing the public to comment,

Floyd Morton III

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 109

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague , VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-109  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am opposed to moving the beach to the northern end of Assateague. It is important to to the community of Chincoteague that the current area be built up with dune and vegation. In the future it is going to be important for Chincoteague to have protection from the ocean. Also, I am opposed to the plan that will cause the watermen's livelihood to be in danger through Tom's cove. It sounds to me like it is a pick and choose what we protect on Assateague. If the pine trees have beetles, they are all cut down to save trees that do not have beetle and to stop the spread of the beetles. The beetles are nature taking it course, but are trying to stopped. Another example, if a Piping Clover is nesting the area is marked off to protect the bird. I understand they are endanger and happy to help protect them, but again, nature is not allowed to take its course. Hunters are allowed a period of time to help controlthe deer population, something else that is not allowing nature to take it course. So , why are we not helping to protect the beach and build it back up with sand dunes and dune grass to help with erosion. I am afraid if we let "nature takes it course" that in the future Chincoteague is going to be faced with oceanfront. It is important now that we start protecting the islands. As a resident of Chincoteague we are already experiencing effects during storms. Please stop and reconsider building up the dunes and helping protect the people of the island.

Also, only 30 letters received. What about all of the years past we have wrote letters, comments, and contacted of VA representatives to help with this issue! I am sure there are more than 30 when looking back on all of the years this upsetting process has taken!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 110

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-110  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The Assateague Island National Seashore has been a part of my life since my earliest memories as a child. I remember driving with my parents down the "back road" on the island and picking which dune crossing we wanted to take that particular day so that we were able to enjoy the natural beach, without having the hustle and bustle of Ocean City.

One of the great benefits of Assateague as it sits today is it's natural size and beauty. It's nice to be able to spread out and be able to enjoy the island for what it is in the ORV section without someone being right on top of you. This is one of the major advantages / reasons why my parents growing up, and now my current wife and children choose the Assateague ORV section over the Delaware beaches as well as the state park of Assateague.

I support option three of the current proposal at this time. I feel that this option works best for the island as well as for the local economy as Assateague as a whole is a major economic stimulus for the area.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 111

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Gary Savage  
Organization: AMSA  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-111 and E-9  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern,

I am commenting on the 2016 GMP for Assateague Island Md.

For generations families, businesses and the local economy has depended on Assateague Island to be there for them.

Campers, OSV beach goers, fishermen, wildlife photographers, shell hunter, honeymooners, hikers and many more hobby groups use this Island for an escape from the daily riggers of every day life. This Island must remain open to all of these user groups and I just named a few.

I am a fisherman, but also a conservationist and a preservationist. I understand the importance of protecting our Wildlife, but at what expense? The Outer Banks just went through a change to the beach access and it has DEVISTATED the economy. There are businesses closing, homes in foreclosure and tourism is down 60%. would hate to see that happen here in Maryland. I am hoping that the NPS and the public can come to an mutual agreement on how Assateague Island can be managed that is fair to everyone and help the local economy grow.

The four alternatives that were offered to the public in the GMP seemed to be one sided with a lot of "could be's" , "maybe's" and "if the appropriate funds are available". The OSV access was not guaranteed in any of the alternatives. I would like to see the OSV access a guarantee not only for the future generation of fishermen/women, but for the local economy, not to mention the revenue for the NPS.

My vote will be for Alternative #3 with the following considerations.

1) I am totally opposed to the idea of a "wilderness designation". Reasons for that is because the Island is in a constant state of change as the Island "rolls over itself". With Climate Change (Global Warming) and Sea Level Rise eventually there will be no beach access for OSV's once the ocean level has reached the "wilderness designation". There is no consideration for the OSV access with Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming).

2) If a "wilderness designation" is created, there must be some consideration for the future of OSV access for generations to come. As the Island "rolls over itself", the carsonite markers must move West as well. If there is a "wilderness designation" created it should be located 300 yards West of the current position of the carsonite markers to account for Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming) to guarantee OSV access. The carsonite markers must be relocated West every year for maximum OSV access.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

3) The bridge that connects Assateague Island to the mainland needs to remain in the sole custody of the state of Maryland without a cooperative agreement with the NPS.

4) The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to " OSV will continue until there is irreversible natural causes and OSV driving becomes unsafe"

5) The GMP states a "passenger ferry" is to be used in the future for transportation to the island from the mainland. The wording needs to be changed to or add the wording "vehicle passenger ferry".

Thank you for allowing the public to comment,

Gary Savage

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 112

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jess P. Whittemore  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Horntown, MD 23395  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-112  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I bought my place here in Horntown VA. for the explicit purpose of being able to access the Beach at Chincoteague / Assateague as an OSV surf fisherman. The threat of having the rules change so I will have less ability to access the Beach in this way is a devastating thought!!! I'm now wondering why I invested in the area. Please stop screwing with a perfectly good system.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 113

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Henry L. Busby  
Organization: Delaware Mobil surf  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Coatesville , PA 19320  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-113  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

As a surf fishermen I spend a lot of time and money in the sport that I love to do, seeing all these reports up and down the coast where we are loosing our small areas for OSV. I would hope that things could be worked out for everyone to enjoy our god giving coast. The OSV bring in a lot of money for the parks and surrounding business, we already have to give up some of our drive on areas for the bird nesting times. I know politics play's a big part of how things are decided on, but please consider the OSV in you final decision.

Thank you  
DMS1473



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 114

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Peggy Fellows  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague Island, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-114  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

There are many issues within this proposal that would be detrimental to the people of Chincoteague. The hook end area must be preserved. The deterioration that has already happened has lead to more flooding on the south end of the island than ever. The currents beach has shrunk from storms and the lack of sand dunes. Dredging must occur with sand replacement to sustain the beach. There have already been 3 cut through so. They self heal but leave Assateague more vulnerable to flooding in the future. Salt water has mixed in with the fresh water that is there leading to much loss of greenery. Chincoteague has a beautiful way of life that needs to be sustained. That depends on tourist dollars. I believe moving the beach would be a decision that will affect tourist dollars need to sustain the town. I pray you make wise decisions that preserve our way of life and the joy so many people get from visiting.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 115

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Matthew L. Wilkins  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Willards, MD 21874  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-115  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I've had time to consider the Draft GMP proposal and have come to conclusion that I support Alternative 3. This proposal seems to be the most balanced of the 4 alternatives and provides for human to still interact with Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS).

However, I still have concerns about Alternative 3 in the following areas:

- Since climate change is mentioned many times during this document and the island is rolling over on itself as it moves westward, as natural barrier islands do, in the OSV section of the beach the carsonite markers that mark where people should drive and not drive need to be considered. As less beach become available due to this natural coastal process and more island is created westward, these markers should be moved westward as well to maintain multiple lanes for vehicles as well as 200' feet of beach that safely away from the vehicle traffic.
- The proposal for the National Park Service to purchase the bridge enter Assateague Island should be removed. The state of Maryland will never sell a bridge nor gift it to the National Park.
- I support the need for mainland parking then pedestrian shuttles to get people into the park. Parking is a huge problem on the island and many holiday weekends, vehicles are lined up down bayberry drive, causing traffic backups and a hazard to those pedestrians walking on the bayberry drive.
- The mention of a ferry service being installed is mentioned, however is very unclear if it is just a passenger ferry or vehicle ferry. It should spell out that this ferry will be for both pedestrians and vehicles.
- The "Wilderness Area" should be removed from the GMP, as it is impractical to try to manage a wilderness area on Assateague Island. Nature is the best part of AINS and the human to animal interaction is very common to see on the island. Most animals on the island do not fear humans as I've witnessed time and time again, with ponies, deer, and yes even piping plovers.
- Vehicle access around piping plovers closures need to be considered. These closures never became a issue until the back road was closed back in the 1990's. The closures happened, but people had ways to get around the closures, so there were never a issue. Since the closure seems to happen in the same general areas each year, access around those area westward of the carsonite markers, this will allow the buffer area for the plovers and for people to travel southward past the closure.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

- Wording around "OSV access will continue until conditions change", should be changed to until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV area.

As a regular user of AINS I want to see it around for many years to come, so that my kids can enjoy the many memories I've had growing up on Assateague Island.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 116

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Amy Settle  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Atlantic, VA 23303  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-116  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Keep the beach the same

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 117

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Irene Lyter  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-117  
Date Sent: 04/15/2016 Date Received: 04/15/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I vote for Alternative #3 with a few exceptions :

- 1) I believe the carsonite marker, in the OSV Zone, should be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving areas.
- 2) Abandon the "Wilderness Area".
- 3) I oppose the idea of a state owned bridge.

## **PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**

### **Correspondence: 118**

#### **Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
MILTON, DE 19968  
USA  
E-mail:

#### **Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-118  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### **Correspondence Text**

Please take time to rethink this plan. We have been traveling to Assateague for many years and would love to continue to do so with our next generation. Maintain vehicle access. And keep Assateague Island as it is for ALL to enjoy.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 119

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael J. Oesterling  
Organization: Shellfish Growers of Virginia  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: P.O. Box 1394  
Gloucester, VA 23061  
USA  
E-mail: mikeo@vashellfish.org

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-119 and H-11  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 18, 2016

Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

[Note: this is a hard copy of a comment which was submitted electronically on April 18, 2016.]

The Shellfish Growers of Virginia (SGV) is a trade association composed of oyster and clam farmers located within Virginia waters. SGV members are proud of our contributions of almost \$50-million to the economy of the Commonwealth, but are equally proud of our environmental benefits as well. We welcome the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP) for the Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS), which also includes the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CNWR). Our comments, however, will only address how commercial shellfish aquaculture will be managed within the AINS/CNWR.

SGV opposes any Alternative Plan (2, 3, or 4) that requires the issuance of a Special Use Permit to the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) for the continued management of shellfishing within the AINS.

The Virginia Marine Resources Commission has successfully managed the leasing of Commonwealth bottoms for over 100-years. Even after the establishment of the AINS/CNWR, VMRC continued to have unrestricted oversight of the leased areas within the Virginia portion of the AINS boundaries. All alternatives presented within the GMP still provide for VMRC management for shellfishing within the AINS. Alternative 1 provides for the status quo of the current management system; Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, would require the issuance of a Special Use Permit to VMRC, in order for VMRC to continue what

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

it already has been doing successfully under the existing conditions (Alternative 1). We see no need to change a system of shellfish management which does not depend on upland access and will not change due to climate change. We support the continuance of the current practice, with VMRC in total control of leasing and shellfish management within the AINS, without the need for the issuance of a Special Use Permit.

The GMP acknowledges the sovereign rights of the Commonwealth of Virginia to manage shellfishing within the boundaries of the AINS. It further recognizes the long history of private leasing of public bottom for the purpose of shellfish culture within the Virginia portion of the AINS. These activities began long before the establishment of either the CNWR or the AINS. The GMP also identifies the positive economic and environmental benefits that shellfish culture contributes to the region. Overall, shellfish aquaculture must be considered a "beneficial impact" by its presence, due to the increased economic input to the region (without National Park Service contributions) and the positive environmental impacts imparted by the filter-feeding nature of cultured molluscs. To generate these positive economic/environmental impacts, shellfish culture does not rely on AINS visitors and thus does not contribute to the problems associated with vehicular traffic.

The GMP targets the issues surrounding climate change and how this could alter visitor "experiences" in the AINS. Much detail is focused on vehicular traffic, potential congestion issues and educational opportunities. These are very valid issues. We understand the need to be prepared for upland changes resulting from climate change. Having contingency plans to address visitor access, experiences and educational opportunities is prudent. However, we suggest that the current practice relative to shellfish management be included within whichever Alternative management plan is deemed most appropriate to address upland climate change impacts.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on such an important document. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or wish additional information.

Sincerely,  
Michael J. Oesterling, Executive Director

CC: Senator Mark Warner  
Senator Tim Kaine  
Congressman Scott Rigell  
VA Delegate Robert Bloxom  
VA Senator Lynwood Lewis  
VMRC Commissioner John Bull



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 120

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: ROBIN J. HAGEL  
Organization: NONE  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
DELMAR, MD 21875  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-120  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As an avid Assateague OSV beach bum I would like to address the future of the plans for the Island and OSV usage. This island has become our summer home. The other beaches in the area are overcrowded and disrespected. As part of the OSV community on Assateague, we have made it a point to respect our surroundings, and leave only our footprints and tire tracks behind. The island is our sanctuary.

As far as the passenger ferry proposition is concerned, this should be changed and reworded as a public vehicle ferry.

The Verrazano Bridge should remain in control of the State of Maryland to ensure the safety and upkeep of the bridge. And the fee area should remain where it is to keep the island state side and federal side.

There is no need to designate any wild life areas. The wildlife on the island is respected and will come and go with the tide. Again, concerning the OSV part of the beach, these people come for the sanctuary of the natural existence of the island and do not impede on the wildlife.

Lastly, the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. Not to be considered, but done.

Again, the future and preservation of the island and our OSV zone is of major concern to those of us that live there all year and especially the warmer weather. Please make all efforts to listen to AMSA and us to not destroy this amazing priviledge.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 121

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Cheriton, VA 23316  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-121  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 11, 2016

Since 1895, the Ballard Fish and Oyster Company has been producing clams and oysters in and around the state waters of Virginia. Today the company is run by the 5th generation of the Ballard family and has over 200 employees on Virginia's Eastern Shore. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan/Environment Impact Statement (GMP) for the Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS), which also includes the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CNWR).

Although the GMP addresses many issues ranging from climate change and sea level rise to the sustainability of traditional facilities and infrastructure, we would most like to comment on the National Park Services (NPS) Marine Resource Management section of the GMP.

We are in agreement with the NPS about the need to protect the unique working marine landscape and way of life and to protect seashore resources. It is important to expand opportunities to research and understand natural resource conditions and the cultural heritage associated with the seashore's marine environment. In addition, we agree that the states of Virginia and Maryland have the right to manage shell fishing within the seashore. Therefore, we do not believe that the NPS needs to issue a special use permit to the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) within the Commonwealth of Virginia to allow for the continued practice of commercial aquaculture. Private leasing of State bottom for the planting and propagation of oysters began around 1875 and has been successfully managed by what is now the VMRC for over 100 years. We believe that a continuation of the current practice of leasing grounds for shellfish aquaculture, without a special use permit in AINS and CNWR by VMRC is appropriate.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft GMP. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Sincerely,

Kim Huskey  
Ballard Fish and Oyster Company

CC: The Honorable Robert Bloxom  
The Honorable Lynwood Lewis  
VMRC Commissioner John Bull  
Nick Barbash, Legislative Assistant, Senator Kaine  
Diane Kaufman, Regional Director for the Eastern Shore, Senator Kaine

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 122

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Sherrie L. Morton  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Georgetown, DE 19947  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-122  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My vote will be for Alternative #3 with the following considerations.

1) I am totally opposed to the idea of a "wilderness designation". Reasons for that is because the Island is in a constant state of change as the Island "rolls over itself". With Climate Change (Global Warming) and Sea Level Rise eventually there will be no beach access for OSV's once the ocean level has reached the "wilderness designation". There is no consideration for the OSV access with Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming).

2) If a "wilderness designation" is created, there must be some consideration for the future of OSV access for generations to come. As the Island "rolls over itself", the carsonite markers must move West as well. If there is a "wilderness designation" created it should be located 300 yards West of the current position of the carsonite markers to account for Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming) to guarantee OSV access. The carsonite markers must be relocated West every year for maximum OSV access.

3) The bridge that connects Assateague Island to the mainland needs to remain in the sole custody of the state of Maryland without a cooperative agreement with the NPS.

4) The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to " OSV will continue until there is

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

irreversible natural causes and OSV driving becomes unsafe"

5) The GMP states a "passenger ferry" is to be used in the future for transportation to the island from the mainland. The wording needs to be changed to or add the wording "vehicle passenger ferry".

Thank you,  
Sherrie L Morton

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 123

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robert Copple  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Brookhaven, PA 19015  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-123  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

You need to keep our access to the beach. If you close access them just think of how much money that will not be spent down there. The surf fishing club do a lot on the beach and also help keep it clean and they monitor the beaches, it is very vital that you keep the beach access open!!!!

Thank you!!!!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 124

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David W. LeCates  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Frankford, DE 19945  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-124  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My vote will be for Alternative #3 with the following considerations.

- 1) I am totally opposed to the idea of a "wilderness designation". Reasons for that is because the Island is in a constant state of change as the Island "rolls over itself". With Climate Change (Global Warming) and Sea Level Rise eventually there will be no beach access for OSV's once the ocean level has reached the "wilderness designation". There is no consideration for the OSV access with Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming).
- 2) If a "wilderness designation" is created, there must be some consideration for the future of OSV access for generations to come. As the Island "rolls over itself", the carsonite markers must move West as well. If there is a "wilderness designation" created it should be located 300 yards West of the current position of the carsonite markers to account for Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming) to guarantee OSV access. The carsonite markers must be relocated West every year for maximum OSV access.
- 3) The bridge that connects Assateague Island to the mainland needs to remain in the sole custody of the state of Maryland without a cooperative agreement with the NPS.
- 4) The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to " OSV will continue until there is irreversible natural causes and OSV driving becomes unsafe"
- 5) The GMP states a "passenger ferry" is to be used in the future for transportation to the island from the mainland. The wording needs to be changed to or add the wording "vehicle passenger ferry".

Thank you for allowing the public to comment,

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 125

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: marcus crowley  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-125  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To NPS GMP/EIS:

I visit Assateague Island NP primary in MD and sometimes VA, as I am local to the area, Berlin MD. I provided comments during the past Draft plan in 2011 and would like those to also be referenced in this comment. I often utilize the ORV, and support continued use for ORV services. My family has grown up visiting AI beautiful and we would hope to continue to in the future.

The current alternative in the Draft GMP/EIS that I support is: Alternative 3 - Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation (NPS Preferred Alternative)

After reading the alternatives, the alternative 3 is the best choice out of the other alternatives, but it is not perfect. Please find the below comments:

- Largest issue or area that I disagree with is the wilderness designation on Assateague Island, which is mentioned often in this Draft GMP. I do not agree nor support any further wilderness designation on Assateague Island.
- I would support further investigation for opening the back road again, to bypass ORV closures due to habitat or temporary over wash issues. Most times we (family and myself) head further south down the ORV (past km 25) as we enjoy the less crowded areas and fishing. Over the last few years this area is closed for the various reasons due to habitat closures and over wash areas, which may cover a small area, and could be bypassed.
- I do not agree nor support of the Federal Government taking control or ownership of the bridge. If the bridge is lost in the future, then any ferry services will also be available for vehicles as well individuals.



Looking forward to the future

Thanks.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 126

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Deborah Lasnier  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague Island, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-126  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My concern, as a disabled senior citizen and resident of Chincoteague Virginia, is being able to park close enough to the beach to be able to enjoy the beautiful view and getting wet in the ocean. My ability to walk is extremely limited.

The current parking is excellent except for lack of 'disabled parking'. That needs to be increased in the current parking lots.

Please consider how important it is for the disabled to be able to get to the beach and enjoy it! Many people love the beach and it gets crowded very quickly in warm summer months....the disabled should be able to enjoy the beach and ocean as well.

Thank you,  
Deborah M. Lasnier  
[REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, Va. 23336

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 127

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Joseph W. Lee  
Organization: PO BOX 382  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Deale, MD 20751  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-127  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This person commented twice (P-9 and P-127). The comments are slightly different.

### Correspondence Text

Please don't take away our access to drive the beach and camp overnight on Assateague Island. I started coming to Assateague Island twenty eight years ago. I understand that wildlife needs to be protected. I just find it hard to believe that we cannot use this wonderful resource while looking out for local flora and fauna.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 128

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carol Mader  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Morristown , NJ 07960  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-128  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

It must be a priority to maintain Assateague & all it has to offer. The value of it's job as a barrier island to Chincoteague can't even begin to be measured. The livelihood of so many wonderful people depend on this. We own property on Chincoteague. We fell in love with Assateague and it's natural, undeveloped seashore. We enjoy the trails and other amenities available. We love the horses and all the activities that surround them. The support for these events proves they are a huge attraction to people of all ages. Ease of access is also critical. I can't imagine a family with children loading up everything they need for a day at the beach and trying to get on a trolley. I'd hate to think what happens when a storm quickly rolls in... The locally owned businesses, which add so much charm to Chincoteague, would surely suffer, close and cause the island to deteriorate. These two islands together are so unique in the experiences they have to offer. There's a reason why generations continue to return year after year. The history must be preserved. There must be a compromise moving forward. Please do whatever it takes to continue to maintain the VA side of Assateague. Most people don't mind if fees need to be raised to help defer the costs. It's well worth it to continue to provide lifelong memories and joyful experiences to so many.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 129

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Karen A. Hoffmeier  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Paradise, PA 17562  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-129  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please reconsider the ramifications your proposed plan will have the on the island of Chincoteague. If the southern end of Assateague is left to wash away, Chincoteague in time will be devastated with Hurricanes and strong storms. This is my home away from home and my retirement home someday. I would like there to be something there when the time comes. The impacts on the fishing industry, tourism will all suffer. Please don't change the beauty and allure that this island(s) has to offer.

Sincerely,  
Karen Hoffmeier

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 130

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Philip Allen  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Middletown, MD 21769  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-130  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello, I have been an annual park entrance pass owner and OSV permit holder for the past 10 years or so. I drive 4 hours each way, several times a year to enjoy AI. I would like to go on record that I support plan 3. I would also like to see all consideration for the wilderness area dropped all together. Making AI or any portion of AI a wilderness area that is off limits to the citizens of this country is not fair. We are the people that pay to use this island in the form of permits, entrance fees and first and foremost, taxes. We should never be denied access. I would also like to see exact wording added to plan 3 to spell out that the OSV boundary markers WILL be moved every year to accommodate island migration.

Thanks for your time, Phil Allen

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 131

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kathryn V. Allen  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Middletown , MD 21769  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-131  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been an annual park entrance pass owner and OSV permit holder for the last 10 years. I live about 4 hours away and drive several times a year to enjoy AI. I would like it noted that I support plan 3. I would also like it to be considered that the wilderness area be dropped. It is not fair to paying citizens to keep AI or any part of AI off limits. We are paying permits, fees and taxes to enjoy AI. We should always be allowed access.

Thank you,  
Kathryn allen

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 132

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dana Estrada  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Wyoming, DE 19934  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-132  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

In reference to the GMP, I agree with AMSA'S point of view, to include the following.

I agree that alternative 3 is the better alternative. However, that being said, AMSA would like to see some consideration for changes within alternative 3.

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". I feel that the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. AMSA strongly opposes a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. AMSA feels very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. AMSA does not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. AMSA's greatest fear is the losing control of the bridge which could mean the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming it impassable.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 133

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Amy S. Dahm  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Great Falls, VA 22066  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-133  
Date Sent: 04/19/2016 Date Received: 04/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I fully support AMSA and would not like to see Assateague Island designated a wilderness area.I would also not like to see the bridge be transferred to the federal government.This is an important resource that AMSA has helped to protect.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 134

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Richard W. Meehan  
Organization: Town of Ocean City  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 301 Baltimore Avenue  
Ocean City, MD 21842  
USA  
E-mail: rmeehan@oceancitymd.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-134 and E-21  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hardcopy sent by email with attached exhibits

Deborah A. Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

RE: Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement  
Federal Register Notice # 2016-02109

Dear Superintendent Darden:

The Town of Ocean City, Maryland supports your effort to adopt a new General Management Plan for Assateague Island National Seashore. As your neighbor to the north, we value the work of the National Park Service to maintain our shared landscape as a resource to the community and to all of our seasonal visitors. We hope that the preferred alternative, if selected, will continue to implement successful current management strategies for the future.

The following comments are provided on the Draft GMP/EIS for the Assateague Island National Seashore:

- 1) Partnerships - Please consider the Town of Ocean City, MD as a local government partner (Sec. 2.6.7), and as a cooperating agency for future studies such as the proposed Breach Management Plan (Sec. 2.4.2).
- 2) Management Zones - The use of zones and subzones to identify management approaches that are unique to a specific area is encouraged. Please consider the addition of a North End Restoration Project subzone that includes the northern 6 miles of Assateague Island in Maryland (Fig. 2.3). (See exhibit 2 - hardcopy)

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

3) USACE - Please clarify whether the North End Restoration Project will continue to be recognized by the preferred alternative, including the federal agency partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

a. Please identify the USACE as a federal agency partner (Sec. 2.6.7)

b. Include both management actions and budget proposals necessary to initiate a renewal of the project with USACE and other partners at least 3 years prior to expiration (by 2025) (Sec. 2.6.7, 2.6.11, Table 2.7)

c. Actions needed to achieve desired future conditions of the North End Restoration Project are missing from Alternative 3/Table 2.7 (page 2-62) and under many of the 'coastal response management actions', add management actions that are specific to the north end of Assateague Island to resolve conflicting management approaches.

d. Coastal Response Management Actions (Sec. 4-17, 4-43, 4-70, 4-95, 4-169) indicate that Alternative 3 seashore management "would allow the island to evolve naturally... (and) would no longer work with the USACE to provide additional sand to mitigate the erosional forces associated with storms and/or sea level rise. No new investment would be made in dune fortification through planting and fencing installation." Please clarify that this does not apply to the North End Restoration Project Area (6 miles from the Ocean City Inlet to Assateague State Park).

4) Ocean City Inlet and Municipal Airport - Please consider and include the Inlet and Airport as critical infrastructure which represents significant federal investment and impact to the 'socio-economic environment' that are directly related to management approaches in the GMP (Sec. 1.9.4, Sec. 3.14 and 4.11).

Thank you for your presentation to the Town of Ocean City and for your contribution to improving the draft General Management Plan.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (410) 289-8931.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Meehan, Mayor

Attachment

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 135

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John J. Bello  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Ashburn, VA 20148  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-135 and H-12  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 17, 2016  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the proposed Assateague General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

Following are my comments on each of the four proposed Alternatives. But first, let me state that I am vehemently opposed to any Wilderness Designation for any part of the park and would like to see all mention of Wilderness removed from the resulting plan.

Alternative 1 - This no action alternative simply leaves too much uncertainty. Maintenance to the park, current structures, and programs would be subject to "available funding." I have no confidence the National Park Service (NPS) would make any funds available.

Under Natural Resource Management, the plan mentions predator control to enhance piping plovers. I do not support any predator control, unless those predators threaten human life and/or safety. Nor do I support removing abandoned roads. On the other hand, I would support reopening the back road in the MD OSV zone. Leave it as a sand road; it does not need to be paved. This road could also provide an alternative route around potential over-wash areas.

The Visitor Experience enhancements replacing deteriorated wayside exhibits, developing an enhanced environmental education program, providing a Kayak education program and modifying facilities for ADA are all good programs and should be pursued. Additionally, I would support each of the initiatives offered under Maryland's Mainland Development Area. As for the Backcountry Area, I am opposed to any Wilderness designation and want all mention of Wilderness removed from the final plan. Moreover, I am opposed to any funds being expended for assessment or studies related in any way to wilderness. In the Sinepuxent and Southern Chincoteague Bay portion, I do want the unauthorized commercial harvest of horseshoe crabs enforced.

Alternative 2 - I support the "Overall Concept" including artificial dune fortification, habitat manipulation, and possible

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

beach nourishment. Additionally, I support the proposed enhancements offered for "Visitor Use and Experience" such as improved visitor amenities including hot showers and utilities at campsites. Under "Response to Storm Damage" I believe NPS should contribute funds to the state of Maryland for the repair of Verrazano Bridge just as NPS provides funds to repair the Virginia Bridge. I could support the acquisition of 10 acres in Maryland, but want to see more detail relative to the planned commercial services.

In the "Natural Resource Zone" I am opposed to the establishment of any Wilderness Area and want all references to any recommended Wilderness area or studies removed from the plan. In this same section I am opposed to any area that is lost to a breach to remaining closed and converting it to a natural resource zone. I understand a breach may make areas not accessible temporarily, but would support changing the language to allowing the area being reopened after the breach fills in naturally.

Alternative 3 NPS Preferred Alternative - In general I support Alternative 3 because I believe it provides the best alternative to keeping the park open. What good is having a National Park if the park is not available for recreation? Again, I object to, and want all two hundred plus references to potential and/or proposed Wilderness Areas removed from the plan. I am opposed to any portion of the park being given this designation. There is no need for it; Assateague Island has not met the requirements for Wilderness designation over the past 30 plus years and does not meet them now. There is no need to study it and I am opposed to any funds being expended to assess it. Accordingly any and all references to Wilderness on Assateague should be abandoned and removed from the plan and/or consideration.

In the Maryland OSV zone, the GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the markers each year." NPS uses the word "consider" far too often. That word is too vague and leaves too much open to interpretation. NPS needs to learn how to use the words "shall" or "will." Accordingly, I support adding the following phrase: "the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone will be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area." Failure to move these markers will, as the island rolls over itself, eventually allow the ocean to reach the carsonite markers leaving no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers. Moreover, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change," should be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island."

I do like the concept of additional access points and potential commercial services. I note however, there is no mention of the potential commercial ferry's carrying vehicles. This subject should be expanded.

As additional information, I am opposed to any NPS efforts being expended to acquire the Verrazano Bridge from the state of Maryland. I do not believe NPS would maintain it, nor do I believe NPS would do anything to protect the bridge in any way. Loss of this bridge would give NPS an excuse to close the park permanently. Contrarily, I would not oppose NPS permanently dedicating funds to "jointly maintaining" the bridge with the State of Maryland. Please note, I said dedicate and did not use the words "if available" as it relates to funds for the Verrazano Bridge.

Alternative 4 Natural Island Evolution and Primitive Island Experience. I find Alternative 4 totally unacceptable. This plan replaces nothing, repairs nothing, and lets all of the existing facilities degrade over time and would eventually cause the Park to close. From my perspective, alternative 4 is nothing more than a surrender and retreat. You might as well close the park. I would not support purchasing any additional land for any NPS activities. Again, I find multiple references to Wilderness Areas and continue my objection to any portion of Assateague Island being declared Wilderness or being studied for Wilderness designation.

In summary, I support the NPS preferred Alternative 3, with my noted objections on Predator Control, moving the carsonite markers, and Wilderness designation. Assateague Island is a beautiful place. Let's keep it that way for future generations to enjoy.

Respectively,

John J. Bello

Ashburn VA, 20148

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 136

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bruce V. Wood  
Organization: AMSA  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Newark, MD 21841  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-136  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am Bruce Wood and wish to share my concerns about your management plan. I have served in the AMSA board room heading up the beach access committee for several years and have served as Vice President for two years. I learned a lot during that time and come to you today with that knowledge but will speak mostly from my individual standpoint.

The Assateague Island National Seashore needs to stay open for all types of recreational use, vehicular included. It needs to remain open for all ALL who want to enjoy our OUR national park for whatever the enjoyment.

The word "consider" that shows up so many times is a concern. If NPS needs to consider any action to be taken, will the action taken in fact be fair to all users involved or will certain groups be satisfied while others shunned? I enjoy fishing right out of the back of my truck and have seen how folks like myself have been put out by an action taken while other interested users are accommodated.

The markers keeping drivers away from the dune area need to move as the island moves. NPS wants the island to move naturally hence not maintaining the dunes. But, if those markers remain where they stand, OSVs will soon have no beach to ride on. What action will NPS be taking to accommodate beach traffic when a certain percentage of the shoreline is at or behind the dune line?

NPS claims they want the island to be natural. We have folks who call themselves "naturalists". Natural... Is it natural when I spend time on Assateague and see SEE the fox with a collar on and then another fox with a collar on and then I visit the island and see that all the fox have disappeared? What all of a sudden happened to the fox? Is there such a thing as an "invasive species"? No, the fox is not natural to the island but then, neither is the pony! Those ponies are a beautiful sight to see and NO they are not native to the island, no more than the fox is. However, I saw the fox leave and I know it loves those little Plover eggs. But the ponies remain even though their hooves take out how many eggs in any given season? So... Natural? Manipulative sounds like a better term.

Bottom line? NPS needs to operate, manage and keep available to ALL our Assateague Island. The top concern for NPS needs to be making sure the people are allowed to use this valuable resource to its fullest in a monitored and regulated manner. So many of us who drive the beach are nothing short of paranoid about the day coming when we cannot access our park by motor vehicle. We pay the fees but the fear is still there. Please keep ALL users in mind when implementing the new GMP. Thank you. Bruce Wood

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 137

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Keith A. Workman  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Glen Allen, VA 23060  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-137  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am in favor of Option 3.



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 138

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bruce D. Lynch  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Frankford, DE 19945  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-138 and E-24  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP, I prefer Alternative 3. I suggest revising the document as follows:

- 1-the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.
  - 2-A wilderness designation should be abandoned.
  - 3-The NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this.
  - 4-the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".
  - 5-Adjust the ferry comment to say a public vehicle ferry instead of passenger ferry.
- My family has enjoyed the Island for many years and my wish is that future generations can too. I believe by choosing Alternative 3 and making the above requested modification to the GMP will be the best way to ensure the Island's future and recreation use going forward. Thanks for your consideration.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 139

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Deborah L. Elliott-Fisk  
Organization: University of California, Davis  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Dept. of Wildlife, Fish & Conservation Biology  
One Shields Ave.  
Davis, CA 95616  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-139  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

20 April 2016

DEBORAH DARDEN  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Superintendent Darden (Debbie):

I am pleased to have had a chance to read the document you have prepared for public review and comment as The Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DGPM/EIS) for Assateague Island National Seashore (ASIS). I have read the entire document (all 646 pages), and I also attended a public meeting at Chincoteague, Virginia on March 31, 2016, led by you and your staff. I have commented throughout the review process. In addition to being a university Professor (now emeritus) who does research on coastal ecosystems, climate change (including sea-level rise), biogeomorphology, and conservation and restoration ecology, I own a home on Chincoteague Island, and I have regularly visited Assateague Island for the last 20 years.

I would like to first state that I am very impressed by the quality and scientific content of the entire DGMP/EIS, as well as the background information on different management actions contained within the document. Your presentation to the public on March 31 at Chincoteague and your response to questions was also excellent. All of the information is very clearly presented and the graphics (maps, photos, etc.) are superb. I have worked with the National Park Service and the Department of Interior all of my academic career, and yours is as high quality of a document and plan as I have ever seen. I would like to congratulate you, your staff, and the regional staff and scientists on creating an all-inclusive planning process and doing a

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

stellar job with it. I fully support your selection of Alternative 3 Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation as the NPS preferred alternative.

I also strongly support further study of the Wilderness Area of Assateague Island National Seashore from Fox Hill south to the Maryland-Virginia state line and beyond to create the best wild area to preserve natural ecological processes with minimal human disturbance. This "wild area" near the state line (on both the Maryland and Virginia sides) is one of the most amazing parts of our North American coastlines that I have visited. It deserves your attention and protection. I do realize that part of what I consider to be a potential wilderness area is actually on the Virginia portion of Assateague Island and not under your NPS jurisdiction. When you start to study this, I encourage you to contact the USFWS and Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge to see if they can participate to designate part of the northernmost section of the refuge (near the state line) as a wilderness area. The USFWS as you know manages many thousands of acres of wilderness across the country, as the NPS does.

As a physical geographer and conservation biologist who studies climate change and sea-level rise impacts on coastal ecosystems (along with their biology and geomorphology), I recognize like you do that global warming and accompanying sea-level rise, with an increase in storm severity, will take its toll on Assateague Island within our lifetimes and over the next 100-300 years. Because of this, and recognizing the very high recreational values that ASIS provides, Alternative 3 is clearly the best choice. As is also true for Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CNWR, as part of their Comprehensive Conservation Plan process), loss of beachside developments, whether parking lots, roads, visitor centers, or other structures, will happen with sea-level rise the next 10 - 30 years (and beyond). As such I support your planning process to develop alternative transportation systems to allow people to experience the beach and other aspects of nature and human cultural history on Assateague Island. I think you address this very well in Alternative 3. I do not support beach nourishment and trying to rebuild beaches and destroyed infrastructure, as the next storm will probably inflict even more damage as sea-level continues to rise. In this regard, your support of an cooperation with Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge in moving the Virginia recreational beach and its associated development north to a much more stable section of the Assateague Island outer coast (beach) is fantastic and really key to making this important move feasible. I believe that this has been the most controversial part of both your planning process and that of the CNWR - it certainly has on the Virginia section of the island and for the Town of Chincoteague. I also believe that the Chincoteague community is becoming more supportive in general of this move of the Virginia recreation beach north, as they have seen the destruction of the current recreational beach, its parking lots and other infrastructure and Beach Road several times since the planning process began about 10 years ago to move the beach. It simply has to be done.

Other controversial points in the planning documents for the "Chincoteaguers" have been the closure of commercial fishing and aquaculture (agriculture), as well as stopping the Horseshoe Crab harvest, especially in Tom's Cove and Chincoteague Bay. Your response and current plan as outlined on p. 2-32 and elsewhere, and addressed in the public meeting on March 31 seems very reasonable to me, and I support what you are planning to do. I also support your proposed actions on and management of privately-owned structures as discussed on page 2-53 and elsewhere, including oyster watch houses and hunting blinds.

Building interpretive and educational programs around the themes of climate change and barrier island dynamics is very worthwhile, as is increasing research on Assateague Island and establishing a marine research reserve.

Thank you for allowing me to comment and for doing such a fine job as stewards of ASIS.

Sincerely,  
Debbie  
Deborah L. Elliott-Fisk, Ph.D  
Professor Emeritus  
Dept. of Wildlife, Fish and Conservation Biology  
University of California, Davis  
Davis, CA 95616

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

and

[REDACTED]

Chincoteague, VA 23336

[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 140

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Gail M. Hudson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Frankford, DE 19945  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-140  
Date Sent: 04/21/2016 Date Received: 04/21/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good afternoon,

My family has enjoyed the Island for many years and our wish is that future generations can too. I believe by choosing Alternative 3 and making the below requested modifications to the GMP will be the best way to ensure the Island's health and recreation use going forward.

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP, again I prefer Alternative 3. I suggest revising the document as follows:

- 1-the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.
- 2-A wilderness designation should be abandoned.
- 3-The NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. Suggest removing and I do not support this.
- 4-the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".
- 5-Adjust the ferry comment to say a public vehicle ferry instead of passenger ferry.

Thanks for your consideration.  
Gail Hudson

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 141

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Brian Scharle  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Ocean Pines, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-141  
Date Sent: 04/21/2016 Date Received: 04/21/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 21, 2016

Dear Debbie Darden,

I am writing to you to provide comments regarding the Draft GMP for Assateague Island. My family and I are Worcester County residents that frequent Assateague Island, both MD and VA, on a regular basis. We purchase a yearly pass and also have an OSV pass for both sides of the island. We primarily enjoy using the OSV zone for fishing, hiking, and for just getting away to have some peace and quiet while enjoying the beauty of the island. We also regularly visit the life guarded sections of the beach during the summer months, use the kayak soft launches to tour the backside of the island, and enjoy kayaking to the north end of the island.

Overall, we support the NPS preferred alternative - Alternative 3. However, we do have some concerns regarding some of the specifics in Alternative 3.

1. I would like to see the GMP state that the OSV boundary markers will be evaluated annually and moved west, as the island migrates west, so there will always be sufficient beach width to allow for OSV use and safe passage. I'm concerned that as currently written in the Draft GMP, OSV access could be lost in the future as the island migrates west and the OSV boundary markers aren't moved west accordingly.

2. As currently stated in the Draft GMP, "OSV will continue until conditions change". The phrase "until conditions change" is very broad and not well defined. Perhaps it could be stated more along the lines of - "OSV access will be maintained until irreparable environmental conditions make OSV usage impossible".

3. The Draft GMP mentions the use of a "passenger ferry" system if vehicular access would be lost. I generally support this system of access, if ever needed, but I'd like to see the use of a vehicular ferry system as well, not just passenger. In the event

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

that "passenger" does already mean both people and vehicles, then it should be more clearly defined in the GMP that the passenger ferry system includes private vehicular access to the island.

4. I would also like to see consideration of implementing a docking/entrance fee on the north end for users who have boated in removed from the plan. I frequent this area via kayak often and don't see how or why a user is beneficial here or how it is even practical? How would fees be collected? A booth on the jetty or something? Or would I have to drive all the way down to the main entrance area of the park to get a pass then have to drive all the way back up to the inlet area to launch my kayak to access the north end of the island? Things seem to be working out fine in that area the way they are now and I don't see a need for changes to the north end in the GMP.

I thank you for your time, your hard work, and your dedication towards trying to find an alternative that best balances the needs of all the users of the island, and for keeping the public involved in the process. I hope you consider my comments and make the appropriate changes to the Draft GMP.

Respectfully,

Brian Scharle

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 142

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: herman h. kenney  
Organization: amsa member for 28 years  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-142  
Date Sent: 04/21/2016 Date Received: 04/21/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

of all the alternatives alternative 3 suits me and i hope camping and fishing on the island will last for future beach enjoyment



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 143

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dottie Daniel  
Organization: Snug Harbor Civic Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-143  
Date Sent: 04/23/2016 Date Received: 04/23/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As a local citizen and regular user of both the MD and Federal Assateague Parks I am commenting on the General Management plan as follows:

I agree that Alternative 3 is best of the 4 options under consideration.

- It's very important to me that the OSV zone remain accessible in years to come, even if the exact location of it needs to move westward. The markers need to be located annually so that as much vehicle access as possible is allowed. In addition, some of the use restrictions should be lifted to allow more vehicles on the beach at any time.
- It is also very important that the park remain accessible for human use, especially since the park was originally established FOR RECREATION. It was not established for wilderness and that option should never be considered.
- The current situation with the separate fee areas should remain, the toll booth should not be on the west side of the bridge.
- IF a ferry is established to the island, it should be a vehicle ferry.

In addition, the NPS should stop destroying perfectly good parking lots and replacing them with shells. If pervious paving is desired, there are other alternatives that are more friendly to barefooted beach users than clam shells and oyster shells. Parking lots should be moved if they've been destroyed, not as a prophylactic measure. It's ridiculous that users must now walk an additional 200 yards or so for beach access.

Thank you for considering my comments as you finalize the plans.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 144

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Susan L. Johnstonbaugh  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Hillsborough, NJ 08844  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-144  
Date Sent: 04/23/2016 Date Received: 04/23/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

I would love to see boating allowed in the waters around Assateague Island. I am from NJ but our family spends almost every weekend in Chincoteague Island. My mom built a vacation home there and we love going to the beach in our own car, kayaking around Toms Cove and taking boat tours up toward Maryland with the many wonderful tour boats. If there are changes like I am reading about it will change tourism on the Virginia side of Assateague which would hurt local business owners in CI.

Thank you.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 145

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John B. Insley  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
selbyville, DE 19975  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-145  
Date Sent: 04/24/2016 Date Received: 04/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I feel plan 3 is the best plan for the future of the island. I use the OSV year round and so work with Get Trash(Ed) On Assateague, a volunteer group that picks up debris when we use the island.

## PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

### Correspondence: 146

#### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Chad Bayless  
Organization: Dms  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
lincoln, DE 19960  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

#### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-146  
Date Sent: 04/24/2016 Date Received: 04/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

#### Correspondence Text

I'd like to see option 3 with the changes suggested by AMSA. The markers need to be moved to account for the island rolling over on itself and OSV access needs to continue as long as it is safe to drive on.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 147

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Miranda N. Magee  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Millsboro , DE 19966  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-147  
Date Sent: 04/24/2016 Date Received: 04/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I really like going there with my family and driving on the beach it's enjoyable. I'm looking forward to go with my family this summer and enjoy the beach assateague has provided for people who love to fish like me

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 148

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Arthur E. Noyes  
Organization: Cape Lookout Mobile Sportfishermen  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Atlantic, NC 28511  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-148  
Date Sent: 04/25/2016 Date Received: 04/25/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

1. The carsonite markers in the OSV zone should be should be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future.
2. The AMSA strongly opposes the wilderness designation on Assateague Island. The island does not the requirement for this designation.
3. I do not support the NPS trying to acquire the State owned bridge to the Island. I feel that any federal budget difficulties would make travel to the island impossible.
4. The wording "OSV will continue until natural conditions" needs to be reworded to say "until irreversable natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV zone on the island".
5. The section about wanting a public passenger ferry to the island should be changed to read a public vehicle ferry.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 149

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael E. McGee  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-149  
Date Sent: 04/27/2016 Date Received: 04/27/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, Maryland 21811

I welcome the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP) for the Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS) which also includes the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CNWR). My comments, however, will be limited to the management of the commercial shellfish aquaculture within the Seashore and Refuge.

To summarize I, as well as others involved in shellfish aquaculture, strongly oppose Alternate Plans 2, 3, or 4 that requires the issuance of a Special Use Permit to the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) for the continued management and regulation of shellfish within the purported water jurisdiction of the AINS.

The comments made herein are made from the perspective of one who has been involved in the cultivation and marketing of clams and oysters from the waters adjacent to Chincoteague and Assateague for over 40 years. As a boy, in the summertime with my grandfather, I watched over the Collins' leased oyster grounds from an oyster watch house off Assateague. In my early years, I oystered and clammed at Tom's Cove until I enlisted in the Armed Services. After my service years, I began a career in aquaculture which I have followed full time in excess of 40 years. Either I or my family own numerous oyster leases of state bottom assigned by the VMRC from Tom's Cove to the Maryland line on the inward side of Assateague Island. Given my background in aquaculture operations for so many years, I would respectfully assert that my observations, comments, and conclusions are made with considerable knowledge of the matter and are not those of someone basically unfamiliar with the issues.

As noted, alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would require the issuance of the Special Use Permit by AINS to VMRC for the continued

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

management of shellfish within the bottomland channel ward of the low water mark adjacent to Assateague. Initially, and suffice to say I am not an attorney, but it is my understanding from others versed in the matter, that such a provision or requirement would most probably violate both the United States Constitution and the Submerged Lands Act, 43 U.S.C., §1311, and further offend the Constitution of Virginia. The constitutional right of a citizen to navigate the navigable waters of the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia is guaranteed under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, and the Constitution of Virginia. In 1953, the Federal Government, by the Submerged Lands Act, ceded title and ownership of lands below navigable waters within a state's boundaries to that respective state, as well as to the waters and natural resources within such lands and waters. The GMP recognizes the sovereign right of the Commonwealth as to the bottom and the right to manage shellfish therein. Those provisions need to be read in conjunction with the right of citizens to freely navigate under the Commerce Clause, as noted. A similar navigation provision is found in the Constitution of Virginia. Obviously, the use of the waters adjacent to Assateague below the low water mark to engage in aquaculture on the ceded bottom is a facet of navigation and commerce. Given those principles of law, any attempt to require VMRC to be permitted by AINS to regulate state bottomland in navigable waters, as well as regulated access thereto would, in all probability, provoke a constitutional confrontation between AINS and the Commonwealth of Virginia. Moreover, the federal courts have recognized that oyster grounds held by private owners by lease from the Commonwealth of Virginia are "private property rights" and restricting ones access and use thereof may well constitute a "taking" under the law of Eminent Domain. Any such conflict and the resolution of those legal issues are totally unnecessary to accomplish the aims of the GMP.

Perhaps more significantly, from my review of the GMP, its primary purpose is to address and provide for anticipated increased traffic at the Seashore and possible climate change - and their impact on the visitor experience. The present and future use of state bottom and its continued sole regulation by VMRC has utterly no causal relationship with Alternative Plans 2, 3, or 4. Access to the state bottomland and aquacultural activities in the waters adjacent to Assateague no way depend on upland access from AINS. Simply put, access is from Chincoteague or other areas. The extent of vehicular traffic and increased visitors on Assateague, again, is not material. Nor is climate change on Assateague material. Aquacultural activities are not factors in those considerations or material insofar as how to address those issues.

Economically speaking, aquacultural activities in the areas adjacent to Assateague and Chincoteague are greatly important to the Chincoteague community, the County of Accomack, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and obviously the people who make their livelihood from them.

I would suggest that there are other critical factors in the discussion, namely, (1) the filter feeding nature of oysters and clams and (2) VMRC's strong and active management of the shellfish industry and the state bottom. It is widely recognized by both the watermen and the marine biologists the crucial role that shellfish play in the filtration of the tidal waters. An oyster in a 24 hour period flushes, filters and cleans many gallons of water. The oyster has a tremendous positive environmental impact. Without shellfish, the creeks and waterways of the Eastern Shore would degenerate environmentally. This resulting condition would certainly not be consistent with the aims of AINS or the GMP to maintain and benefit our natural resources. This is a fact of life over which there is no intelligent difference of opinion. As to the Commission, since 1962 it has had the duty under state law to lease and regulate state bottom for aquacultural purposes and other uses. The Commission, consistent with the State's charge under the Constitution of Virginia to protect the waters of the Commonwealth from pollution and impairment for the benefit, enjoyment, and welfare of its people, has well performed that function. Leases are sharply regulated and the bottomland is not permitted to be nonproductive. The Commission strongly encourages aquacultural activities and even itself has a significant program for the creation of public oyster rocks. The Commission neither needs the assistance of the AINS nor the imposition of unnecessary restrictions by it, which arguably, knowing government will only become more restrictive over time.

As noted, the GMP recognizes the sovereign rights of the Commonwealth to manage the shellfish industry within the boundaries of the AINS. It further recognizes the long history of the leasing of public bottom for the purpose of aquaculture within the Virginia portion of the AINS - a history that began many decades before the establishment of either the Refuge or the National Seashore. The GMP also recognizes both the positive economic and environmental impact that the shellfish industry contributes to the region.



The effect of climate change and increased vehicular traffic and people, and their potential impact on the so called visitor experience are certainly prudent issues to consider for the long term management of AINS. But the attempt at imposition of restrictions on the Commission as to the regulation of the public bottom is again, not material to the issues being considered and it is not a problem or concern that needs "fixing". Whichever management plan is adopted, the current plan or scheme of regulation solely by the Commission, without intercession by AINS is clearly the most viable choice for the reasons enunciated herein.

Thank you for the opportunity again to comment.

Sincerely yours,

Michael E. McGee  
Chincoteague, Virginia

Cc: Senator Mark R. Warner  
Senator Timothy Kaine  
Senator Lynwood W. Lewis, Jr.  
Delegate Robert S. Bloxom, Jr.  
John Bull, Commissioner, Virginia Marine Resources Commission

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 150

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Harold B. Brasure  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague Island, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-150  
Date Sent: 04/27/2016 Date Received: 04/27/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern;

Please leave the recreational beach where it is on Assateague Island National Seashore. Also please rebuild the dunes on the southern portion of the island as their removal constitutes a safety hazard for the citizens and property owners of Chincoteague Island VA. The dune removal has caused overwashes and more frequent flooding to the southern portion of Chincoteague. Also please discontinue and remove any restrictions for fishing, clamming, oystering, hermit crab fishing, wildfowl hunting, duck blinds and watch houses in our area. All of these functions have provided our citizens and visitors with food, employment and a way of life for hundreds of years. Please leave our islands and way of life as they have been in the past. There is no valid reason for the interference you are trying to dictate to our citizens. We should be able to peacefully co exist. Please work with us to retain our heritage.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 151

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Gregory Mitsch  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Ocean Pines, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-151  
Date Sent: 04/27/2016 Date Received: 04/27/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello,

My family and I have enjoyed the Island for many years and our wish is that future generations can too. I believe by choosing Alternative 3 and making the below requested modifications to the GMP will be the best way to ensure the Island's health and recreation use going forward.

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP,. I suggest revising the document for Alternative 3 as follows:

- 1-the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.
- 2-A wilderness designation should be abandoned.
- 3-The NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I would like to remove this recommendation, as I do not support this.
- 4-the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".
- 5-Adjust the ferry comment to say a public vehicle ferry instead of passenger ferry.

Thanks for your consideration.

Greg Mitsch

[REDACTED]  
Ocean Pines, Md. 21811

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 152

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kathleen M. Armstrong  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Hatboro  
Hatboro, PA 19040  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-152  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good afternoon,

My family has enjoyed the Island for many years and our wish is that future generations can too. I believe by choosing Alternative 3 and making the below requested modifications to the GMP will be the best way to ensure the Island's health and recreation use going forward.

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP, again I prefer Alternative 3. I suggest revising the document as follows:

1-the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

2-A wilderness designation should be abandoned.

3-The NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. Suggest removing and I do not support this.

4-the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

5-Adjust the ferry comment to say a public vehicle ferry instead of passenger ferry.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Thanks for your consideration.

Kathleen Armstrong

[REDACTED]

Hatboro, PA 19040

&

[REDACTED]

Ocean Pines, MD 21811

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 153

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Frank Piorko  
Organization: Maryland Coastal Bays Program  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 8219 Stephen Decatur Highway  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: fpiorko@mdcoastalbays.org

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-153 and E-31  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Maryland Coastal Bays Program  
8219 Stephen Decatur Highway  
Berlin MD 21811  
410-213-2297 x 102

Deborah Darden  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811  
Attn: Assateague GMP Comments

Dear Ms. Darden,

We are pleased to express our full support for Assateague Island National Seashore's preferred General Management Plan (GMP) alternative, Alternative 3. As a National Estuary Program, Maryland Coastal Bays Program (MCBP) is a non-profit partnership among the towns of Ocean City and Berlin, the National Park Service (NPS), Worcester County, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Maryland Departments of Natural Resources, Agriculture and Planning.

The National Estuary Program was established under Section 320 of the 1987 Clean Water Act (CWA) Amendments as a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency place-based program to protect and restore the water quality and ecological integrity of estuaries of national significance. Section 320 of the CWA calls for each National Estuary Program to develop and implement a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). The CCMP is a long-term plan that contains specific targeted actions designed to address water quality, habitat and living resources challenges in its estuarine watershed.

The CCMP has been developed with assistance from natural resource experts, advocates, citizens and our partners. This plan reflects significant contributions from individuals, community groups and scientists who share a common interest in a healthy environment and a prosperous region.

MCBP supports Assateague Island National Seashore in their preparation for climate change as well as planning for the continued westward movement of the island. Over the past century, the Mid-Atlantic coastal region has seen an increase in sea level. It is predicted that this trend will continue into the next century. Increasing sea level can result in coastal erosion, exacerbated flooding and storm damage, inundation and loss of wetlands and other low-lying areas, salt intrusion into drinking water aquifers and streams and higher water tables. Higher sea surface temperatures associated with climate change are likely to increase the frequency and intensity of hurricanes.

The CCMP calls for enhancing the level of sustainability in land use decision making (CE 2). By planning for climate change adaptation, this alternative supports MCBP's Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) action item CE 2.2.2: "MCBP will work with city, county and state officials to ensure planning efforts include adaptation to climate change to protect infrastructure, public health, agriculture, wetlands and forests..."

In addition to climate change, Assateague Island has been migrating westward primarily due to overwash. This landward migration has accelerated at the northern end since the opening and subsequent stabilization of the Ocean City Inlet in 1933, which disrupted sediment transport to the north end of the island.

The CCMP also calls for continuing to implement the Ocean City Water Resources Study recommendations (RN 3). Specifically, this alternative also supports our CCMP action RN 3.1.2: "ACOE and NPS will continue to facilitate the Assateague Island North End Restoration Project to restore the natural sediment supply to the barrier island." A commitment to these actions was made by our partners to include the National Park Service.

In addition, the CCMP states our goal of balancing resource protection with recreational use (RN 2). We believe that Alternative 3 best accomplishes this goal.

MCBP applauds the research, planning, and vision that went into defining Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Frank Piorko  
Executive Director  
Maryland Coastal Bays Program

#### References:

Cain, C. J., & Wilson, D. (Eds.). (2015). Our Path Forward: The Comprehensive Conservation & Management Plan for Maryland's Coastal Bays. Cambridge, MD: IAN Press, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.  
<http://www.mdcoastalbays.org/pdf/ccmp.pdf>

Dennison, W. C., Thomas, J. E., Cain, C. J., Carruthers, T. J., Hall, M. R., Jesien, R. V., . . . Wilson, D. E. (2009). Shifting Sands- Environmental and cultural change in Maryland's Coastal Bays. Cambridge, MD: IAN Press, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 154

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kristy D. Wilbert  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Jacksonville, FL 32225  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-154  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please allow for option #3. I was born and raised in MD and enjoyed visiting, sunbathing, surfing, hiking and many other activities on the island. Asstateague should be maintained for everyone. For the memories we all have and the memories to be made. It is an important part of history as well as our future.



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 155

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robert S. Bloxom  
Organization: House of Delegates  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: P.O. Box 27  
14116 Lankford Highway  
Mappsville, VA 23407  
USA  
E-mail: delrbloxom@house.virginia.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-155, H-26 and E-32  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 25, 2016  
Deborah A. Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, Maryland 21811

Dear Ms. Darden,

I would like to open my response to the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP) regarding Assateague Island National Seashore by thanking the National Park Service for their commitment to keeping a public beach open with ample parking for visitors. It is vital to the economy of the Town of Chincoteague and Accomack County for seaside access. I do have concerns with many parts of this plan and I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address them during the open comment period.

The GMP is written primarily for the Maryland part of Assateague Island. The Maryland side of Assateague Island is wholly controlled by the Park Service and is focused on access to the Island by people. Overnight camping, access to the Bay, and seaside beaches are priorities for Maryland. This is not the case on the Virginia portion of Assateague Island. The Park Service only controls one mile of beach access and the rest of the Island is controlled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Historically, U.S. Fish and Wildlife only controlled to the high water mark because the wildlife which they protected could not nest below that line of delineation. The Park Service controls the water in front of public beaches which makes sense since this is where people have swimming access. Noone is debating the water off the one mile of swimming beach.

The concept that the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife are both under the Interior Department umbrella,

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

allowing their jurisdictional authority to be traded back and forth, is very disconcerting to me. This is a broad expansion of Federal authority that was feared and addressed in every document signed by the State of Virginia and the U.S. Government. The fear of Federal overreach was addressed in the 1965 Act which states "That nothing in this Act shall limit or interfere with the authority of the states to permit or to regulate shell fishing in any waters included in the national seashore...". The Act did not include other types of fishing because in that day oystering was the best option for watermen. The intent was to leave Virginia in control of the surrounding areas and have U.S. Fish and Wildlife control the Island. This control of the surrounding area by Virginia has been slowly eroding as the Federal Government claims authority over more and more activity as now they claim jurisdiction over water in a half mile circle around the Island.

In Virginia the water belongs to the Commonwealth. It is a constitutional right to have navigational access to the waters of the Commonwealth. The bottom ground has been surveyed and leased to the people of the Commonwealth for over 100 years.

Some of the following concerns are not in the GMP but show a pattern of slow creep of Federal overreach.

- Charter boats are being required to purchase yearly permits to use the water around your "park". I believe this is wrong and is a practice of extortion. They don't anchor nor launch from any federal facilities and only "cruise" around on open water. The highland is controlled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife but they are required to get a yearly Park Service permit.
- The National Park Service imposed a prohibition of personal watercraft around your "Park". In Virginia, personal watercraft has as much of a right to use the water as a kayaker. Even though they may be loud and obnoxious they should still have the "right" to use the water. I think this is a similar situation as the snowmobile ban in the parks out west that was defeated in court.
- The next practice of concern that is in the GMP is horseshoe crab harvest. This harvest of horseshoe crabs off the bottom ground has been occurring on Chincoteague for decades. The harvest is federally regulated by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Committee. A quota is given to participating States. In Virginia the Virginia Marine Resource Commission controls the catching by licenses and strict quotas are followed. This harvest happens off Virginia bottom ground as horseshoe crabs do not swim. Harvesting of horseshoe crabs started in the 80s and was not mentioned in the 1965 agreement as they had not begun harvesting them.
- Watch houses and concern for water quality is again a State issue. The Virginia Health Department began a shellfish sanitation division in 1920 which performs over 24,000 water samples a year and monitors pollutant levels in Virginia water. Watch houses were included within the Code of Virginia pursuant to §28.1-117 until 1975 and were encouraged to help protect the valuable oyster production within the Commonwealth.
- Duck blinds are again a State issue as they are anchored to Virginia bottom. Virginia Game and Inland Fisheries issues hunting licenses and regulations that control the duck blinds. Many of these locations have been handed down from generation to generation.
- Shellfish and the harvest of shellfish on leased bottom has been occurring before Colonel Baylor surveyed the productive oyster grounds in Virginia for the use by the public. Areas not outlined in Baylor ground were then leased to the people of Virginia so they could invest in shell and start propagating shellfish. This survey was completed in 1894. The shellfish beds and control of the bottom are specifically exempted from control by the Federal Government in an agreement signed between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the U.S. Government. I find it ludicrous Virginia needs to get a permit to do something that we already have the authority to do.

In conclusion, the main question is how the National Park Service (whose main focus is on public access) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife (whose main focus is on wildlife protection) interchange jurisdiction to whichever agency has the most authority. Water column jurisdiction makes sense when people have access for their safety. The perplexing situation to me is when the high ground is controlled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife and I cannot anchor to nor walk across it. How can the adjacent water column need this water jurisdiction by the Park Service for the protection of the people?

I thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the GMP. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments you may have.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Bloxom, Jr.

Cc: Senator Mark R. Warner

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Senator Timothy Kaine  
Congressman Scott Rigel  
Congressman Rob Wittman  
Senator Lynwood W. Lewis, Jr.  
John Bull, Commissioner, Virginia Marine Resource Commission  
Virginia Health Department  
Town of Chincoteague, Robert Ritter  
Accomack County Board of Supervisor Chair, Ron S. Wolff  
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries  
Shore Daily News  
Eastern Shore Post  
Eastern Shore News

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 156

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kathleen F. Hevener  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21801  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-156  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I support alternative #3! I love visiting Assateague. I support the sunbathers, the campers, the passion and the joy it brings to our Surf Fishermen, and the memories of others of their fun on the island and those yet to be made. Please insure the ability to enjoy Assateague in the future for us, our children and others is maintained for the years to come.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 157

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael Luisi  
Organization: Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 580 Taylor Ave, B-2  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
USA  
E-mail: Michael.Luisi@Maryland.Gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-157  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 29, 2016

Deborah A. Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Dear Ms. Darden:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Assateague Island National Seashore Draft General Management Plan (GMP). Fisheries Service would like to take this opportunity to indicate our desire to work cooperatively on commercial and recreational fisheries issues referenced in the GMP. Commercially licensed fishing activity within the National Seashore boundary includes activities such as crabbing, eeling, and gill netting. Recreational and charter activities include clamming, crabbing, surf fishing, and fishing in the Coastal Bays. These activities are important to our local economy and historic use of the area; we hope they can continue.

If you have any fisheries questions please contact Angel Willey, Program Manager, Coastal Fisheries Program. Mrs. Willey can be reached by phone at 410-456-0311 or via email at Angel.Willey@Maryland.Gov.

Sincerely,

Michael Luisi  
Director, Estuarine and Marine Fisheries

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 158

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Steven Miner  
Organization: Accomack County Board of Supervisors  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Accomac, VA 23301  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-158 and H-25  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes: This correspondence notes only that Accomack County's comments have been sent by mail. No additional comments are provided than are in the letter (H-25)

### Correspondence Text

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am submitting comments into the mail today, April 29, on behalf of the Accomack County Board of Supervisors.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Steve Miner

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 159

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lisa B. Saban  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
South Colby, WA 98384  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-159  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I applaud your efforts in managing this unique resource. Moving the parking area makes sense due to the cost of constant rebuilding. I have been going to Assateague Island for many years and own a home on Chincoteague Island. We love this little piece of paradise and support efforts to manage too much human use. I also encourage less hunting, fishing, and harvesting of horseshoe crabs. Over harvesting in general is a problem and we need these resources for the wildlife so the birds have food when they stop over on migration, etc. Thank you for taking care of these unique resources and managing for the future generations to enjoy!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 160

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-160  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PROPOSED MANAGEMENT PLAN BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE COMMENTS

I believe:

Virginia Assateague Island management plan needs to be separate from the Maryland Assateague Island management plan. The plan in reality is a binding contract between the federal government and the two different state citizens and two unique requirements.

I see no reason to destroy more natural "wild" grounds to move the beach from its existing site to one further north. It goes against why the National Parks Service (NPS) was created "to preserve grounds for future generations to have the use of and be able to see what the land would be like in the "wild"." NPS should maintain the existing beach and parking lots. The millions of dollars currently slated for establishing a new parking lot and beach should be used to put the dunes back on the existing beach and down the OVP section to the point. If NPS had maintained the dunes on the existing beaches and parking lots we would not be having this debate; the beach would not be in the shape it is today. NPS is responsible for caring for natural environments and wildlife. You can't justify the destruction of land/forest to establish a new beach and 1,000-space parking lot northward of the current recreational beach and stay within your mandate. The least damage to natural environment would be to maintain the current beach, create new dunes to help prevent beach erosion. Assateague Island protects Chincoteague Island during severe weather so the dunes should have been maintained years ago. NPS removed the snow fences, were suppose to replace them and never did (breach of contract?). The result is we have no dunes today; this is a good example why the government should not be making decisions. Furthermore, don't blame the pine tree beetle for the removal of the trees, which is currently taking place. If the beetle and the storm took down the trees the NPS should have only removed what was in the road or threaten to damage an existing structure to keep the "wild" in existence. The natural

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



cycle of the forest had been disrupted.

As for the existing duck blinds, watch-houses, horseshoe crab harvesting and aquaculture they should be left as they are today. If the NPS did their job these structures are all authorized or they would not be in existence today. So why spent countless hours paid for by taxpayers to try and decide if they are currently authorized or not is mute, what is in existence is authorized (NPS did their job, right?). Watermen have been harvesting horseshoe crabs in Tom's Cove for 56 years and have not depleted the supply. If you "phase out" harvesting you are just creating another problem for Assateague Island and will put the watermen out of business. The federal government might have book learning but does not have practical experience on horseshoe crab harvesting and should not make a decision to stop horseshoe crab harvesting. NPS says horseshoe crabs are considered "wildlife" and therefore, cannot be taken from a national park, if that is so how did the NPS justify shooting an EMU (again wildlife) that was on the Island; the national park boundaries are to the low tide mark of Assateague Island only and NPS jurisdiction ends there. Chincoteague has never relinquished their governance of everything between Assateague Island low tide mark and Chincoteague and won't stand for you trying to expand your jurisdiction.

The comments made at the open houses should to be considered formal comments. Why have open houses if the comments don't count? If the comments aren't considered they are a total waste of time and taxpayers dollars. They only give the illusion of the government wanting to hear what the public has to say and being able to say the government held them (but they don't count)-there is no honesty in that process.

Aquaculture is permitted because it has been determined that it falls under a ..."permit it as an historic scene exemption that allows us (US citizens) to have these kinds of activities in national parks if they are part of the historic scene". This is very generous of NPS to acknowledge, the horseshoe crab harvest is a "historic scene" in these waters as well.

Wanda Holman  
United States Citizen and Taxpayer

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 161

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Weston S. Young  
Organization: N/A  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-161  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Of the four alternatives, I am willing to accept 1, 3 & 4. I am adamantly against Alternative 2, as one can get a similar experience in Ocean City not that far away. Let's keep Assateague different.

I attended the public session at Wor-Wic Community College. I asked the estimated costs associated with each alternative. It makes absolutely zero sense that Alternative 4, the full retreat option, so should cost so much. Letting the beach go natural should have been the cheapest option. Being someone who performs engineering economic analyses on the regular, the do-nothing option is almost always the cheapest option. Given the price tag I saw associated with Alternative 4, it indicated to me there was an agenda being pushed. Please look in to the assumptions made here.

What should also be considered is the estimated sea level rise. My time in Hampton Roads dealing with coastal resiliency, I was made aware that through a combination of subsidence, glacial melting, water expansion from increased temperatures, and the gulf stream moving closer to the east coast, the estimated sea level rise for this area per the US Army Corps was a 3 foot increase by 2100. So if that assumption is correct, would alternatives 1, 2, or 3 make any sense if the sea level is 3 feet higher? Is it even remotely economically feasible to adapt to that? I doubt it.

Do not get me wrong, I love Assateague. I surf fish there. I bought a jeep precisely to take advantage of the OSV area. But we have to be realistic about the future and if the message being portrayed is correct from a climate change standpoint, Alternative 4 is the only option in my opinion. Why throw money at a lost investment?

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 162

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David Johnson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-162  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I think the well-thoughtout comments that you have received from the town of Chincoteague and from delegate Bloxom and Senator Lewis identify a number of points that I hope you will give your own careful attention to. As you well know these issues of the future relationship between Chincoteague and Assateague are central to our life. And to the millions of visitors who come to Chincoteague and Assateague every year. I realize that every national park has issues related to neighbors and interested parties that have to somehow be worked out. The one in front of you is certainly one of the most important and pressing. I believe that it would be wise for everyone concerned to go the extra mile to work with your neighbors.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 163

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Rachelle C. Daigneault  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Snow Hill, MD 21863  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-163  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Alternative 1 is impractical. It may seem like the way to go for those who only think in the short term, but acting without a plan is a sure way to be buffeted by political and private pressures with little or no appreciation for consequences. This could also be an expensive route to take.

Alternative 2 would be an irresponsible and stunningly expensive approach to managing the resource and the visitor experience. It also highly specific to one group of visitors while having little to no regard to for the range of visitor activities. This approach would be applauded by certain political and private groups who have no interest in protecting the resource or the range of visitor experiences.

Alternative 3 is my choice and the best plan for protecting natural barrier island processes and experiences while also preparing and responding to climate change. It gives the local economy time to adjust to changes and adopt sustainable practices that will benefit visitors and business. It will give visitors the experience they should have at a national seashore. It will give managers the tools to respond to outside pressures that are not in the best interest of the seashore.

Alternative 4 is the likely end result in the future. By the time the island is responding to serious impacts of climate change, funding to maintain facilities and even visitor experience will not be available while coastal communities are dealing with the ramifications of inaction and/or poor planning.

I am also in support of all actions that are common to all the alternatives.

If alternative 3 is selected, even with a management plan in place, it will require that the NPS has the will and backbone to follow through when political pressures and short term economic interests attempt to compel or strong-arm the seashore response to natural and climate related change.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 164

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Donna S. Mason  
Organization: Waterside Inn  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-164  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As the Chairperson of the Citizens Beach Committee I would like to make a very simple comment. Our request to The Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife and the Interior Department is to please leave the recreational beach at Assateague Island, Virginia at the current location. We really need some sand dunes pushed up and some sand for beach replenishment. Sand fencing would also be great. Anything to hold the sand and preserve the current location and the fertile oyster and clam ground at Toms Cove would be appreciated. If the Virginia end of Assateague was managed in much the same way as the Maryland end is we would not have the issues that we do. Moving the beach North would in my opinion be a very expensive mistake that could never be changed back or rectified and would not solve any problems only create more. Please work with our town officials and our State and Federal representatives who have heard the voice of the people. With the current management plan not only will we lose our beach but with allowing the washover to continue the South end of Chincoteague is also in danger as one of our barrier Islands continues to erode. We would appreciate any assistance that you can offer. thank you Donna Mason Chincoteague Island. [REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 165

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lisa Traynor  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-165  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

There is no reason the park and its facilities can't stay exactly where it is. A getty would be a more cost effective way to manage the beach, in addition to the reestablishment and maintenance of sand dunes. It would be detrimental to all those involved to move the beach and especially to have remote parking.

The watermen have used this area to hand harvest horseshoe crabs forever. The crabs are used for medical research. Hand harvesting them after they have spawned insures the continuation of the species.

Methods used that disturb the ecology of the area should be addressed.

I do not support the development of this plan as it stands. If there are changes to be made to Assateague Island, they need to be made with the guidance of those who actually live and use the island.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 166

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Cy Butner  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Reston, VA 20191  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-166  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Darden:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft GMP/EIS) for Assateague Island National Seashore. We are frequent and long-time visitors to Assateague and Chincoteague Islands, VA, and we know what a special place Assateague Island really is. The three comments we wish to offer are based on our knowledge of, and love for, this wonderful area.

We agree with the National Park Service in its choice of Alternative 3 as its preferred alternative.

We also think it is best to allow the fishing industry in the area to continue as it has to date, with no impact resulting from the management plan going forward.

Finally, if it is within the purview of the NPS, we suggest that it would be best to actively maintain the dunes in the Virginia portion of Assateague Island in order to provide for its continued successful use by the plover and human visitor populations going forward. We firmly believe that the current and past lack of dune management has been detrimental to the Virginia portion of Assateague Island.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Cy and Sandi Butner  
Reston, VA

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 167

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Gail Reichard  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA. 23336  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-167  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As residents of Chincoteague Island, our biggest concern is that our island (Chincoteague) may be threatened by direct hits from the ocean if the federal government agencies responsible for Assateague abandon any maintenance of the beach at the southern end, where it has been for many years. It seems likely that the ocean can break through Assateague and hit the south end of Chincoteague during storms and storm surges. The rip-rap at both the north end of Assateague which protects Ocean City, and now at the south end of Assateague to protect Wallops Island facilities, leave the residential community of Chincoteague in an ever more vulnerable position. Please do not proceed with any plans that would negatively affect our island's safety.

Thank you.

Gail and Birge Reichard



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 168

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Craig L. Beitzel  
Organization: Retired / Museum Board of Directors  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-168  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The manner in which the NPS and FW has dealt with the beach issue, the town of Chincoteague, and town management has been a disappointing string of misleading events and lies. If you would have appropriately addressed the issue 10 years ago we would not have such problems. YOU knocked down the original dunes .... what a disaster. YOU have consistently refused to consider rock piers, large dunes with appropriate planting, etc, that have proven very successful elsewhere. And in public meetings your personnel have specifically stated that the town, the southern part of town that now has flood issues, is NONE of your concern. Just wonderful ... a gov't dept that cares not for people, and really displays that you do not even want us on that beach ... pushing for buses was a strong indication of that, and the congressional meeting proved that you lied and were taking steps behind our backs when you promised not to do so. It is simply embarrassing for citizens to be treated like crap by a dept that benefits greatly from this town. Without a prosperous Chincoteague the visitation will drop-off by 90% .. zero doubt. Someone needs to wake up and care about the beach and this town. There would no longer be yearly parking lot expenses if you had handles this correctly years ago. You have PRETENDED to listen to the town for a couple of years, and NEVER have. A perfect example of why the public is disgusted with gov't departments.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 169

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Christine E. Gudikunst  
Organization: Surfrider Foundation  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Clarksville, DE 19970  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-169  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Assateague Island has been a treasure to my family for decades. We chose to buy a home here so that we could continue to enjoy it's beauty. Every time we visit we pick up at least one bag of trash before we play. We have watched the island change over the years and know that it won't always be here for us to enjoy. It is a pleasure to pay for our passes. It doesn't bother us when parts of the beach need to be closed. It is all part of the management of our treasure.

It is upsetting to think that they want to take away the privilege of being able to take care of the island and enjoy it. We have been members of the AMSA, we support AIA and the Assateague Coast Keeper. We participate in all of the beach and bay clean ups. As long as we take care of it we should be able to enjoy it. Since hearing of this agenda we are considering selling our place if we can't continue to be part of the island.

At this time we are in favor of option #3. We understand that there are people who take advantage. There are always going to be those people, but you have the people who care about the welfare of the wildlife and habitat. The bridge should be kept by the state and if a ferry is planned it should be for a public vehicles and pedestrians. If the island keeps moving west, then the markers should be moved to allow for the OSV Zone and the wildlife to coexist. The OSV plan should read "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the Island".

My husband and I drive to the line and walk to clean the beach. We come off the beach once a month with our truck loaded. It is our way of giving back and don't want to lose that.

On another stand, we like to surf and to paddle board. Being out on the island has less water traffic and it is naturally a nice place to surf with it's sand bars. It is one of the last remaining places on the central atlantic coast where you can enjoy the beach with out the tourism, rules and commotion.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 170

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Hazel A. Russell  
Organization: AMSA  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-170  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I love to fish I think God made every beach so He could calm my soul. I think the animal's are smarter then the people that that make all these rules. I guess alternative 3 is a good choice. But I don't like choices when it comes to a national parks I think the National Park is for the people and that the park service should do their job and Patrol it without having to close any of it that's why I pay taxes. I don't like the idea of the national parks taking over the bridge at Assateague because if that happens we lose the whole Island. I feel that there's just too many people from Ocean City that use that beach from Pennsylvania New Jersey Virginia and West Virginia, New York, I think the whole thing was a waste of taxpayers money from writing up this plan and the 700 pages that it took to write it. I love animals too. I believe you can protect without closing our beaches. I wish you would let us has lovers of the beach to take of it. Just please keep it so it opened all year round like it should be. Hazel Russell Amsa director

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 171

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Todd N. Russell  
Organization: AMSA, NCBBA, OBPA, CHAC  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-171 and P-172  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This correspondence is from the same person as P-172 and is identical.

### Correspondence Text

Dear Assateague superintendent, As a surf angler that frequents Assateague island. The GMP process that is taking place is about the BIGGEST waste of time and Tax money. If we have an GMP for the island and it WORKS why are we in the process of changing it??? If alternative 3 is what NPS is in favor of then let me put my useless 2 cents in. First the ferry system that is spoke of needs to be defined as a vehical ferry.operation. So when you close the bridge.What is the time frame that you plan on having the vehicle ferry in operation? And since I'm not allowed to access the island will the NPS be refunding my OSV PERMIT and Park Pass. If alternative 3 Is based on climate change, where is proof.Change happens everyday.Assateague Island doesn't need a wilderness area. Its a National Park that is paid for buy tax paying Americans, for Americans to ENJOY.whether you enjoy camping or fishing hiking, bird watching or hunting. It's our park. And I still understand why your trying to fix something that's not broke.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 172

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Todd N. Russell  
Organization: AMSA, NCBBA, OBPA, CHAC  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-172 and P-171  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes: This correspondence is from the same person as P-171 and is identical.

### Correspondence Text

Dear Assateague superintendent, As a surf angler that frequents Assateague island. The GMP process that is taking place is about the BIGGEST waste of time and Tax money. If we have an GMP for the island and it WORKS why are we in the process of changing it??? If alternative 3 is what NPS is in favor of then let me put my useless 2 cents in. First the ferry system that is spoke of needs to be defined as a vehical ferry.operation. So when you close the bridge.What is the time frame that you plan on having the vehicle ferry in operation? And since I'm not allowed to access the island will the NPS be refunding my OSV PERMIT and Park Pass. If alternative 3 Is based on climate change, where is proof.Change happens everyday.Assateague Island doesn't need a wilderness area. Its a National Park that is paid for buy tax paying Americans, for Americans to ENJOY.whether you enjoy camping or fishing hiking, bird watching or hunting. It's our park. And I still understand why your trying to fix something that's not broke.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 173

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Janine Roberto  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pittsburgh, PA 15206  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-173  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The southernmost tip of Assateague must be preserved! It is vital for the safety and livelihoods of the residents of Chincoteague. Ocean City Maryland and the manipulation of the environment there is a major contributor to the issues affecting lower Assateague! Their safety, property values and livelihoods are no more valuable than the people of Chincoteague. Yet money is continuously poured into resources for them. This needs to be revisited now!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 174

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bonnie J. Russell  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Levittown Pa, PA 19055  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-174  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

We vacation here 4 times a year. Been coming to Chincoteague and Assateague Island for almost thirty years. the way Assateague is set up and the facilities are great. To change things now won't do any good. This was a National Park established by President Lyndon Johnson for all americans to enjoy Leave it alone.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 175

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Tiffany Cherrix  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Salisbury , MD 21801  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-175  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

None of these options are acceptable. You need to keep going back to the drawing board. The only thing I see is that is consistent is taking away and eroding a way of life that my family has lived for generations. By not preserving and building up the beach you risk the loss of Assateague as a barrier island for Chincoteague. You are risking not only our livelihoods related to tourism but also our homes, businesses, and heritage. Decreasing access to the beach by moving forward with plans for a beach shuttle is absolutely not acceptable. How many lives are willing to put at risk when a sudden Summer storm rolls onto the beach. With whipping winds, rain and lightening you are risking lives unnecessarily. You should listen to the voices of the people whose lives you are directly affecting by buying up lands, dismantling duck blinds, refusing to replenish the beach and decreasing access.

These policies are unacceptable and this not the future I want for Assateague or Chincoteague.

Tiffany



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 176

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Steven Merrick  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Georgetown , DE 19947  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-176  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern.

I'm writing this to comment on the 2016 GMP for Assateague island. I have been going to the island since 1965 and hope that my grandchildren and their families will still have that ability. I'm for access to all!

I am a fisherman hunter and conservationist. I understand the importance of protecting our resources and nature. We have so many user groups visiting AI it would devastate the local community and the NPS if access is limited or denied! One only has to look at Hatteras to see the horrible results.

With that said I will support option 3 with some changes.

First AI is not suitable for a wilderness designation. The island is always changing with storms sea level rise and climate change. If a wilderness designation is applied it must be at least 400 yard s west of current Carsonite markers.

Next the carsonite markers might be moved needs to be changed to will be moved to allow OVS access.

The bridge going to AI needs to remain in control of the state. This will help mantain access to AI and limit financial responsibility for NPS.

The wording OVS use may be limited because of sea level rise and climate change should be changed to will be allowed until until unsafe for OVS use.

Finally the passenger ferry should be passenger vehicle ferry.

Thank you for allowing my comments.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 177

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Chris Seymour  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Newark, MD 21841  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-177  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I agree with the National Seashore that Alternative Three is the preferred alternative. The park operations and facilities must adapt and change to the ever shifting barrier island. Increased frequency of extreme weather events such as Nor'Easters and hurricanes will continue as a fact of climate change. Adding sea level rise and Eastern Shore land mass subsidence with magnify the change rate to the Island's land mass.

While Alternative 4 of letting the Island revert to some of it's pre-park and even pre-human natural state would be ideal, the realities of having park facilities that are able to handle the 1-2 million visitors in an area that has 10 million people within a 3 hour drive, are/is a necessity. Via Alternative 3, adaptation of the facilities location and type will allow the park staff to continue to control access to the park's resources in a protective manner, which is essential to it's Organic Act mission: to provide access for future generation.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 178

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: ferrell santacroce  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-178  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I didn't see one option here that I completely agree with. Out of the options I would have to go with option #3. I don't think the island is meant to be a resort destination. There is Ocean City for that. The remains of its' history are fragile. There should NEVER be a ferry to Green Run or ANY of the other lodges! To walk out there and see them is part of appreciating the land and the people that came prior, as is. I believe the shore line of the bay side is too fragile and the money that it would take to build them up could be better spent on marketing to the like minded people that are not looking for a resort vacation. Better spent on restoration of the remaining buildings, etc.. and to build on that bay side to support more tourists would destroy the essence of this island.

You know those National Geographic expeditions to the Galapagos,etc.? People go on those because they ARE wild. No one goes there expecting to be staying in a high rise hotel with Jacuzzi rooms and be delivered to their destination on a luxury yacht in a limousine.

As it stands now, there are two kinds of tourists, segregated by park development and access. The people that want the beach/pony experience come down Bayberry Dr. or camp ... head to the beach and see a few ponies and go home. The lesser developed area of the OSV bring people by foot(after you drive on the beach) and kayak. The latter group, I believe appreciate the island and its' history.

Save the money that it would take to build up/restore and put it into keeping it as is. When a storm hits, other than making it safe for people, let it be. The charm of this place is that it is ever changing, yet stays the same.

Spend more money on educating people (A local in school program would be awesome - bring the island to the kids.). Add ranger support so the island monitoring duties do not fall on a few.

PLEASE, do not let this decision making to go on forever ... don't let the momentum you have gained here get lost in government due process. The people that truly love this island and those that run it, and the island itself, deserve better than what has happened in previous years.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 179

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: jane wolffe  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-179  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

RE: Assateague Island National Seashore, Virginia portion

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am writing in regards to the comment period which ends today regarding the proposed changes to the Virginia Portion of Assateague Island including the Wilderness area , Horeshoe Crab Harvest, Oyster Watch Houses, Aquaculture, and Duck Blinds. Also, the issue of Beach Restoration needs to be readdressed as it is successfully being done on the Norther Portion of Assateague and would save our beaches.

Due to the land base being so small, I agree with the Town of Chincoteague that the proposed Wilderness Area not be included in this document. As for the Oyster Watch Houses, Duck blinds, Horseshoe Crab Harvest, and Aqua Culture: leave these alone as they are already managed by other agencies.

Finally, please pursue adding Beach Restoration, including sand dunes and bences to the Virginia Portion of Assateague. The federal government has invested years and years of time and money to preserving Assateague Island and should not stop now. Increase, don't decrease efforts to fortify the beach!

Respectfully,

Jane Wolffe  
Lifelong resident, Chincoteague

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 180

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Willards, MD 21874  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-180  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Why close the beach , a lot of ppl grew up on this beach I have myself and wanna keep it going threw my family , it's our home away from home . we look forward to summer season every year to get to drive out and enjoy our wonderful beach . the locals around here don't wanna loose our beach . keep our beach open

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 181

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mary Brown  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
SALISBURY, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-181  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good Day,

My husband and I were the original owners and founders of Buck's Place on RT 611 and I know firsthand how the National Seashore has an economic impact on businesses in the area. I would hope that when this new GMP is final that it will take into account the businesses in the area. First and foremost, Good Day,

My husband and I were the original owners and founders of Buck's Place on RT 611 and I know first hand how the National Seashore has an economic impact on businesses in the area. I would hope that when this new GMP is final that it will take into account the businesses in the area. First and foremost continued OSV use in it's current 13 mile use is going to be important remains. If people can not access as it is currently, then I fear the negative impact it will have on the area businesses.

I would hope to see the carsonite markers re-positioned each year to be suited to the winter mean high tide allowances. I also am not in favor of a co-operative with the federal and state giving the control to the federal government of the bridge. As we all know this bridge is the only way to access the island by vehicle. It would be sad that the federal government not have the funding to repair or possibly replace the bridge one day.

I really don't think the ferry system that is mentioned is a great idea simply because of the aquaculture that would be destroyed in the bottom of the bay (which by the way is the position that the Superintendent took to remove the PWC back in the late 90's).

I have never or will never be in favor of any kind of wilderness designation on Assateague and to keep exploring the possibility of meeting the desired qualities the NPS should be exploring how to remove it their agenda (seeing how congress has never approved this measure). I would like to see the southern bullpen replaced in the OSV as it was historically and the number of vehicles raised on the OSV to better accommodate the to the visitors that are currently having to sit in line adding to the already dangerous parking problem and congestion near the air pumps.

Thank you for considering my concerns and I wish the public and the NPS the best of luck finalizing the GMP for the future

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

to citizens to enjoy. continued OSV use in its current 13-mile use is going to be important remains. If people cannot access as it is currently, then I fear the negative impact it will have on the area businesses.

I would hope to see the carsonite markers re-positioned each year to be suited to the winter mean high tide allowances.

I also am not in favor of a co-operative with the federal and state giving the control to the federal government of the bridge.

As we all know this bridge is the only way to access the island by vehicle. It would be sad that the federal government not have the funding to repair or possibly replace the bridge one day.

I really don't think the ferry system that is mentioned is a great idea simply because of the aquaculture that would be destroyed in the bottom of the bay (which by the way is the position that the Superintendent took to remove the PWC back in the late 90's).

I have never or will never be in favor of any kind of wilderness designation on Assateague and to keep exploring the possibility of meeting the desired qualities the NPS should be exploring how to remove it their agenda (seeing how congress has never approved this measure). I would like to see the southern bullpen replaced in the OSV as it was historically and the number of vehicles raised on the OSV to better accommodate the to the visitors that are currently having to sit in line adding to the already dangerous parking problem and congestion near the air pumps.

Thank you for considering my concerns and I wish the public and the NPS the best of luck finalizing the GMP for the future to citizens to enjoy.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 182

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William Mariner  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Greenbackville, VA 23356  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-182  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Superintendent Darden

I would like for you to add my comments to the GMP please..

I want to add that the beach carsonite markers will be reset each winter.

I don't wish the NPS peruse the wilderness or the ownership or control of the bridge.

The ferry needs to be clearly defined as a vehicle ferry. But I don't care to see a ferry due to trying to figure where it would land on the mainland and cost associated.

I hoped to see the vehicle limit being raised on the beach.

145 vehicle can and should be raised. Lack of scientific data shows no reason it couldn't be done.

Thanks Bill



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 183

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bruce V. West  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Milton, DE 19968  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-183  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I choose option #3 with consideration of change to wording . Thank you .Bruce West

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 184

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A Megee  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Selbyville, DE 19975  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-184  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been going to Assateague Island (Md) for approx 45 years... started out with my family riding over for a day, driving the 2 wheel truck on the beach and having so much fun, memories I'll never forget!! We would pack our lunch, fish and swim all day then head back home feeling so very happy! We all loved the island, as I still do today!

My husband and I go as often as we can and some of my family still go! We like to camp on the island. We have a slide in camper/truck and love every minute we are there! Most of our friends camp also and there are some do the day trips.

When we get to the island it seems as though all the stress and tension is left behind on the mainland! There is such beauty on Assateague I hope and pray there isn't a day to come that we all can't go there to enjoy it..!

Thank you!

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 185

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robert Fudge  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Batesville, VA  
Batesville, VA 22924  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-185  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I like the well-reasoned NPS preferred alternative. I particularly like that it allows for both traditional uses and adaptations to the rising sea levels. I strongly recommend increased public involvement in resource preservation, as well as increased public education in barrier island dynamics and cultural resource preservation. Many people are drawn to the seashore and to protecting the island through public assess programs, employee contacts, and through social media links. Education and interpretation is vital to the preservation of the Seashore and should be very reflective in the GMP. This would by all means include a cultural resource component as well as a natural resource one. Some of the best advocates for the Seashore have been those with historical and generational attachments, and those who appreciate the cultural links the park has had to history of the country and to the region. Finally, I believe some special attention should be given to the Assateague Coast Guard Station in VA. It is on the National Register, is a link to the local community, and provides a structure that can be adapted well to education. It should be protected and preserved in the best tradition of the NPS.

Engage the public in all preservation efforts and promote the island effectively through an ongoing dynamic, diverse, and inclusive interpretive program. Although extraordinary efforts should not be made to influence natural processes and seashore dynamics, a special effort needs to be made to provide for the ongoing enjoyment of the public, especially if preservation efforts may necessitate adjusting traditional recreational uses or limiting public access to fragile natural areas.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 186

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Erin Smith  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Parkville, MD 21234  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-186  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

We want option 3

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 187

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Sarah L. Miller  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Fruitland, MD 21826  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I'm writing in to support the NPS' GMP alternative 3. Letting the island evolve naturally and moving/designing structures for sustainability. This will allow us and others to continue to enjoy the island now and later down the road. As far as the proposed OSV use in alternative 3, in the comparison chart it states if access is lost the zone "might" be relocated or modified. The word might should be removed and something along the line of if access is lost, the zone will be modified or relocated, unless the natural damages are irreversible.

I recall many years of visiting the island, all the memories of camping and sun bathing, picnicking, watching friends surf and now learning the joys of Surf Fishing. A relaxing enjoyable hobby that I will pass on to my daughter and share times together. I want to create stories and memories with my daughter on Assatueague Island, like the memories I have of enjoying times on the island with family and friends but more importantly, I want the ability for my daughter to be able to do the same with her children some day as well.

I stand with alternative 3.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 188

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: James M. Malone  
Organization: A.M.S.A.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Rising Sun, MD 21911  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-188  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been fishing Assateague Island Md.&Va.for more than 35 yrs. I enjoy being able to drive my truck on the beach to scout an area to fish. Love to observe the wildlife there,Assateague ponies,Sika deer,red fox,Bald eagles,ghost crabs & more. Do my part to keep beach clean,participate in annual AMSA beach cleanup. I have a feeling of well being each time i come onto the island,camped there many times over the years. After all these years i still see something new/different each visit. Love to camp there to observe the Gemini/Perseid meteor showers each year. It is a meeting/gathering place for fellow fishermen that i reunite with each year at specific times to fish for migratory Striped Bass,Red&Black Drum & socialize together. This has become a way of life for myself and my friends and would like to preserve this experience & freedom. I support the NPS GMP Alternative #3 with a few clarifications: 1) Would like in writing the moving of carsonite markers annually so as to allow the maximum area for beach driving. 2) " OSV will continue until conditions change"needs to be reworded/rewritten to say "OSV will continue until irreversible natural causes prohibits safe use of OSV zone on island". 3)I oppose any wilderness designation,the island has never met requirements due to instability for wilderness designation for over 35 yrs.This proposal should be discarded and never revisited. 4) Do not support NPS/Federal Government acquisition of and responsibility for repair/maintenance of the bridge connecting the island to the mainland from the State of Maryland & moving fee area to the mainland. The fear here being the government not releasing funds for maintenance/repair and the bridge ultimately being deemed impassable,leading to ferrying people/vehicles as only means of access to the island-including first responders who need timely access in time of emergency. Thank you for reading and considering my comments. James Malone

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 189

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kathy Phillips  
Organization: Assateague Coastal Trust  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: PO Box 731  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: coastkeeper@actforbays.org

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-189  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

May 1, 2016  
Deborah Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Attn: 2016 Assateague Island National Seashore Draft GMP/EIS

Dear Superintendent Darden,

Thank you for this opportunity to submit public comment on the 2016 Assateague Island National Seashore Draft GMP/EIS.

Founded in 1970 as The Committee To Preserve Assateague Island, Assateague Coastal Trust (ACT) is the oldest environmental education and advocacy organization on the Delmarva peninsula. Today ACT works to protect not only Assateague Island but the entire coastal watershed and inland bays behind Ocean City, MD and Assateague Island including Worcester County, MD and northern portions of Accomack County, VA. Our mission: To promote and encourage the protection of the health, productivity, and sustainability of the coastal bays watershed of Delmarva through advocacy, education and conservation.

Assateague Coastal Trust supports the Preferred Alternative #3, with the following additional comments:

ACT feels that Preferred Alternative #3 best addresses the need to adapt the Seashore visitor use to the expected natural changes that will occur, while also significantly protecting the natural resources of Assateague Island as sea level rise and increased intensity of coastal storms impacts the island. We applaud the National Seashore for their vision knowing this Alternative will eventually mean significant changes to how the island is being used today.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

We would also like to comment that in Section 1.5.3 Partnerships, it is noted that water quality in Chincoteague, Sinepuxent and Newport Bays is impaired and in decline due to nutrient loadings to these waterways from the mainland watershed and this will impact the aquatic resources within the Seashore. ACT agrees with this assessment and urges the National Park Service to participate aggressively in the Coastal Bays TMDL implementation process by Worcester County, and to support the position of other NPS partners who also want to see non-point source pollution loadings to the Coastal Bays reduced.

#### Section 2.6.1 - Overall Concept - re: Breach Management Protocol

ACT finds this concept intriguing in that a permanent breach through the island into Chincoteague Bay could possibly aid in restoring healthier water quality to Chincoteague bay and help to restore certain fisheries and shellfish populations that have so dramatically declined in the past 30 years. We would be very interested in understanding more about the Seashore's Beach Management Protocols as they are developed. This Protocol would need to be more protective of mainland properties in Sinepuxent Bay however.

#### Section 2.6.2 - North End and Backcountry Areas (Natural Resource Zone)

ACT understands there are visitor impacts to the North End because of boats beaching on the bayside and visitors using the bayside beaches for recreational use. As recreational boating continues to expand in the northern bays ACT would prefer to see the North End managed in such a way as to better control the impacts from visitors accessing this area by motorized vessel and we support a docking fee if use increases enough to warrant it. While we appreciate most of those visitors who access the North End bayside beaches currently are appreciative of the need to protect the natural resources of the island, we are also concerned the placement of visitor use facilities (such as mobile restrooms) will only increase the number of visitors using the bayside of the North End. The language in this paragraph is confusing and it is not clear if the docking/entrance fee is only going to be implemented IF the visitor use facilities are installed, or is it going to be implemented regardless of these installations? How and where would these visitor use facilities be installed? If a docking/entrance fee is to be charged and day use facilities are to be installed, ACT would prefer clearly defined areas for this type of use on the North End and clearly defined areas that are then off-limits to motorized vessel access. Given the possibility that breaches or erosion may also direct more OSV activity to the North End, we are concerned this area of the island may become overused.

#### Section 2.6.4 - Privately Owned Structures

Regarding the oyster watch houses in Virginia, ACT appreciates the character and significance these structures have to the Chincoteague area. We would support keeping these structures that are within the Seashore boundaries if the private owners who want to keep and use these agree to share with the State of VA and Accomack County the responsibility to ensure appropriate wastewater management and resource conservation are implemented, and the private owners must sign an agreement with the Seashore in VA to responsibly remove the structures once they are no longer being actively used.

We greatly appreciate that Assateague Island National Seashore has included ACT as a partner and stakeholder during the development of this extensive General Management Plan and we hope to continue this partnership in the development of the final Plan. We appreciate your consideration of these comments and again thank you for the opportunity to submit them.

Sincerely,

Kathy Phillips, Executive Director & Assateague COASTKEEPER  
Assateague Coastal Trust




# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 190

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Diane Cherry

Organization: Back Country Horsemen of Virginia  Official Rep.

Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups

Address: 1123 Powder Mill Road  
Ivanhoe, VA 24350  
USA

E-mail: dcrmg@centurylink.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-1

Date Sent: 02/24/2016 Date Received: 03/08/2016

Number of Signatures: 3 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

February 24, 2016

Deborah A. Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811  
410-629-6090

[www.bchva.org](http://www.bchva.org)

RE: Assateague Island National Seashore Draft General Management Plan  
and Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Darden:

We are writing on behalf of the Back Country Horsemen of Virginia membership. Our BCH chapters in Virginia are part of the Back Country Horsemen of America, an organization dedicated to assisting the local, state, national, and private organizations in the maintenance of the trail systems on our public lands. We also strive to keep open the access to public lands for stock use.

We respect the work the National Park Service does for the public lands and the wonderful management that it has been doing for Assateague Island National Seashore. Your work on the ASIS DGMP/EIS is appreciated. The ASIS DGMP/EIS shows your commitment to keeping Assateague Island the wonderful natural resource it is now.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

We have a few comments we would like to submit on the ASIS DGMP/EIS.

1) When looking at the four alternatives in the ASIS DGMP/EIS we were pleased to see no references to reducing the current access for horseback riders with horses on the beaches in the OSV areas.

Please continue to allow horseback riders to use the Virginia and Maryland OSV areas for riding. The 2015 ASIS Horseback Riding brochure indicates day use is allowed in the Virginia OSV area for most of the year, and the Maryland OSV area is open to day use horseback riders from October 9 to May 14. Maryland also has two horse camp sites available during that time frame. Riding on an ocean beach is a rare opportunity many riders never have a chance to experience. We would hate to see any reduction to the currently allowed access for horseback riders.

2) All DGMP alternatives except #1 indicate a potential reduction in the OSV area size. Alternatives #2, #3, and #4 indicate the Virginia OSV area would be determined by the US Fish and Wildlife Services. It is also possible natural erosion can have an impact on the available OSV areas. We request some consideration always be given to keeping OSV areas open for the horseback riders.

3) None of the DGMP alternatives indicate any provisions for maintaining long term bridge access to the island. Transitioning to an all water ferry service is the only option when bridges are no longer maintained. Please ensure that there would be ferry services willing to transport large horse trailers to provide continued access to the island for horseback riders if an all water service ever occurs.

Thank you for listening to our comments. We hope to continue seeing many future generations have the opportunity to enjoy the feel of riding a horse along the beautiful Assateague beach front.

Sincerely,  
Diane Cherry, Chairman  
Back Country Horsemen of Virginia  
1123 Powder Mill Road  
Ivanhoe, VA 24350  
276- -699-9686  
email: dcrmg@centurylink.net


Nancy Sluys, Chairman, Public Lands Committee  
Back Country Horsemen of the Virginia Highlands  
478 Big Brush Creek Road  
Fries, VA 24330  
276-7 44-0277  
email: mi\_glewood@surry.net

Don Saner, Chairman  
Back Country Horsemen of America  
P.O. Box 1367  
Graham, WA 98338

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 191

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ethel R. Eaton  
Organization: Division of Resource Services and Review, Virginia Department of Historic Resources  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: S - State Government  
Address: 2801 Kensington Avenue  
Richmond, VA 23221  
USA  
E-mail: ethel.eaton@dhr.virginia.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-2 and E-2  
Date Sent: 03/17/2016 Date Received: 03/21/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 17, 2016

Deborah A Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Re: Assateague Island National Seashore  
Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement  
Accomack County, Virginia  
DHR File No. 2010-1241  
Received February 16, 2016

Dear Ms. Darden:

Thank you for your letter of February 12, 2016 requesting our review of the draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Assateague Island National Seashore. The Department of Historic Resources supports Alternative 3, Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation, the National Park Service (NPS)' preferred alternative for the future management of the seashore lands and waters under its management. We note the Conclusions section on page 4-198 states: "Under all alternatives cultural resources would continue to be exposed to unavoidable adverse impacts associated with natural coastal processes and the effects of climate change/sea level rise". We appreciate the challenges facing the Seashore. However, we strongly encourage including in the future management strategies in the GMP effective ways to address these unavoidable impacts. We offer the following comments for your consideration:

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Archaeological Sites. On page viii the draft GMP acknowledges the absence of archaeological survey data for most of the island. The challenge in identifying these sites is illustrated by the attached photos courtesy of Darrin Lowery. Some shorelines have an erosive season (or phase) and a stable season (or phase). In our comments on the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges Comprehensive Conservation we brought to the attention of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service a prehistoric site eroding out of the shoreline on Metomkin Island, 44AC0138. Although located on the Nature Conservancy portion of Metomkin Island (not the Service' portion), the site illustrates both the potential for prehistoric resources and the threat of erosion to the cultural resources on the refuges. Stating that occasional discoveries of aboriginal projectile points in the ocean surf zone constitute the only physical evidence of Native American use of Assateague Island (or presumably on other barrier islands within the jurisdiction of the NPS) ignores the critical need to collect baseline data about these sites spatial, historical and cultural contexts, followed by periodic monitoring of identified resources in order to more effectively manage them.

The section, Assessing Impacts, on page 4.1.3, states: "The NPS is an agency with a "conservation" mandate and identifies fundamental resources and values in its GMPs". In section 1.4.3 of the GMP/EIS, Cultural Resources are included under Other Important Resources, ranging from historic structures to archaeological objects and sites. We strongly encourage NPS not to drop archaeological resources from consideration in the GMP but to include archaeological resources together with other Cultural Resources (Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes). We recommend that Section 2.6.5 Cultural Resource Management (NPS Preferred Alternative) includes a management strategy of conducting baseline archaeological survey and monitoring. Failure to do so is in our opinion may be considered an adverse impact, and inconsistent with the directives of Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, as well as Bulletin 28.

We also encourage the NPS to include as a management strategy partnering with the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges in the Service' wreck monitoring program, which will serve both as a useful monitoring tool for cultural resources as well as assessing the movement of the barrier islands.

Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station. The Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station and its Cultural Landscape are considered eligible for both the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Under alternative 3, management actions would protect and maintain the Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station in situ until the site and/or structures are no longer sustainable... Page viii states that the Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station sits vacant and underutilized due to problems with access. We do not see any management strategies to address the access problem. We are pleased to see, however, that Section 2.6.5 Cultural Resource Management (NPS Preferred Alternative) that NPS would seek partners to rehabilitate and reuse the station, perhaps including an historic lease or with commercial service providers to provide access... We encourage the NPS to explore partnerships, such with the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges, potentially including the Station as a venue for environmental education. The NPS might also schedule occasional interpretive tours with local partners to encourage an understanding the Station's place in the history of Assateague Island, enhancing Visitor Use and Experience in addition to the kayak tours from Toms Cove that include a stop at the site.

We look forward to working with the NPS under section 106 of the NHPA and the Service-wide 2008 Programmatic Agreement among the NPS, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers as plans progress. Tribal consultation will need to be considered in the Section 106 process. As you know, the Virginia Council on Indians no longer exists. Virginia now has its first resident federally recognized Indian Tribe, the Pamunkey Tribe. If NPS has not already done so, we encourage initiating consultation with the Pamunkey Tribe on the GMP/EIS.

Thank you for offering us the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions concerning our comments, or if we may provide any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me (for archaeology) at (804)482-6088; e-mail [ethel.eaton@dhr.virginia.gov](mailto:ethel.eaton@dhr.virginia.gov), or M. Amanda Lee (for architectural issues) at (804) 482- 6092; [amanda.lee@dhr.virginia.gov](mailto:amanda.lee@dhr.virginia.gov).

Sincerely,

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Ethel R. Eaton, Ph.D., Senior Policy Analyst  
Division of Resource Services and Review


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 192

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Beth Cole

Organization: Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Department of Planning  Official Rep.

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: 100 Community Place  
Crownsville, MD 21032  
USA

E-mail: beth.cole@maryland.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-3

Date Sent: 03/22/2016 Date Received: 03/25/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 22, 20 16

Deborah Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
National Park Service  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Re: Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
Worcester County, Maryland

Dear Superintendent Darden:

Thank you for your recent letter, dated February 12, 2016 and received by the Maryland Historical Trust (Trust) on February 17, 2016, regarding the above-referenced planning effort.

Your letter provided the Trust with a copy of the draft GMP/DEIS for Assateague Island National Seashore, for review and comment. Trust staff reviewed the document pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, and the relevant provisions of the NPS Nationwide Programmatic Agreement (NPA), with regards to effects on historic and archeological properties. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the park's planning efforts with regards to historic preservation issues in the Maryland section of the property.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

The draft document presents detailed background information and discussion of the guiding principles, planning issues, resources, and alternatives NPS considered during the GMP planning and development process. Based on the information presented in the GMP, the Trust supports the NPS preferred alternative, Alternative Three - Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation. Alternative Three presents a sound basis for addressing the various resource management, visitor experience, interpretation, administrative and maintenance issues within the dynamic seashore and barrier island environments. We are pleased that the plan includes completion of an island wide archeological - overview and assessment as a common action for all the alternatives. This would provide important information on the island's archeological heritage and help inform management decisions regarding the stewardship of archeological resources. We ask that NPS keep us informed regarding the archeological overview and assessment, so we may provide relevant input.

We look forward to working with NPS to complete the Section 106 review of individual undertakings located in Maryland, during the implementation of the preferred alternative, in accordance with the streamlined review process under the NPS NPA or standard review process under 36 CFR 800. If you have questions or need further assistance, please contact Troy Nowak, Assistant Underwater Archeologist at 410-514-7668 / troy.nowak@maryland.gov or me at 410-514-7631 I beth.cole@maryland.gov. Thank you for providing us this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,




Beth Cole  
Administrator, Project Review and Compliance

EJC/TJN/201600617  
cc: Bill\_Hulslander@nps.gov

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 193

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John P. Szwed  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportsfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address:   
Hancock, NY 13783  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-4  
Date Sent: 03/22/2016 Date Received: 03/25/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 22, 2016

To  
Ms. D. Darden  
Superintendent, Assateague Island National Seashore

cc Andy Harris  
US Congressman, Md.

Subject- OSV portion of the GMP

Ms. Darden, my name is John Szwed, 68 yrs. old, NY Guide, A.M.S.A. member. Contact = jkjjswed@gmail.com. I live in the western Catskills, Upper Delaware River area 88%-90% of the year, the other 10%-12% (40+ -days) of the year, I live out on the OSV/bullpen portion of Assateague, fishing, exploring, camping, relaxing, socializing, but mostly fishing. Sometimes my wife is with me, sometimes my grown sons are with me, and sometimes I'm solo. Each trip is between 7 - 12 days, unless weather cuts it short. We "stumbled" on to Assateague Island, April of 2002 on a 3 day getaway in Ocean City. After seeing the northern tip from the boardwalk, asking questions, and taking a ride to the island, we became very interested. We did some hiking, both the north end and a little of the OSV. We were over whelmed with the uniqueness of the place and it triggered the beginning of a life change. Seeing buggies and campers on the beach woke up an old, lost dream f Spending time and surf fishing at the Jersey shore since my youth started that dream.

The following year I purchased my first OSV permit. Did 3 trips that year, 2 I stayed in the bayside campground, also did a little sika deer hunting. Couldn't get this place out of my thoughts.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



By the spring of 2004, because of this place, I had bought a new truck, a new slide in camper,. upgraded my fishing gear, and was hitting the beach monthly. Meeting new friends with good advise educating myself and not giving up, payed off with some very large fish I had the pleasure of landing and releasing. The money spent by the serious anglers is probably a lot more than most realize. New trucks/suv's, campers, gear (average \$500 for a good set-up, rod/reel/sandspike, and most have 4 or 5 set-ups out at a time with back-ups in the truck). Then there is the money spent locally, bait and ice, for me about \$150-\$200 a 10 day trip, then food, gas, and always some tackle shops. Oh yea, \$150 yr. for bullpenn permit (not complaining = good deal). I'll spend an average of \$500 per trip to focal retailers, times 5 trips/yr, and a lot spend much more with room rentals, resturants, etc. I know some that invested all, and moved to the area just because of the OSV and their passoin to surf fish.

Thru. the years I've met a lot of people on the Island, many became friends, some close, with one becomming as close as a brother. I also took up the hobbie of wrapping my own surf rods thru the influence of these new friends. It's a nice day when people I know stop by and talk for awhile maybe have breakfast or lunch, or fish along side of me. I now have more close friends I met at Assateague than I do at home! This place has brought much joy and happiness to my retirement, it energizes me. it gives me something to look forward to. Some weekday mornings I'd be fishing, and as far as the eye could see, they're would be no one on the beach, the solitude few experience these days. Try finding that anywhere else that is available to all. Some sections of Cape Cod and OBX are the closest places. What it comes down to is, I'd rather fish out on the OSV and not catch anything, than fish somewhere else and catch alot!

It is important to recreational fishing on A.I. that the OSV stay open to the state line. The southern portion of the OSV is know for better chances of big fish and the bulk of Red Drum are caught there. Not all the beach is the same, the structure in the surf along the beach changes at places due to current and underground aquifers sending up water (springs) in some places creating holes/deep spots, up to about 75 yds. out. The loose sand from these holes pile up on the sides of these holes and create points. Some come and go, some are long term (fox levels) and some are from old former channels/inlets (Green run). All of this structure makes A.I. an attraction for the fish swimming by... making it an attraction for anglers. These springs are also responsible for much of the structure on the bayside, and the ponds and marshes on parts of the island that is the freashwater source that makes it possible for a lot of wildlife to exist there. I believe that the aquifers/springs some go out a few miles, are responsible for the existance of Assateague Island as it is now. There's so much more to learn about this place.

I find it disturbing that anglers are loosing more and more access to fishing. We don't have lobbiests in DC like so many "environmental" groups do. We pay more for our fishing/hunting supplies because of the Pittman Act tax. Altering the OSV rules to restrict access would be a sad day for a lot of people and local businesses. This is a very special place that can be enjoyed in a very special way, by everybody. It would be a big plus if we had some kind of access after the plover hatch. Although I mostly fish May, Sept & Oct, June is a great time due to fish migrating, but the beach is closed, so not worth visiting at that time. Although we enjoy the vast bird life on the Island, further restrictions would be heartbreaking for many. I hope any "wilderness" wording in the GMP never affects the OSV use, size, or access.

As a superintendent of such a unique place, I hope you had a chance to absorb and enjoy the true, natural beauty of this place in solitude, without a team around you. I know that would be hard since your responsible for what goes on here and total relaxation might be impossible, but try if you can, life needs rewards! By keeping access open to the OSV many can enjoy a very rare experiance for this modern time. Isn't that what's a seashore/park is for?

Thank you for taking the time to read my point on this matter. I will try to attend the meeting in Ocean Pines, March 30, to ask some questions. Hope to see you then.

Sincerely,

John Szwed

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 194

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carol Enemark  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-5  
Date Sent: 04/01/2016 Date Received: 04/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Rebuild dunes, plant seagrass and add fencing to the Virginia side of Assateague south of parking lot. Consider eliminating OSV in that area. Maintain buffer to parking lot after each storm to minimize damage. Raise cost of entrance fee. Establish walkways to access beach and do not allow people to walk on seagrass and dunes. Have more areas for people to clam and oyster.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 195

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: E. Herrick  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-5  
Date Sent: 03/30/2016 Date Received: 04/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I could support Alternative #3, but with some reservations. I am very skeptical of the number of commercial partnerships. I would like to see the NPS and MD DNR run all of the operations, including the ferries. I don't know whether we need three new bayside access points. The greater number of access points, the more people are greater the crowding may be. I would only like to see shuttles if vehicle spaces were lost as I would not like to see busloads of people descending across the dunes further crowding the beaches. I would hope that any shuttles would be all electric and green and not diesel as there is no such thing as clean diesel and the fuel spills and diesel exhaust would be very polluting to people and the island. If ferries are utilized I would like to see them be electric solar powered like the Duffy boats, or if that is not possible gas or low impact diesel like the Lewes Ferry is going to, as the fumes are very obnoxious and hazardous to our lungs, prove to cause lung cancer.

I support the idea of future land acquisition to the west if as much open, natural space is left as possible. I don't think anything should be done with the visitor center at this time as it is very beautiful as it is, but planning could be done for future need.

I would like to see only non-motorized boats, i.e., canoes, kayaks on the island and try to keep the island as natural and primitive as possible. Too much commercialization and too many people will spoil the island. It would be great to have the beaches all self-policed as "non-smoking" and bonfires restricted to dusk until in certain areas only. (Thank you. Please keep Assateague wild! We don't want another place as Ocean City.)

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 196

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Allen Sklar  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Bishopville, MD 21813  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-7  
Date Sent: Date Received: 04/05/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Debbie Darden  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7260 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

From:

Allen Sklar  
10656 Piney Island Drive  
Bishopville, Maryland

My comments regarding the GMP Assateague Island follow. They are directed at one specific point, continued access to the Over Sand Vehicle area. Any change in current use/access will adversely affect the public's appreciation of Assateague, forever removing the photographic capture of wildlife interaction, documentation of physical changes, and removal of access to the history laden hunting past of the island. On top of that the historic tradition of surf fishing will die. I'm sure you have heard plenty from folks who recreate on the beach with their families so I will not dwell on that topic though it is just as important as the ones I will feature.

Fishing: Why it matters:

For twenty years I have obsessively fished the surf on Assateague. As with migratory birds, so move the fish, up and down the coast. Hard core surf fishermen live for the few weeks. When trophy size fish are within casting range of the surf bank. This activity by humans on Assateague has been going on since before there were automobiles. And while the fish of old were killed and eaten today most of us practice "catch and release" for large fish. Assateague's OSV is the northernmost

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

beach on the Atlantic coast where large Channel Bass (aka red drum) can possibly be caught.

These giant Drum alone are enough reason to never restrict the current OSV, but on top of that, all of the record Coastal Striped Bass (Rockfish) and Bluefish have also been caught within Assateague OSV area.

Restricting access in any way to the 12 miles of fishing area we currently use would be a travesty in the worst way, killing the both the fishing history of the island and one of its most incredible features in one terrible decision.

#### Photography: Why It Matters

OK I confess to being a photographer/naturalist. I spend more than a hundred days a year on island with either cameras or rods, sometimes both. My love of nature photography even exceeds that of fishing. Award winning images I have captured in the OSV zone have been featured in magazines, used by the DNR, even featured on the cover of the GMP we are discussing. While the typical visitor never intimately sees the backside .forests, marshes, and dune zones of the OSV, I have spent twenty years trekking there, absorbing everything I can. It is there I documented the first Goshawk ever photographed on island, the first Snowy Owl transmitter fitting, and Peregrine researchers drawing blood from falcon..... these moments have been some of the most interesting and photographically satisfying of my 65 years. If my driving access is limited in any way the beauty of Assateague's backside and front side cannot be shared with anyone, another travesty.

#### Hiking/Exploring/History: Why it matters

Besides fishing and photography the OSV provides people with access to the ultimate solitude, winter hiking. On winter walks I often return to the old gunning lodges where my current friends hunted and gunned more than fifty years ago. When I want more isolation I can follow a horse path to some of the most isolated and unknown areas of the island. It was recently down near the Virginia line in such a place I photographed my first Golden Eagle on Assateague.

Over the years I've had an Eagle fly mere feet from me, seen Peregrines eating ducks on the beach, walked on a whale carcass, seen dozens of seals, and watched Snowy Owls for hours. I feel strongly the essence of Assateague lies in this area and any closures (beyond for piping plovers) should never be considered. I totally understand that a back country camper who had to walk 12 miles to his campsite may resent my presence in my truck on the beach, however there were trucks on the beach before there were campsites.

Thank you for reading my comments. Allen Sklar

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 197

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Thomas W. Bowden, Sr.  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-8  
Date Sent: 04/04/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am Thomas W. Bowden, Sr.

I have been working on the water for 47 years catching horseshoe crabs. They have been my livelihood. It's all I've done. It has helped me to raise 3 sons and 1 daughter. And has helped take care of my grandchildren.

I was born and raised on Chincoteague Island. I hope to keep on doing this for as long as I can. I would like for my children and their children to have the same opportunity as I have had because it has been a very good living for me and my family.

If it were not for Tom's Cove I would not be able to make the living I have done.

My family has always been watermen and has worked in Tom's Cove.

If you see fit to take this away from me you'll take away my ability to make a living and no one is going to hire me at 65 years old.

Just imagine if someone would come in and tell you that we are going to take your livelihood away. How would you be able to cope if you were 65 years old and they told you to find another occupation. Why change something that has worked for generations? We haven't hurt the land or destroyed any environment. It has been a great living for me and I hope to continue until I die.

I also work with the VMRC. My license number is 0214.

Thank you very much,

Thomas W. Bowden, Sr.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 198

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carol Smith  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Darien, IL 60561  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-9  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Deborah,

I am a part time resident on Chincoteague for 20+ years.

However the plan evolves, please be sure to have no time period during summer tourist season when beach access is prohibited. We cannot risk families planning vacation around beach activities only to find "CLOSED" signs. A day or two may not sound like a lot for planners, but it is a bad experience for beach goers.

The topic of horseshoe crab harvesting needs to be revisited. To watermen the technical classification of this species as arachnid is meaningless and has no value to people making a living from the ocean. Please consider restoring watermen full ability to harvest this species.

About ponies, I am not sure if you have input into herd size and management, but the south of Beach Road group has less and less forage, so consider phasing the number down and transfer to north herd location.




# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 199

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Bettina Sullivan

Organization: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  Official Rep.

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: PO Box 1105  
Richmond, VA 23218  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-10 and E-7

Date Sent: 04/11/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 11, 2016

Superintendent Deborah Darden Assateague Island National Seashore 7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

RE: Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement: Assateague Island National Seashore (DEQ 16-026F)

Dear Ms. Darden:

The Commonwealth of Virginia has completed its review of the response to comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the above-referenced project. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is responsible for coordinating Virginia's review of federal environmental documents prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and responding to appropriate federal officials on behalf of the Commonwealth. DEQ is also responsible for coordinating Virginia's review of federal consistency documents submitted pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and providing the state's response (see Federal Consistency Under the CZMA on page 3). This letter is in response to the January 2016 Draft EIS for the above referenced project. The following agencies participated in this review:

Department of Environmental Quality  
Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (VDACS)  
Department of Conservation and Recreation (OCR)  
Marine Resources Commission (VMRC)  
Department of Health (VDH)  
Department of Historic Resources (OHR)  
Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF)  
Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

The Department of Forestry, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Town of Chincoteague, Accomack County and the Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission also were invited to comment.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The National Park Service (NPS), part of the U.S. Department of the Interior submitted a Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for review and compliance with NEPA. The GMP is a policy-level document that defines the park's purpose and guides planning and management decisions into the future. The purpose of the Assateague Island National Seashore is to preserve the coastal resources of Assateague Island and to provide high quality recreational opportunities that are in-tune with the resources of the island. The seashore is a 37-mile barrier island following the eastern shores of Maryland and Virginia from the Ocean City inlet to Toms Cove Hook. It includes the 850-acre Assateague State Park in Maryland (owned by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources) and the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia (managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). Four planning management alternatives were considered with emphasis given to climate change and sea level rise, as two important factors that will influence the future of the seashore. The management alternatives are:

- Alternative 1: The "no action" alternative continues the current management strategy and implements projects that are presently funded or approved as is.
- Alternative 2: This alternative provides for concentrated traditional beach recreation within a high density developed area in Maryland, accessible by private vehicle. Artificial dune fortification and beach nourishment would occur in the developed area, while backcountry areas would be allowed to evolve naturally.
- Alternative 3 (Preferred Alternative): The NPS preferred alternative puts an emphasis on climate change adaption and over time, natural processes would become the dominant force shaping the island. Visitor infrastructure would evolve to include more sustainable designs and facilities would be sited in more stable locations. Some active management to sustain recreational uses would occur, including limited maintenance of the artificial dune system. Breach management protocols would balance the natural coastal processes that shape the island with consideration for human safety and infrastructure protection. Planning and development of potential water access points to the seashore would occur in preparation for possible loss of traditional vehicular access. The visitor experience would be focused on sustainable recreation.
- Alternative 4: This alternative allows for the island to evolve naturally, without active management, and subject to the full effects of natural coastal processes, including climate change and seas level rise. In Maryland, existing visitor infrastructure would remain in the developed areas, until such time as they are lost or damaged by natural processes. Over time visitor use would shift towards day-use activities in a more primitive island setting.

For Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, in Virginia, the NPS would continue to support beach oriented recreational uses on the island developed area within Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge. NPS would continue to manage the beach in accordance with the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NPS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Through the MOU, the NPS has management responsibility for providing public recreation opportunities in the Virginia Assigned Area, currently Toms Cove, of the refuge. The FWS's Final EIS and Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge support the continued management of the beach and associated parking by NPS. Additionally, it recognized that the current parking area is vulnerable to the effects of coastal erosion and sea level rise and proposes that the beach and parking area move to an area 1 .5 miles north of the existing beach over time and as conditions warrant. Until the beach moves, NPS would maintain the Toms Cove Visitor Center. After the move, the center would be used for environmental education programs until the building is no longer serviceable. Regarding marine resources, the NPS would collaborate with Maryland, Virginia, and local communities to protect the marine landscape and way of life, in addition to protecting seashore resources. Virginia and Maryland would continue to manage shellfishing within the seashore and NPS would issue a special use permit to VMRC to continue to allow commercial aquaculture within Virginia. The harvest of horseshoe crabs would be prohibited, as proposed by the FWS Final CCP.

## FEDERAL CONSISTENCY UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, activities both within and outside of the Commonwealth's designated coastal zone with reasonably foreseeable effects on any coastal uses or resources resulting from a federal agency activity (15 CFR Part 930, Subpart C) must be consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with Virginia's Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program. The Virginia CZM Program consists of a network of programs administered by several agencies. DEQ coordinates the review of federal consistency determinations (FCDs) with agencies administering the enforceable policies of the Virginia CZM Program.

According to the cover letter (dated January 29, 2016) submitted with the GMP and DEIS, a specific FCD was not developed due to the broad scope and programmatic nature of the draft GMP and EIS. However, Section 930.31 (a) of the federal consistency regulations define federal agency activities as including "a plan that is used to direct future agency actions." In addition, state federal consistency lists identify federal agencies and activities that the state believes will have reasonably foreseeable coastal effects. Consistency is triggered by the "reasonably foreseeable effects" test. Accomack County is within Virginia's designated coastal zone. Also, the acquisition and management of lands, including development of master plans for national parks and seashores, by the NPS is a listed activity in the Virginia CZM Program (<https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/consistency/media/va.pdf>). The Virginia CZM Program believes• that the proposed plan would have reasonably foreseeable effects on Virginia's coastal zone. Whether an activity is listed or not, it is the federal agency's responsibility to provide the Virginia CZM Program with consistency determinations for federal agency activities affecting the coastal zone. If the NPS believes that there are no reasonable foreseeable coastal effects, then Section 930.35 of the federal consistency regulations require that a federal agency submit a negative determination for a federal agency activity which is identified by a state agency on its list. See Item 13 under the Regulatory and Coordination Needs Section for additional information.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

1. Water Quality and Wetlands. The DEIS (page 4-17) states that under the preferred alternative (Alternative 3) seashore management would allow the island to evolve naturally. Visitor use infrastructure would evolve to more sustainable designs and shift to more stable locations. Wetlands would be avoided, but new sites would be within the 100-year floodplain. The natural resource management approach would seek to enhance the resiliency of saltmarsh habitats and inland wetlands, with improved water quality being the expected outcome. Some adverse impacts associated with this alternative include potential water contamination associated with private motorboat use, oversand vehicle use, routine seashore operations and maintenance, and use of chemical treatments for pest management.

1(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The State Water Control Board promulgates Virginia's water regulations covering a variety of permits to include the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (VPDES) regulating point source discharges to surface waters, Virginia Pollution Abatement Permit regulating sewage sludge, storage and land application of biosolids, industrial wastes (sludge and wastewater), municipal wastewater, and animal wastes, the Surface and Groundwater Withdrawal Permit, and the Virginia Water Protection (VWP) Permit regulating impacts to streams, wetlands, and other surface waters. The VWP permit is a state permit which governs wetlands, surface water, and surface water withdrawals and impoundments. It also serves as §401 certification of the federal Clean Water Act §404 permits for dredge and fill activities in waters of the U.S. The VWP Permit Program is under the Office of Wetlands and Stream Protection, within the DEQ Division of Water Permitting. In addition to central office staff that review and issue VWP permits for transportation and water withdrawal projects, the six DEQ regional offices perform permit application reviews and issue permits for the covered activities:

- Clean Water Act, §401;
- Section 404(b)(i) Guidelines Mitigation Memorandum of Agreement (2/90 State Water Control Law, Virginia Code section 62.1-44.15:20 et seq.; and
- State Water Control Regulations, 9 VAC 25-210-10.

1(b) Agency Findings. The DEQ Tidewater Regional Office (TRO) did not comment on specific wetlands impacts. For Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

impacts to surface waters, authorization from the VWP Program must be received prior to construction.

The possible wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) at the FWS Maintenance Facility in Virginia will require a VPDES permit if it is to discharge to surface water.

1 (c) Requirement.

- Submit a Joint Permit Application for any impacts to surface waters.
- Coordinate with DEQ TRO regarding the submittal of a Certificate to Construct (CTC) and Certificate to Operate (CTO) for the WWTP at the FWS Maintenance Facility in Virginia, if that wastewater treatment option is chosen.
- Submit a VPDES permit application to TRO if the WWTP will be constructed.

2. Subaqueous Lands and Tidal Wetlands. According to the DEIS (page 4-18), working with Virginia, the NPS would assess the legal status of owned structures (oyster watch house and hunting blinds) located within the seashore's Virginia waters and pursue removal of unauthorized structures. For authorized structures, NPS would work to ensure appropriate wastewater treatment. When vehicular access to the island ceases, access would shift to a ferry-based operation. New facilities near the existing seashore headquarters would include a ferry terminal, docking facilities, offices, and associated infrastructure. During construction, dredging, placement of piers, construction of bulkheads, and disposal of dredged material would potentially impact subaqueous lands. Some wetland areas could be lost or adversely impacted by development of ferry docking facilities.

2(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) regulates encroachments in, on or over state-owned subaqueous beds as well as tidal wetlands pursuant to Virginia Code §28.2-1200 through 1400. For nontidal waterways, VMRC states that it has been the policy of the Habitat Management Division to exert jurisdiction only over the beds of perennial streams where the upstream drainage area is 5 square miles or greater. The beds of such waterways are considered public below the ordinary high water line.

2(b) Agency Finding. The VMRC has indicated that they are drafting comments to submit to the NPS.

3. Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management. The DEIS (page 4- 17) states that the NPS would strive to utilize non-structural stormwater management techniques, and alternatives in design and construction of new facilities to limit stormwater runoff and potential impacts to water quality as a result of erosion. These efforts would include the use of alternatives to asphalt paving, to improve groundwater recharge and reduce runoff, erosion, and sheetflow from impervious sites. During construction of new facilities, best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented to address stormwater management and water quality protection.

3(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The DEQ Office of Stormwater Management (OSWM) administers the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law and Regulations (VESCL&R) and the Virginia Stormwater Management Law and Regulations (VSWML&R). Also, DEQ is responsible for the issuance, denial, revocation, termination and enforcement of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities related to municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and construction activities for the control of stormwater discharges from MS4s and land-disturbing activities under the Virginia Stormwater Management Program.

3(b) Requirements.

3(b)(i) Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management Plans. The applicant and its authorized agents conducting regulated land-disturbing activities on private and public lands in the state must comply with VESCL&R and VSWML&R, including coverage under the general permit for stormwater discharge from construction activities, and other applicable federal nonpoint source pollution mandates (e.g. Clean Water Act-Section 313). Clearing and grading activities, installation of staging areas, parking lots, roads, buildings, utilities, borrow areas, soil stockpiles, and related land disturbing activities that result in the total land disturbance of equal to or greater than 10,000 square feet or 2,500 square feet on lands analogous

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

to Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas would be regulated by VESCL&R. Accordingly, the applicant must prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control (ESC) plan to ensure compliance with state law and regulations. The ESC plan is submitted to the DEQ regional office that serves the area where the project is located for review for compliance. The applicant is ultimately responsible for achieving project compliance through oversight of on-site contractors, regular field inspection, prompt action against non-compliant sites, and other mechanisms consistent with agency policy (Reference: VESCL 62.1-44.15 et seq.).

3(b)(ii) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities (VAR10). The operator or owner of a construction project involving land-disturbing activities equal to or greater than one acre is required to register for coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater from Construction Activities and develop a project-specific stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must be prepared prior to submission of the registration statement for coverage under the general permit and the SWPPP must address water quality and quantity in accordance with the VSMP Permit Regulations. General information and registration forms for the General Permit are available on DEQ's website at <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/Water/StormwaterManagement/VSMP/Permits/ConstructionGeneralPermit.aspx> (Reference: VSWML 62.1-44.15 et seq.; VSMP Permit Regulations 9VAC 25-870-10 et seq.).

4. Air Quality. The DEIS (page 1-38) states that air quality was an impact that was dismissed from further analysis. All alternatives would have local, short-term impacts on air quality due to fugitive dust. Operation of construction equipment would result in temporary increase in vehicle emissions and exhaust. The long-term impacts to air quality resulting from local traffic and vehicle idling during peak visitation periods would be negligible.

4(a) Agency Jurisdiction. DEQ's Air Division, on behalf of the State Air Pollution Control Board, is responsible for developing regulations that implement Virginia's Air Pollution Control Law. DEQ is charged with carrying out mandates of the state law and related regulations as well as Virginia's federal obligations under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990. The objective is to protect and enhance public health and quality of life through control and mitigation of air pollution. The division ensures the safety and quality of air in Virginia by monitoring and analyzing air quality data, regulating sources of air pollution, and working with local, state and federal agencies to plan and implement strategies to protect Virginia's air quality. The appropriate regional office is directly responsible for the issuance of necessary permits to construct and operate all stationary sources in the region as well as monitoring emissions from these sources for compliance. As a part of this mandate, environmental impact reports of projects to be undertaken in the state are also reviewed. In the case of certain projects, additional evaluation and demonstration must be made under the general conformity provisions of state and federal law.

4(b) Ozone Attainment Area. According to the DEQ Air Division, the project site is located in an ozone attainment area.

4(c) Requirements.

4(c)(i) Open Burning. If the project activities include any open burning or use of special incineration devices in the disposal of land clearing debris, this activity must meet the requirements under 9VAC5-130 et seq. of the regulations for open burning, and it may require a permit. The regulations provide for, but do not require, the local adoption of a model ordinance concerning open burning. The responsible party should contact the locality to determine what local requirements, if any exist.

4(c)(ii) Fugitive Dust. As applicable, fugitive dust must be kept to a minimum by using control methods outlined in 9VAC5-50-60 et seq. of the Regulations for the Control and Abatement of Air Pollution. These precautions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Use, where possible, water or chemicals for dust control;
- Install and use hoods, fans and fabric filters to enclose and vent the handling of dusty materials;
- Cover open equipment for conveying materials; and

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

- Promptly remove spilled or tracked dirt or other materials from paved streets and dried sediments resulting from soil erosion.

4(c)(iii) Fuel-Burning Equipment. Fuel-burning equipment (boilers, generators, compressors, etc.) or any other air-pollution-emitting equipment may be subject to registration or permitting requirements.

5. Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas. The DEIS does not include a specific discussion on Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas.

5(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The DEQ Office of Local Government Programs administers the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (Virginia Code §62.1-44.15:67 et seq.) and Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations (9 VAC 25-830-10 et seq.). Each Tidewater locality must adopt a program based on the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations. The Act and regulations recognize local government responsibility for land use decisions and are designed to establish a framework for compliance without dictating precisely what local programs must look like. Local governments have flexibility to develop water quality preservation programs that reflect unique local characteristics and embody other community goals. Such flexibility also facilitates innovative and creative approaches in achieving program objectives. The regulations address nonpoint source pollution by identifying and protecting certain lands called Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas. The regulations use a resourcebased approach that recognizes differences between various land forms and treats them differently.

5(b) Agency Findings. DEQ OLGP did not comment on the GMP or DEIS for the Assateague Island National Seashore. Their comments on the recent review of the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges Comprehensive Conservation Plan dated (September 29, 0215) are attached for reference and summarized below.

Accomack County's local Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program includes designated Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas; however, CBPAs are not designated on federally owned lands. The refuges include lands that would be analogous to Resource Protection Areas and Resource Management Areas.

5(c) Requirements. NPS must ensure that proposed activities are implemented consistent with the requirements in the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (Virginia Code §62.1-44.15:67 et seq.) and Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations (9 VAC 25-830-10 et seq.).

6. Shellfish Sanitation. The draft EIS (page 2-25) states that desired conditions for shellfish will be achieved through collaboration with states and partners; the states will continue to manage shellfishing. Periodic pumping of vault toilets associated with visitor infrastructure could result in inadvertent spills of untreated wastewater.

6(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The VDH's Division of Shellfish Sanitation is responsible for protecting the health of the consumers of molluscan shellfish and crustacea by ensuring that shellfish growing waters are properly classified for harvesting, and that molluscan shellfish and crustacea processing facilities meet sanitation standards. The mission of this Division is to minimize the risk of disease from molluscan shellfish and crustacean products at the wholesale level by classifying shellfish waters for safe commercial and recreational harvest; by implementing a statewide regulatory inspection program for commercial processors and shippers; and by providing technical guidance and assistance to the shellfish and crustacea industries regarding technical and public health issues.

6(b) Agency Comment. The VDH Office of Shellfish Sanitation determined that the document, as drafted, will not change the current classification of shellfish waters in the area.

7. Solid and Hazardous Waste Management. The DEIS (page 4-23) states that handling solid waste in transit from the island to disposal sites on the mainland may pose a risk of accidental spills that could introduce contaminants into the environment. Spill prevention and response actions would be implemented to minimize the potential for contamination resulting from solid waste handling at the site.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

7(a) Agency Jurisdiction. On behalf of the Virginia Waste Management Board, the DEQ Division of Land Protection and Revitalization is responsible for carrying out the mandates of the Virginia Waste Management Act (Virginia Code §10.1-1400 et seq.), as well as meeting Virginia's federal obligations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act, commonly known as Superfund. The DEQ Division of Land Protection and Revitalization also administers those laws and regulations on behalf of the State Water Control Board governing Petroleum Storage Tanks (Virginia Code §62.1-44.34:8 et seq.), including Aboveground Storage Tanks (9VAC25-91 et seq.) and Underground Storage Tanks (9VAC25-580 et seq. and 9VAC25-580-370 et seq.), also known as 'Virginia Tank Regulations', and § 62.1-44.34:14 et seq. which covers oil spills.

Virginia:

- Virginia Waste Management Act, Virginia Code § 10.1-1400 et seq.
- Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations, 9 VAC 20-81
  - o (9 VAC 20-81-620 applies to asbestos-containing materials)
- Virginia Hazardous Waste Management Regulations, 9 VAC 20-60
  - o (9 VAC 20-60-261 applies to lead-based paints)
- Virginia Regulations for the Transportation of Hazardous Materials, 9 VAC 20-110.

Federal:

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S. Code sections 6901 et seq.
- U.S. Department of Transportation Rules for Transportation of Hazardous Materials, 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 107
- Applicable rules contained in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

7(b) Agency Findings. The DEQ Division of Land Protection and Revitalization (DLPR) conducted a cursory review of its database files, including a Geographic Information System search (100-foot radius) and found no waste sites of concern in close proximity to the Virginia park sites.

7(c) Requirements.

7(c)(i) Generated Waste. Test and dispose of any soil that is suspected of contamination or wastes that are generated during construction-related activities in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations.

7(c)(ii) Asbestos-containing Material and lead-based Paint

All structures being demolished or removed should be checked for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) (such as insulation) and lead-based paint (LBP) prior to construction. If ACM or LBP are found, in addition to the federal waste-related regulations mentioned above, state regulations 9 VAC 20-80-640 for ACM and 9 VAC 20-60-261 for LBP must be followed.

7(c)(iii) Petroleum Releases. If evidence of a petroleum release is discovered during implementation of this project, it must be reported to DEQ, as authorized by Virginia Code § 62.1-44.34.8 through 9 and 9 VAC 25-580-10 et seq.

7(c)(iv) Fuel Storage Tanks

The installation and use of an aboveground storage tank (AST) (>660 gallons) for temporary fuel storage (> 120 days) during the project must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Virginia Tank Regulations 9 VAC 25-91-10 et seq.

7(d) Agency Recommendations. DEQ encourages all projects and facilities to implement pollution prevention principles, including:

- o the reduction, reuse and recycling of all solid wastes generated; and
- o the minimization and proper handling of generated hazardous wastes.

8. Natural Heritage Resources. According to the DEIS (page 4-48), Alternative 3 could have both beneficial and adverse Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

impacts on vegetation and habitat. Habitat disturbances could occur during construction of new visitor facilities. Adversely affected areas would be forest, shrubland, dunes and grassland habitat on the island, and upland forest on the mainland. Beneficial impacts resulting from the action include the restoration of natural surface and groundwater flows in saltmarsh habitat and a reduction of sedimentation in saltmarsh, forest and shrubland, inland wetland, and dunes and grassland habitat. Additionally, the action will foster a return to natural conditions in areas where land use or construction of new facilities have damaged or caused a loss of natural habitat (DEIS, page 4-49).

S(a) Agency Jurisdiction.

8(a)(i) The Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation's (OCR) Division of Natural Heritage (DNH). DNH's mission is conserving Virginia's biodiversity through inventory, protection and stewardship. The Virginia Natural Area Preserves Act (Virginia Code §10.1-209 through 217), authorized OCR to maintain a statewide database for conservation planning and project review, protect land for the conservation of biodiversity, and to protect and ecologically manage the natural heritage resources of Virginia (the habitats of rare, threatened and endangered species, significant natural communities, geologic sites, and other natural features).

8(a)(ii) The Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (VDACS). The Endangered Plant and Insect Species Act of 1979 (Virginia Code Chapter 39 §3.1- 1020 through 1030) authorizes VD ACS to conserve, protect and manage endangered and threatened species of plants and insects. Under a Memorandum of Agreement established between VDACS and the OCR, OCR represents VDACS in comments regarding potential impacts on state-listed threatened and endangered plant and insect species.

8(b) Agency Findings. OCR has searched its Biotics Data System for occurrences of natural heritage resources from the area outlined on the submitted maps associated with the Assateague Island National Seashore Draft General Management Plan. The site is located within the Assateague Island Conservation Site. Assateague Island Conservation Site has been given a biodiversity significance ranking of 81, which represents a site of outstanding significance. The natural heritage resources within the project area are included in the attached Table 1: Assateague Island National Seashore General Management Plan - Natural Heritage Resources (attached). OCR supports efforts to maintain lands to maximize habitat and wildlife management strategies for rare, threatened and endangered species, migratory birds and resident wildlife for all of the proposed alternatives. OCR also supports ongoing research by the National Park Service and others to benefit threatened and endangered species as stated in The Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Assateague Island National Seashore (GMP/EIS), 2016, p 4-84. OCR supports the expansion of natural resource management actions that restore island habitats, remove invasive *Phragmites australis*, manage the deer populations and once access is lost, the removal of visitor facilities to allow developed areas to return to natural conditions (p 4-99).

B(b)(i) State-listed Plant and Insect Species. The project or activity may impact Seabeach amaranth, a state rare plant. VOACS found that the draft management plan for the Assateague Island National Seashore addresses concerns regarding Seabeach amaranth. It is anticipated from the statements contained in the document that efforts will be taken to preserve, and potentially benefit, this and other threatened and endangered species on the island.

B(b)(ii) State Natural Area Preserves.

OCR files do not indicate the presence of any State Natural Area Preserves under the agency's jurisdiction at either project site.

8(c) OCR Recommendations.

- Avoid of documented natural heritage resources including the mapped natural communities when planning for potential development and placement of new facilities. To obtain the Natural Heritage digital data for the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge/Assateague Island National Seashore for use in planning and management of natural heritage resources, please contact Rene Hypes, Environmental Review Coordinator, at [rene.hypes@dcv.virginia.gov](mailto:rene.hypes@dcv.virginia.gov) or 804-371-2708 with your request. VDACS concurs with this recommendation with regard to those species under the regulatory authority of the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



- Perform a new inventory of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge/Assateague Island National Seashore (CNWR/AINS) in order to accurately document the current location and extent of natural heritage resources within the CNWR/AINS and allow for appropriate planning based on current information. Many of the resources were documented in the late 1990s or early 2000s and have not recently been field verified. VDACS concurs with this recommendation.
- OCR-Division of Natural Heritage biologists are qualified and available to conduct inventories for rare, threatened, and endangered species. Contact J. Christopher Ludwig, Natural Heritage Inventory Manager, at [chris.ludwig@dcr.virginia.gov](mailto:chris.ludwig@dcr.virginia.gov) or 804-371-6206 to discuss arrangements for field work. A list of other individuals who are qualified to conduct inventories may be obtained from the FWS.
- Coordinate with FWS to ensure compliance with protected species legislation regarding the following species: the Loggerhead sea turtle, Piping plover, the Delmarva fox squirrel, and the Seabeach amaranth.
- Re-submit project information and map for an update on this natural heritage information if the scope of the project changes and/or six months has passed before it is utilized.

9. Wildlife Resources. Wildlife resources stand to be impacted and benefitted by the proposed alternative (DEIS, page 4-75). Adverse impacts resulting from construction of new visitor use facilities would include habitat loss and disturbances.

Beneficial impacts would result over the long-term from the continuation of certain management actions that would enhance wildlife habitats. Seashore management would allow the island to evolve naturally, benefitting the wildlife inhabiting the beach, intertidal areas, dunes, grasslands, and saltmarshes. Visitor use infrastructure would evolve in a more sustainable fashion and over time development on the island would become less intensive (DEIS, page 4-70).

9(a) Agency Jurisdiction. DGIF, as the Commonwealth's wildlife and freshwater fish management agency, exercises enforcement and regulatory jurisdiction over wildlife and freshwater fish, including state- or federally-listed endangered or threatened species, but excluding listed insects (Virginia Code, Title 29.1 ). DGIF is a consulting agency under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.Code §661 et seq.) and provides environmental analysis of projects or permit applications coordinated through DEQ and several other state and federal agencies. DGIF determines likely impacts upon fish and wildlife resources and habitat, and recommends appropriate measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for those impacts. For more information, see the DGIF website at [www.dgif.virginia.gov](http://www.dgif.virginia.gov).

9(b) Agency Findings. Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS) lies within the states of Virginia and Maryland. The southern section of AINS, totaling approximately 10,000 acres, is located within Virginia and is encompassed within Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CNWR), managed by the FWS. According to the Draft GMP/EIS, the only lands within Virginia that fall under the management authority of NPS are those associated with the Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station. All other Virginia lands will be managed by the FWS in accordance with the recently finalized Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP).

Assateague Island and associated waters in Virginia are known to support, at some time during the year, federal-listed threatened piping plovers, state-listed threatened peregrine falcons, federal-listed threatened loggerhead sea turtles, federal-listed threatened green sea turtles, federal-listed endangered Kemp's Ridley sea turtles, VA Wildlife Action Plan Tier 11 northern diamond-backed terrapins, and the recently de-listed Delmarva Peninsula fox squirrels. During review of the draft CCP for CNWR, DGIF provided the attached comments (dated July 22, 2014) and recommendations in support of Alternative B: A Balanced Approach, the FWS's preferred alternative plan for management of CNWR. It is possible that Delmarva Peninsula fox squirrels on Assateague Island have moved from CNWR to areas north of the Virginia border. As described in Alternative 3: Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation, the NPS's preferred alternative, Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station is located within the Cultural Resource Zone and is proposed to be protected and maintained in situ, including activities to keep historically relevant structures in good repair. This alternative also states that NPS will actively seek out partners to rehabilitate and protect these structures. Protective actions may include non-structural bayside shoreline stabilization for protection against storm and wave action.

9(c) Agency Recommendation.

- The NPS should work closely with FWS to survey for the Delmarva Peninsula fox squirrel in all suitable habitats within the
- Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

boundaries of Assateague Island National Seashore and work cooperatively to monitor and manage any documented populations of this species and their habitats in Maryland in

- accordance with CNWR's CCP.
- Shoreline stabilization activities associated with the protection of the U.S. Coast Guard Station should be completed in accordance with living shoreline or other ecologically sound and sensitive design principles. NPS should coordinate closely with FWS to ensure adherence to the CNWR CCP.
- Adhere to the CNWR CCP, particularly as it relates to the protection of sensitive wildlife species and unique habitats.

9(d) Agency Conclusion.

Provided adherence to the above recommendations, DGIF are supportive of continued management of Assateague Island within in Virginia by the FWS, as described in all of the alternatives still under consideration in the draft GMP/EIS for AINS.

10. Public Water Supply. The DEIS (page 3-59) states that at Toms Cove Beach in Virginia, wells along the parking area perimeter are used for potable water and cold water showers.

10(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Virginia Department of Health (VDH) Office of Drinking Water (ODW) reviews projects for the potential to impact public drinking water sources (groundwater wells, springs and surface water intakes). VDH administers both federal and state laws governing waterworks operation.

10(b) Agency Findings. VDH ODW states that there are no apparent impacts to public drinking water sources due to this project. There are no public groundwater wells within a 1-mile radius of the project site. There are no surface water intakes located within a 5- mile radius of the project site. The project is not within the watershed of any public surface water intakes.

11. Septic Tanks and Drainfields. The DEIS (page 4-9) states that at the FWS Maintenance Facility in Virginia, development of seventeen additional bedrooms for seasonal employees would result in additional potable water usage and the need for wastewater treatment infrastructure. Potable water would be obtained from a new groundwater well or by tapping in to the Wallops Island potable water system. Wastewater treatment would be achieved via the installation of a package plant or a community on-site wastewater disposal system.

11 (a) Agency Jurisdiction. The mission of the VDH Onsite Sewage and Water Services is to protect public health and ground water quality. This is best achieved by implementing an onsite wastewater program based on sound scientific, engineering, and public health principles.

11 (b) Agency Requirement. Coordinate with the Virginia Department of Health if an alternative system that does not discharge is chosen for the FWS Maintenance Facility. Potential impacts to public water distribution systems or sanitary sewage collection systems must be verified by the local utility.

12. Historic and Archaeological Resources. According to the DEIS (page 4-115) some adverse impacts to historic resources are expected as some structures eligible for the National Register of Historic Places would be lost due to natural coastal processes under the Preferred Alternative.

12 (a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Virginia DHR conducts reviews of both federal and state projects to determine their effect on historic properties. Under the federal process, DHR is the State Historic Preservation Office, and ensures that federal undertakings - including licenses, permits, or funding - comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulation at 36 CFR Part 800. Section 106 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of federal projects on properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. For state projects or activities on state lands, DHR is afforded an opportunity to review and comment on (1) the demolition of state property; (2) major state projects requiring an EIR; (3) archaeological investigations on state-controlled land; (4) projects that involve a landmark listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register; (5) the sale or lease of surplus state property; (6) exploration and recovery of underwater historic properties; and (7) excavation or removal of archaeological or historic features from caves. See DHR's website for more information about applicable state and federal laws and how to submit an

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

application for review: [http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/State Stewardship/ Index.htm](http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/State%20Stewardship/Index.htm).

12 (b) Agency Findings. DHR supports Alternative 3, Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation, the National Park Service preferred alternative for the future management of the seashore lands and waters under its jurisdiction.

Regarding archaeological sites, DHR states that there is a critical need to collect baseline data about the spatial, historical and cultural contexts of the prehistoric sites, followed by periodic monitoring of identified resources in order to more effectively manage them. Presently there is little archaeological survey data available for most of the island.

The Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station and its Cultural Landscape are considered eligible for both the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Under alternative 3, management actions would protect and maintain the Assateague Beach U.S. Coast Guard Station in situ until the site and/or structures are no longer sustainable. DHR notes that there are no management strategies proposed to address the access problem to the station which has resulted in the facility being underutilized and vacant.

12 (c) Agency Recommendation.

- OHR strongly encourages including effective ways to address the unavoidable impacts to cultural resources associated with natural coastal processes and the effects of climate change/sea level rise in the future management strategies in the GMP.
- OHR strongly encourages NPS not to drop archaeological resources from consideration in the GMP but to include archaeological resources together with other Cultural Resources (Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes).
- OHR recommends that Section 2.6.5 Cultural Resource Management (NPS Preferred Alternative) includes a management strategy of conducting baseline archaeological survey and monitoring. Failure to do so may be considered an adverse impact, and inconsistent with the directives of Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, as well as Bulletin 28.
- OHR encourages the NPS to include as a management strategy partnering with the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges in the NPS's wreck monitoring program, which will serve both as a useful monitoring tool for cultural resources as well as for assessing the movement of the barrier islands.
- OHR encourages the NPS to explore partnerships to rehabilitate and reuse the U.S. Coast Guard Station, such as with the Chincoteague and Wallops Island National Wildlife Refuges, potentially including the Station as a venue for environmental education.
- Coordinate with the Pamunkey Tribe on the GMP/EIS, in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA.

13. Pesticides and Herbicides. In general, when pesticides or herbicides must be used, their use should be strictly in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. In addition, DEQ recommends that the responsible agent use the least toxic pesticides or herbicides effective in controlling the target species. For more information on pesticide or herbicide use, please contact the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (804-786-3798).

14. Local Comments.

14(a) Jurisdiction. In accordance with CFR 930, Subpart A, § 930.6(b) of the Federal Consistency Regulations, DEQ, on behalf of the state, is responsible for securing necessary review and comment from other state agencies, the public, regional government agencies, and local government agencies, in determining the Commonwealth's concurrence or objection to a federal consistency determination. 14(b) Local Comments. The Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission, Town of Chincoteague and Accomack County did not comment on the project.

## REGULATORY AND COORDINATION NEEDS

1. Wetlands and Water Quality. Virginia Water Protection Permit authorization is required for proposed project impacts to wetlands and surface waters pursuant to Virginia Code §62.1-44.15:20 et seq. Coordinate with DEQ TRO (757-518-2000) to obtain VWP authorization if there will be impacts to surface waters or wetlands. Coordinate with VMRC (757-247-8027) regarding the submittal of a JPA if necessary.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

2. Wastewater Treatment.

- Coordinate with DEQ TRO (757-518-2000) to apply for and obtain a VPDES permit if a WWTP at the FWS Maintenance Facility in Virginia is installed and proposes to discharge to surface water.
- Submit a CTC to DEQ TRO if construction of a wastewater treatment plant is planned. A CTO will be required prior to operation of the plant.
- If an alternate system is used that will not discharge, coordinate with the Department of Health (Eastern Shore Health District, 757-787-5880).
- Potential impacts to public water distribution systems or sanitary sewage collection systems must be verified by the local utility.

3. Air Pollution Control. Contact DEQ TRO (Troy Breathwaite at [Troy.Breathwaite@deq.virginia.gov](mailto:Troy.Breathwaite@deq.virginia.gov) or 757-518-2006) for additional information on air quality regulations or if the project proposes the use of fuel-burning equipment that may be subject to registration or permitting requirements.

4. Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. The GMP must be consistent the applicable requirements of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (Virginia Code §62.1-44.15:67 - 62.1-44.15:78) and Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations (Regulations) as locally implemented. Contact DEQ (Daniel Moore at [Daniel.Moore@deq.virginia.gov](mailto:Daniel.Moore@deq.virginia.gov)) for additional information as necessary.

5. Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management. The draft GMP and EIS must be consistent with Virginia's Erosion and Sediment Control Law (Virginia Code § 62.1-44.15:61) and Regulations (9 VAC 25-840-30 et seq.) and Stormwater Management Law (Virginia Code§ 62.1-44.15:31) and Regulations (9 VAC 25-870-210 et seq.) as administered by DEQ. Erosion and sediment control, and stormwater management requirements should be coordinated with the DEQ TRO (Noah Hill at [Noah.Hill@deq.virginia.gov](mailto:Noah.Hill@deq.virginia.gov) or 757-518-2024).

6. General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities (VAR10). The operator or owner of a construction activity involving land disturbance of equal to or greater than 1 acre is required to register for coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater from Construction Activities and develop a project specific stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Specific questions regarding the Stormwater Management Program requirements should be directed to DEQ (Holly Sepety at 804-698-4039) (Reference: VSWML §62.1-44.15 et seq.).

7. Solid and Hazardous Waste Management. Contact DEQ TRO (757-518-2000) for additional information on waste management, tank installation requirements, or if evidence of petroleum contamination is found.

8. Natural Heritage Resources. Contact DCR-DNH, Rene Hypes at (804) 371-2708, to secure updated information on natural heritage resources if the scope of the project changes and/or six months passes before the project is implemented, since new and updated information is continually added to the Biotics Data System.

Coordinate with DHR (Christopher Ludwig, 804-371-6209) regarding their recommendation to conduct a new inventory of the natural heritage resources located in the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge/ Assateague Island National Seashore.

9. Protected Species Coordination. Coordinate with the FWS (Troy Anderson, [troy\\_anderson@fws.gov](mailto:troy_anderson@fws.gov)) regarding potential impacts to the following protected species: the Loggerhead sea turtle, Piping plover, the Delmarva fox squirrel, and the Seabeach amaranth.

10. Wildlife Resources. Coordinate with DGIF (Amy Ewing, 804-367-2211) with questions related to DGIF's recommendations to protect wildlife and comply with the CNWRCCP.

11. Historic Resources. Coordinate with DHR (Ethel Eaton, 804-482-6088) regarding its recommendations to protect cultural resources and conduct archaeological surveys and monitoring.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

12. VMRC Coordination. VMRC has indicated that they have comments on the draft EIS related to fisheries and habitat issues. These comments will be submitted directly to NPS. Coordinate with VMRC (Rachael Maulorico, 757-247-8027) with questions.

13. Federal Consistency. The NPS must submit a FCD pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972, as amended (16 USCA, CZMA § 307, § 1456(c)(3)(A)) and its implementing federal consistency regulations (15 CFR Part 930, subpart C). Coordinate directly with OEIR for the submittal of FCDs. Information on document submission is available at <http://www.deg.virginia.gov/Programs/EnvironmentalImpactReview/DocumentSubmissions.aspx>.

Information on FCDs is available at  
<http://www.deg.virginia.gov/Programs/EnvironmentalImpactReview/FederalConsistencyReviews.aspx>

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Detailed comments of reviewing agencies are attached for your review. Please contact me at (804) 698-4204 or Janine Howard at (804) 698-4299 for clarification of these comments.

Sincerely,

Bettina Sullivan, Manager  
Environmental Impact Review and Long Range  
Priorities Program


Enclosures

cc: Amy Ewing, DGIF  
Keith Tignor, VDACS  
Robbie Rhur, OCR  
Keith Tignor, VDACS  
Roy Soto, VDH  
Roger Kirchen, OHR  
Pam Mason, VIMS  
Greg Evans, DOF  
Tony Watkinson, VMRC  
Robert G. Ritter, Town of Chincoteague  
Steven B. Miner, Accomack County  
Elaine K.N. Meil, Accomack-Northampton PDC  
Bill Hulslander, NPS

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 200

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael J. Oesterling  
Organization: Shellfish Growers of Virginia  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: B - Business  
Address: PO Box 1394  
Gloucester, VA 23061  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-10 and PEPC 119  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/21/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 18, 2016

Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

(Note: this is a hard copy of a comment which was submitted electronically on April 18, 2016.)

The Shellfish Growers of Virginia (SGV) is a trade association composed of oyster and clam farmers located within Virginia waters. SGV members are proud of our contributions of almost \$50-million to the economy of the Commonwealth, but are equally proud of our environmental benefits as well. We welcome the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP) for the Assateague Island National Seashore (AINS), which also includes the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CNWR). Our comments, however, will only address how commercial shellfish aquaculture will be managed within the AINS/CNWR.

SGV opposes any Alternative Plan (2, 3, or 4) that requires the issuance of a Special Use Permit to the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) for the continued management of shellfishing within the AINS.

The Virginia Marine Resources Commission has successfully managed the leasing of Commonwealth bottoms for over 100-years. Even after the establishment of the AINS/CNWR, VMRC continued to have unrestricted oversight of the leased areas within the Virginia portion of the AINS boundaries. All alternatives presented within the GMP still provide for VMRC management for shellfishing within the AINS. Alternative 1 provides for the status quo of the current management system;

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, would require the issuance of a Special Use Permit to VMRC, in order for VMRC to continue what it already has been doing successfully under the existing conditions (Alternative 1). We see no need to change a system of shellfish management which does not depend on upland access and will not change due to climate change. We support the continuance of the current practice, with VMRC in total control of leasing and shellfish management within the AINS, without the need for the issuance of a Special Use Permit.

The GMP acknowledges the sovereign rights of the Commonwealth of Virginia to manage shellfishing within the boundaries of the AINS. It further recognizes the long history of private leasing of public bottom for the purpose of shellfish culture within the Virginia portion of the AINS. These activities began long before the establishment of either the CNWR or the AINS. The GMP also identifies the positive economic and environmental benefits that shellfish culture contributes to the region. Overall, shellfish aquaculture must be considered a "beneficial impact" by its presence, due to the increased economic input to the region (without National Park Service contributions) and the positive environmental impacts imparted by the filter-feeding nature of cultured molluscs. To generate these positive economic/ environmental impacts, shellfish culture does not rely on AINS visitors and thus does not contribute to the problems associated with vehicular traffic.

The GMP targets the issues surrounding climate change and how this could alter visitor "experiences" in the AINS. Much detail is focused on vehicular traffic, potential congestion issues and educational opportunities. These are very valid issues. We understand the need to be prepared for upland changes resulting from climate change. Having contingency plans to address visitor access, experiences and educational opportunities is prudent. However, we suggest that the current practice relative to shellfish management be included within whichever Alternative management plan is deemed most appropriate to address upland climate change impacts.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on such an important document. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or wish additional information.

Sincerely

Michael J. Oesterling, Executive Director

CC: Senator Mark Warner  
Senator Tim Kaine  
Congressman Scott Rigell  
VA Delegate Robert Bloxom  
VA Senator Lynwood Lewis  
VMRC Commissioner John Bull

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 201

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John J. Bello, Jr.  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Ashburn, VA 20148  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-12  
Date Sent: 04/17/2016 Date Received: 04/25/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 17, 2016

Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the proposed Assateague General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.

Following are my comments on each of the four proposed Alternatives. But first, let me state that I am vehemently opposed to any Wilderness Designation for any part of the park and would like to see all mention of Wilderness removed from the resulting plan.

Alternative 1-This no action alternative simply leaves too much uncertainty. Maintenance to the park, current structures, and programs would be subject to "available funding." I have no confidence the National Park Service (NPS) would make any funds available.

Under Natural Resource Management, the plan mentions predator control to enhance piping plovers. I do not support any predator control, unless those predators threaten human life and/or safety. Nor do I support removing abandoned roads. On the other hand, I would support reopening the back road in the MD OSV zone. Leave it as a sand road; it does not need to be paved. This road could also provide an alternative route around potential over-wash areas.

The Visitor Experience enhancements replacing deteriorated wayside exhibits, developing an enhanced environmental

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



education program, providing a Kayak education program and modifying facilities for ADA are all good programs and should be pursued. Additionally, I would support each of the initiatives offered under Maryland's Mainland Development Area. As for the Backcountry Area, I am opposed to any Wilderness designation and want all mention of Wilderness removed from the final plan. Moreover, I am opposed to any funds being expended for assessment or studies related in any way to wilderness. In the Sinepuxent and Southern Chincoteague Bay portion, I do want the unauthorized commercial harvest of horseshoe crabs enforced.

Alternative 2 - I support the "Overall Concept" including artificial dune fortification, habitat manipulation, and possible beach nourishment. Additionally, I support the proposed enhancements offered for "Visitor Use and Experience" such as improved visitor amenities including hot showers and utilities at campsites. Under "Response to Storm Damage" I believe NPS should contribute funds to the state of Maryland for the repair of Verrazano Bridge just as NPS provides funds to repair the Virginia Bridge. I could support the acquisition of 10 acres in Maryland, but want to see more detail relative to the planned commercial services.

In the "Natural Resource Zone" I am opposed to the establishment of any Wilderness Area and want all references to any recommended Wilderness area or studies removed from the plan. In this same section I am opposed to any area that is lost to a breach to remaining closed and converting it to a natural resource zone. I understand a breach may make areas not accessible temporarily, but would support changing the language to allowing the area being reopened after the breach fills in naturally.

Alternative 3 NPS Preferred Alternative - In general I support Alternative 3 because I believe it provides the best alternative to keeping the park open. What good is having a National Park if the park is not available for recreation? Again, I object to, and want all two hundred plus references to potential and/or proposed Wilderness Areas removed from the plan. I am opposed to any portion of the park being given this designation. There is no need for it; Assateague Island has not met the requirements for Wilderness designation over the past 30 plus years and does not meet them now. There is no need to study it and I am opposed to any funds being expended to assess it. Accordingly any and all references to Wilderness on Assateague should be abandoned and removed from the plan and/or consideration.

In the Maryland OSV zone, the GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the markers each year." NPS uses the word "consider" far too often. That word is too vague and leaves too much open to interpretation. NPS needs to learn how to use the words "shall" or "will." Accordingly, I support adding the following phrase: "the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone will be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area." Failure to move these markers will, as the island rolls over itself, eventually allow the ocean to reach the carsonite markers leaving no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers. Moreover, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change," should be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island."

I do like the concept of additional access points and potential commercial services. I note however, there is no mention of the potential commercial ferry's carrying vehicles. This subject should be expanded.

As additional information, I am opposed to any NPS efforts being expended to acquire the Verrazano Bridge from the state of Maryland. I do not believe NPS would maintain it, nor do I believe NPS would do anything to protect the bridge in any way. Loss of this bridge would give NPS an excuse to close the park permanently. Contrarily, I would not oppose NPS permanently dedicating funds to "jointly maintaining" the bridge with the State of Maryland. Please note, I said dedicate and did not use the words "if available" as it relates to funds for the Verrazano Bridge.

Alternative 4 Natural Island Evolution and Primitive Island Experience. I find Alternative 4 totally unacceptable. This plan replaces nothing, repairs nothing, and lets all of the existing facilities degrade over time and would eventually cause the Park to close. From my perspective, alternative 4 is nothing more than a surrender and retreat. You might as well close the park. I would not support purchasing any additional land for any NPS activities. Again, I find multiple references to Wilderness Areas and continue my objection to any portion of Assateague Island being declared Wilderness or being studied for Wilderness designation.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

In summary, I support the NPS preferred Alternative 3, with my noted objections on Predator Control, moving the carsonite markers, and Wilderness designation. Assateague Island is a beautiful place. Let's keep it that way for future generations to enjoy.

Respectively,

John J. Bello

[REDACTED]


Ashburn VA, 20148

Cc: US Congressman Andy Harris  
212 W Main St  
#2048  
Salisbury, MD 21801

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 202

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Gene Taylor  
Organization: Council, Town of Chincoteague, Virginia ;  Member  
Organization Type: T - Town or City Government  
Address: x  
x, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-13  
Date Sent: Date Received: 04/22/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To: Ms. Debbie Darden:

Thank you for your hard work at the NPS. We know we put you in hard places with the government when we ask you to go to bat for us, but in many cases we are fighting for our town's very existence. Not just financially but physical existence, because of not adhering to Vims recommendation of maintaining a beach wide, duned, grassed, and fenced. We currently have a wide expanse of our southern beach that is flat and dangerously low elevated. My suggestion is to go with berm elevations at the height of 5 ft above parking lot elevations the whole length of the beach. The berm needs to be wide enough to allow for fencing and grassing.

My next major concern is that I think it is horrible that the government is even considering taking away our hunting and waterman rights.

With the many many acres of beautiful beach, wetland, and forest, it all can certainly be maintained in a way that is better for our Islands, better for our hunters and watermen, and better for our wildlife.

Sincerely,

Councilman Gene Taylor  
Town of Chincoteague

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 203

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Alix Ottenstein  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Ocean City, MD 21842  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-14  
Date Sent: 04/22/2016 Date Received: 04/25/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Page "V" of the GMP has a statement under the section "Visitor Use and Experience" that reaches to the essence of the argument for me: "The seashore is one of the few publicly accessible coastal environments in the densely populated N.E. US where visitors can experience unspoiled beaches, tranquil bays and marshlands, natural sounds, quiet dark night skies, and solitude." For many children growing up in the area, the Assateague experience is as much an outdoor education as it is a Rite of Passage. For the many children visiting the area they should be so lucky as to be able to experience a sliver of that sweet section of shoreline. For the adults, its surprisingly similar - those that grew up locally still enjoy the many amenities of Assateague, passing down the secret sea-glassing spots, vantage points, and recreational responsibility to their kids. Adults that visit for the first time revel with wide eyes in the sounds, solitude and unspoiled beaches spoken of in the GMP, with nearly every visitor eagerly planning their next escape, almost immediately after leaving. As there are more and more resources available as time goes on - specifically including the advancement of science, the understanding of environmental impact, and the ability to adapt Assateague to best accommodate change from a pro-active position, it continues to become clear that Alternative #3 is the proposal acting in the best interest of not just preserving one of our area's most fantastic resources, but also to enhance existing opportunities while creating new ones as well. Thanks for considering my, and the rest of the public's, opinions!

Alix Ottenstein, W.O.C.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 204

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Francis J. Kreig, Jr.  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-15 and E-10  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/25/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 14, 2016

Supt Darden  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, Md21801  
GMP Comment  
Dear Debbie,

Please let me Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the GMP for Assateague Island National Seashore. I feel that Alternative 3 is the method for future guidance of this treasured resource. I have a few comments regarding this method. I would like to address a few issues of concern for the users. Having the opportunity to surf fish via OSV use is of paramount importance to not only myself, but countless thousands of other people who have experienced the pleasure over the past several decades as well. I derive great pleasure from reading the GMP. It appears that in compilation of this tool, it goes to significant effort to maintain OSV access at pretty much the same level as it enjoys today. Maintenance of the pylons as close to the winter berm should allow for maximum use of beachfront for surf fishing. I feel this should be examined in an ongoing basis. I didn't find this issue addressed in the GMP. Areas where a potential washout should be addressed on a as needed basis as well and allow vehicle access until safety becomes a significant problem. Now for my areas of concern, not in particular order. Let's start with the biggest area of concern.

Wilderness Designation. As I'm sure you are keenly aware this was suggested by President Ford in 1974 and never enacted by congress. The failure of this designation speaks volumes to me. While Wilderness Designation requires all agencies to treat possible designation as a wilderness area ongoing. This Executive Order while some 42 years old, is it to stay forever? Since 1974 there has been 6 Superintendents and I know of at least 4 Refuge Managers(probably more), who have guided Assateague Island. None of these caretakers has chosen to fully implement the island as a wilderness area in it's entirety. All

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

have done their best to care for Assateague. I'm sure their reasoning is because of the great imposition to all their staff. Maintenance of back country campsite for example by NPS on the Md end of the island or FWS issuing a special use permit for CVFD and veterinarian care of the Virginia herd.

I personally question why any Wilderness area should be on a barrier island that is continually changing. The longitudinal and latitude done originally in no way are in place today. Much of the original area is now under water. Can anyone say Marine Sanctuary? (let's not go there.)

The present 1982 GMP calls for revisiting Wilderness potential after all prior rights expired.(2002) Revisiting potential Wilderness Designation is **MUST DO AS SOON AS POSSIBLE!** My personal choice would be to see the Executive Order go away and let the people who have the knowledge of the area be in control of the area rather than someone in a remote location(who may have never been to Assateague) choose how the island is treated . The GMP as presently written calls for the possibility of relocating the eastern boundary of the of the wilderness to be some 50 meters west of ocean beach winter storm berm along with the two cross islands being not considered as part of the wilderness area. This an **EXCELLENT IDEA** that should be implemented ASAP. This would allow for the OSV access to the beachfront as it has existed for generations.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES.** I personally think that not saving the Assateague Beach Coast Guard station as well as the Green Run Lodge(while I've never been there) would be a travesty of monumental proportions.The historical value should be retained if at all possible. While the Coast Guard station has no electric, this could be achieved without significant expenses being generated. It could be used for summer temps housing as well as storage space. While it might be cheaper to bury a new electric cable, I would recommend some sort of solar system as I personally feel that the possibility of the present washover area could possibly be the beginning of a new inlet.(just my opinion as I've seen this area change significantly in the last 40 years).

OSV vehicle limits described on pg 3-78 makes mention of a 48 vehicle limit. I'm aware that this number could be confusing with the proposed beach relocation as described in the impending CCP. Does vehicle limit stay at 42 or is it 48? I'm aware that the CCP really doesn't nail this down.

**SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO VRMC** to determine use for Tom's Cove. While I'm not nor do I pretend to understand this specific issue, I know it is quite significant to the watermen in Chincoteague area. I guess I fall in line with the watermen as they have used this area for years.

I noticed that NPS is responsible for the waters surrounding Assateague Island. It would make sense to me this should fall under the control of FWS in Virginia waters.

Thanking you again for the opportunity to comment on the GMP. Feel free to contact me with any questions or clarification of my comments.

MOU between FWS & NPS. I feel this issue should be revisited. While reading this, it appears to me that this is a very one sided agreement. It would behoove NPS to revisit this agreement in the near future to ensure equal responsibility between the two agencies.

---

Francis J.Krieg,Jr.

Salisbury,Md

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 205

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Frederick G. Traut, III  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Abingdon, MD 21009  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-16, E-4, E-56, and P-28  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/27/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 20, 2016

Debbie Darden  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7260 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811  
Deborah\_darden@nps.gov

Congressman Andy Harris M.D.  
212 W. Main Street  
#204B  
Salisbury, MD 21801  
Bill.reddish@mail.house.gov

Subject: GMP/EIS Comments

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my concern over the changes that the NPS is requesting to Assateague Island National Seashore through the GMP/EIS.

First a bit of my family history, my Grandfather first introduced his love of the National Seashore to my Father, who then introduced his love of the National Seashore to his children, who then introduced their love of the National Seashore to their children. As a grandfather of 6, I have introduced my love of the National Seashore to my grandchild, who have all fallen in

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

love with the National Seashore. (I hope you are getting the picture.

For many generations the National Seashore has not only been enjoyed by my family, past and present, and hopefully future, but by tens of thousands of those like me.

I am a fisherman and enjoy the freedoms that the Over Sand Vehicle Access allows. Not just for fishing, but for hiking, nature photography, discovering island history, family recreation, meditation, cookouts, and the satisfaction of watching my children and grandchildren share the same love I have for the National Seashore.

Now for my opinion, I see no reason to change from the current GMP. I see no reason to fix what is not broken. As one who served to protect our freedom, a citizen and taxpayer of this great country, and a conservative conservationist, I am FED UP with the Federal Government's continued plan to seize and control land owned by the people of the United States of America. Hopefully I did not misread the Gettysburg Address by President Lincoln, which states, "We are a Government of the People, For the People and By the People". I could not find any statement that dictates the government controls the people. I also believe that the Constitution of the United States starts with "We the People".

I am not a proponent of the liberal interpretation of our Constitution. I am also not a proponent of the Federal Government's use of small liberal organizations who have developed guidelines to control the majority of the population who for generations have enjoyed and respected what God has given us.

In closing, If a decision needs to be made my choice would be alternative 3 as the better alternative. However, that being said, I would like to see some consideration for changes within alternative 3.

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". Please change to the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone WILL BE moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. I strongly oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. I feel very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. My greatest fear is the losing control of the bridge which could mean the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming it impassable.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

Last but not least, a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island.

I would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is currently written.

My second choice would be to postpone any discussions and decisions until after the general elections. Thank you for your time and understanding and May God Bless America.

Frederick Grandon Traut III

Abingdon, Maryland 21009

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140






# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 206

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: John M. Bull

Organization: Virginia Marine Resources Commission  Official Rep.

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: 2600 Washington Avenue  
Newport News, VA 23607  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-17 and E-26

Date Sent: 04/22/2016 Date Received: 04/27/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 22, 2016  
Deborah Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Dear Ms. Darden,

This letter is in response to the 2016 Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and Environmental Impact Statement for the Assateague Island National Seashore. The GMP addresses specific natural resources that are currently managed by the Commonwealth of Virginia through the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC). These resources include the commercial harvest of horseshoe crabs, finfish, shellfish aquaculture, state-owned subaqueous bottoms, tidal wetlands, dunes, and beaches.

The comments below will address alternative 3, the National Park Service's preferred alternative. The VMRC's preferred planning alternative, however, related to the management of Virginia's marine fishery resources is the adoption of alternative 1, "no-action". We strongly encourage the National Park Service (NPS) to consider the elements of alternative 1 to preserve the status quo in the Commonwealth's management of horseshoe crabs, finfish, and shellfish aquaculture.

Finfish and Shellfish Aquaculture:

The Commonwealth appreciates the efforts taken by the NPS to preserve the status quo in the commercial harvest of finfish and crafting alternatives to continue to allow commercial aquaculture. We thank the NPS for the willingness to craft alternatives that maintain the Commonwealth's sovereign rights to continue to responsibly manage its finfish fisheries and its shellfish fisheries adjacent to the refuge. The Commonwealth continues to reserve its sovereign rights under the United States

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Constitution.

The Commission would like to thank the NPS for highlighting the historic, economic, and ecological significance of shellfishing and shellfish aquaculture in the Commonwealth and on the Eastern Shore. The prohibition of aquaculture around Assateague Island National Seashore would adversely affect the livelihood of over 50 local watermen, remove millions of dollars from the local economy (Table 1 ), and displace a significant historical community and way of life.

Table 1. Total reported harvest, and dockside value, of aquacultured oysters and clams from leases within NPS boundaries from the years 2007 through 2015.

Year Species Total Pounds Total Dockside  
(meat weight) Value

2007-2015 Private Oysters 71,282 \$ 518,163.37  
2007-2015 Private Hard Clams 255,590 \$1,702,079.44  
2007-2015 Total Private Harvest 326,872 \$2,220,242.82

#### Horseshoe Crab Harvest:

In 2011 VMRC's Commissioner Bowman sent public comment opposing the prohibition of horseshoe crab harvest to the GMP Team (Attachment I). This letter expressed concern that regional prohibitions on horseshoe crab harvest could conflict with the current coastwide horseshoe crab management plan. The Commission continues to echo the concerns outlined in our 2011 comments. Pursuant to §28.2-201 of the Code of Virginia, the Commission has the authority to promulgate regulations, including those for taking seafood, necessary to promote the general welfare of the seafood industry and to conserve and promote the seafood and marine resources of the Commonwealth. Virginia's horseshoe crab fishery is managed in such a way that conservation of horseshoe crabs is ensured while providing industry for rural communities. The Commonwealth continues to reserve its sovereign rights under the United States Constitution to manage its marine fisheries.

The Commonwealth objects to the ban on the harvest of horseshoe crabs within a half-mile of mean low water in the Assateague Island area. The Commonwealth's sovereign rights under the United States Constitution allow for the management of fisheries resources within its territorial waters. The horseshoe crab fishery in Virginia is responsibly managed under the auspices of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). The resource is being sustainably harvested, and the Technical Committee at ASMFC has presented no reason to change the fishery management plan or the Commonwealth's quota. There is no demonstrable fisheries management reason to institute a ban on the harvest of horseshoe crabs within a half-mile of mean low water in the Assateague Island area. A ban on horseshoe crabs within this area would have the negative impact of creating additional horseshoe crab harvest pressures in other areas, specifically areas east of the COLREGS line. Furthermore, this ban would not improve food availability for the migratory red knots because these birds do not primarily subsist on horseshoe crab eggs during stopover in Virginia (Cohen et al., 2011). The Commonwealth believes that if Alternatives 2 through 4 are adopted in the final GMP, it would likely result in a negative economic impact to local watermen permitted to harvest horseshoe crabs in Virginia, and displace a significant historical community and way of life.

The harvest of horseshoe crabs in the Delmarva region is a historical fishery, where horseshoe crabs have been harvested for fertilizer and livestock feed for over two centuries. Early reported annual harvests range from 4 million pounds of horseshoe crabs in the 1870's to about 2 million pounds from the 1880's through the 1920's (Finn. 1990, Shuster. 1985). Since that time management framework has been developed, which has allowed this fishery to remain active in this region and supply a majority of the region's bait for the eel and conch fisheries. Currently the horseshoe crab fishery in Virginia is managed under conditions set forth in the I 998 Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Interstate Fisheries Management Plan for Horseshoe Crab (FMP) and the subsequent Addenda. This FMP sets the annual harvest quota of horseshoe crabs in Virginia as determined by Addendum VII's Adaptive Resource Management (ARM) framework. This ARM model is a collaborative ecosystem based model which establishes ideal harvest packages for Delaware Bay origin horseshoe crabs based on red knot population estimates to ensure the dietary needs of red knots during migration stopovers to achieve long term sustainability

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

for both species. The overall goal of the Horseshoe Crab FMP is to conserve and protect the horseshoe crab resource to maintain sustainable levels of spawning stock biomass to ensure its continued role in the ecology of coastal ecosystems, while providing for continued use over time. Virginia has complied with this plan, and we have seen evidence that it is working with increasing abundance in the latest ASMFC stock assessment report. Any additional restrictions on horseshoe crab harvest should be vetted through this plan.

The Virginia horseshoe crab fishery operates under a quota management system that ensures Virginia does not exceed its state-specific horseshoe crab quota. Fisheries management schemes in Virginia ensure harvest parameters stay within the bounds set forth by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Management Plan for sustainable harvest. From 2009 through 2015 the commercial horseshoe crab fishery averaged 47,716 horseshoe crabs harvested per year in the Assateague Island area and surrounding water bodies that totaled a dockside value of \$585,365 (Table 2).

Table 2. Number of horseshoe crabs harvested in number and pounds and dockside value from the Assateague Island area from 2009 through 2015

Year Dockside Harvest Harvest  
Value (\$) (Number) (lbs)

2009	56,091	44,526	89,052
2010	61,401	54,335	108,670
2011	80,890	63,164	126,328
2012	45,767	31,187	62,374
2013	94,272	36,164	72,328
2014	140,310	57,604	115,207
2015	106,634	47,033	94,066

The GMP claims that "prohibiting harvest of horseshoe crabs (as proposed by FWS in the Final CCP/EIS) would effectively eliminate illegal horseshoe crab harvesting in the Toms Cove area, resulting in a beneficially (sic) impact on the horseshoe crab population by directly reducing the decline of spawning horseshoe crabs in the Toms Cove area (US FWS 2015)". This horseshoe crab harvest prohibition, as described, would not result in an overall increase in the number of spawning crabs. Harvest prohibitions in this area could put additional pressure on the horseshoe crab stock in other areas, specifically areas east of the COLREGS demarcation lines, an especially important region in the existing horseshoe crab fisheries management plan for protecting the Delaware Bay horseshoe crab stock.

The GMP claims that the harvest of horseshoe crabs has negative effects on migrating birds during stopover in Delaware Bay due to the depletion of critical food supplies. Virginia and surrounding states jointly manage the harvest of horseshoe crabs to limit the number and manner in which each state can harvest horseshoe crabs that are from Delaware Bay origin. The ecosystem based Adaptive Resource Management (ARM) model takes this harvest into account when determining ideal harvest packages to ensure long-term sustainability for horseshoe crabs and red knots. Furthermore, recent studies by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University show that red knots that stopover in Virginia during migration do not use horseshoe crabs as their main food source, but rather forage on abundant mollusks (Cohen et al. 2014). This same information is referenced by the GMP stating the "The diet of red knots in Virginia includes coquina clams (*Don(JX variabilis)*) and blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis*; Truitt et al. 2001), as was also the case historically (MacKay 1893), and lacks the horseshoe crab (*Limulus polyphemus*) eggs that are a staple in the Delaware Bay."

State Owned Submerged Lands, Tidal Wetlands, Beaches, and Sand Dunes:

The Commission, pursuant to Chapter 12 of Title 28.2 of the Code of Virginia, has jurisdiction over any encroachments in, on, or over the beds of the bays, ocean, rivers, streams, or creeks which are the property of the Commonwealth. Accordingly, if any portion of any project proposed in the future will involve any encroachments channel ward of mean low water, a

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

permit may be required from our agency. Any jurisdictional impacts will be reviewed by VMRC during the Joint Permit Application process.

The Commission, through its Habitat Management Division, is also charged with the oversight of regulatory programs put into place to protect the Commonwealth's tidal wetlands (Chapter 13 of Title 28.2 of the Code of Virginia) as well as beaches and coastal primary sand dunes (Chapter 14 of Title 28.2 of the Code of Virginia). These programs are part of Virginia's Coastal Zone Management Program that are deemed necessary to preserve and protect Virginia's natural resources and the marine habitats that support its saltwater fisheries. Jurisdictional impacts are reviewed during the Joint Permit Application process.

As you may know, Accomack County has adopted the Wetlands Zoning Ordinance. As such, any proposed use or development of tidal wetlands may require a permit from the Accomack County Wetlands Board. They did not, however, adopt the Coastal Primary Sand Dune and Beaches Ordinance. As such, the Commission serves as the default authority for any projects that may impact any primary dunes or beaches, which would affect Virginia's Coastal Zone surrounding Assateague Island.

In conclusion, the Commonwealth of Virginia appreciates the efforts of the NPS to develop alternatives with the intention of conserving the natural resources of Virginia. The VMRC's preferred planning alternative related to the management of Virginia's marine fishery resources is the adoption of alternative 1, "no-action". As such, we strongly encourage the National Park Service (NPS) to adopt those elements of alternative I that preserve the status quo in the Commonwealth's management of horseshoe crabs, finfish, and shellfish aquaculture.

Sincerely,

John M.R. Bull  
Commissioner

cc: Molly Joseph Ward, Secretary of Natural Resources  
Matthew Hull, Assistant Attorney General  
Janine Howard, Department of Environmental Quality

Literature Cited:

Chincoteague and Wallops Island national wildlife refuges final comprehensive plan and environmental impact statement. 2015 Chincoteague, VA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Cohen, J.B., Gerber, B., Karpanty, S.M., Freaser, J.D. and Truitt, B.R. 2011. Day and night foraging of red knots (*Calidris canutus*) on the New Jersey Atlantic Coast during spring stopover. *The Condor* 112: 655-662.

Finn, J.J., C.N. Shuster, Jr., and B.L. Swan. 1991 *Limulus* spawning activity on Delaware Bay shores 1990. Finn-Tech Industries, Incorporated (private Printing). 8pp.

Shuster and M.L. Botton. 1985 A contribution to the population biology of horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus* (L.), in Delaware Bay. *Estuaries* 8(4):363-372.


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 207

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Joseph T. Thornton

Organization: Oyster Water House Owners  Official Rep.

Organization Type: O - Civic Groups

Address: 5419 Woodland Drive  
Cincoteague, VA 23336  
USA

E-mail: t.thornton@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-18

Date Sent: 04/26/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016

Number of Signatures: 10 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 26. 1016

To: Superintendent Assateague Island National Seashore

From: Oyster Watch House Owners, Assateague Island, Va.

Subject: Comments GMP/EIS Plan

The undersigned owners of the watch houses located near Assateague Island National Seashore would like to respectfully submit comments to address the proposed GMP/EIS plan which is being considered for adoption.

After reading the four alternatives provided by the National Park service we specifically would request that under "Private Structures (oyster watch houses, hunting blinds) (in VA)" the wording under Alternatives 3 and 4 "initiate an assessment of privately owned structures (oyster watch houses and hunting blinds) located within the seashore's Virginia waters to determine their legal status; pursue removal of any unauthorized structures" be removed from the plans.

We would like to point out several facts to help facilitate that these structures are in fact recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the National Park Service as legal structures with legitimate ownership.

- According to a study conducted on behalf of the National Park Service from July 2004, by the firm Ralph E. Eshelman, Ph.D and Patricia A. Russell Eshelman & Associates, titled Waterfowl Hunting Camps and Related Properties within Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland and Virginia reports the following: "Oyster watch houses could be built on leased oyster grounds to protect one's oyster beds." as per your own document. The majority of structures are identified by Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

names with the exception of a few whom are mis-identified. The legality of ownership is validated via this document.

- Furthermore, the Virginia Health Department also recognizes the individual/partnership ownership of the watch houses. Communications between the owners and VDH are not uncommon and prove the validity of their legal status. Several times over the course of the years, the Shellfish Sanitation division of the Virginia Health Department sends out correspondence to various owners and ascertains the status of the watch houses waste water disposal.

- Another proof of allowable use can be found in the Journal of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia dated 1903. In the legislation it specifically states "Approved December 31, 1903, entitled on act to authorize parties planting oysters on grounds rented from the state to erect piers, docks or watch houses on the same"

In addition to being allowed by law in the Commonwealth of Virginia, your plan stresses the importance of cultural and historical heritage structures. The definition of heritage is "any property, especially land that devolves by right of inheritance. Anything that has been transmitted from the past or handed down by tradition . The evidence of the past, such as historical sites, buildings, and the unspoilt natural environment, considered collectively as the inheritance of present day society." All of the Watch Houses in the Virginia boundaries predate the National Sea Shore Act of 1965, and by definition are historical. These properties have been handed down generations by owners to their families and relatives for the preservation of cultural and livelihood as a way to protect the oyster grounds they own. I can remember stories from many owners which predate the combustible outboard engine. The owners would oar or scull their skiffs miles to get to their cabins to protect and harvest their clams and oysters.

In closing, we would like to reiterate the historical importance of the watch houses to our local area and the proven ownership which goes back generations. Please remove them from the plan so that the use of the structures may continue for generations to come. If you have any questions or would like to meet with representatives from the group please do not hesitate to call or email.

Signed, owners of the watch houses north of the Assateague Bridge to Maryland border.

Joseph T. Thornton  
Mike Jester  
Mike McGee  
Arthur Leonard  
Ronnie Malone  
Chris Fox  
Billy Reed, Jr.  
Robert Conner  
Russel Fish  
Dove Eccleston

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 208

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Randy Birch  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-19  
Date Sent: 04/26/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April, 26, 2016

National Park Service,

I am writing concerning the National Park Services's 20 year Comprehensive Conservation Plan. I am very concerned about how it is going to effect me, my livelihood and my community.

My name is Randy Birch, I am a 59 years old, I have lived on Chincoteague Island all my life. I have been a full time waterman aft my life, my grandfather and his grandfather have made their living commercial fishing, crabbing, clamming, oystering and providing guided duck hunts and guided fishing trips within what is now considered National Park Service boundaries.

One hundred percent of my yearly income comes from exactly what I have just described, and I am not only speaking for myself, but for many other Chincoteague watermen. My grandmother grew up and went to school on Assateague Island, Virginia; near the lighthouse back in the teens. My great, great grandparents, The Jone"s are buried on Assateague near the foot of the Assateague bridge. My grandmother's brother was the last lighthouse keeper before it was automated.

Ever since I was young, going to work with my grandfather and uncles on the water commercially harvesting crabs, oysters, minnows, clams, fish and horseshoe crabs in the waters of the Assateague Channel and Tom's Cove and surrounding areas of the Chincoteague inlet, all the way north to the Maryland state line, this has been not only a job but a special way of life. Always abiding by state and federal laws, rules and regulations, I have managed to make an honest living for me and my family. From my understanding, on the Maryland side of Assateague Island, the Park Service goes generally by Maryland State laws on some of these issues, duck blinds, commercial fishing, etc. We are hoping that you will follow Virginia state laws and regulations on the Virginia side of Assateague Island as well, regarding the same issues. In the recent past few

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



years, I have mainly harvested blue crabs and horseshoe crabs in the spring and summer, and been a duck hunting guide in the winter, all within the Assateague Channel, and within the Park Service boundaries.

In reading some of the National Park Services Comprehensive Conservation Plan, this would greatly effect the future of my livelihood and leave me without the means to make a living. from my understanding, the chance on this effecting my harvesting of seafood and also effecting-the placement of my, duck blinds, which have no negative effect on the environment whatsoever, and has never been a problem with the Park Service, Fish and Wildlife or the state of Virginia, I feel very threatened that the government is going to take away my ability to make a living in this area.

Can you just imagine something or someone, the government in this case, taking away your heritage and way of life, not to mention, your total income? I am speaking for not only myself, all of the working watermen of Chincoteague Island, and my hometown also. I'm afraid that this will be a domino effect also on all of the other businesses of our little town, such as., motels, where my hunters stay in the winter (off season), restaurants, where they eat and a tot of other businesses that will be effected. especially in the off season (winter).

I hope there is some way that we can all work together, concerned citizens of Chincoteague Island, the Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife, amongst other government agencies to keep and preserve our quaint tittle town, our heritage and our beach without excessive government control.

If you have any questions on the contents of this fetter, contact me and I wi take you on a free boat tour and I will show you what this is all about.

Concerning the Special Use Permit for commercial activity within the Park Service boundaries, Debbie Morlock and all of the staff in Berlin, Maryland, have been very helpful and accommodating and are an asset to the National Park Service.

I hope this letter will be read and sincerely considered, as it effects my whole life greatly.

Thank you,

Randy Birch

Chincoteague Island, Virginia 23336

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 209

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Donna Bakula  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-20  
Date Sent: 04/25/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Enclosed is my letter to the Fish and Wildlife Service dated 08/08/14. I attended the March 31, 2016 meeting of the National Park Service and listened carefully to the talk by Debbie Darden and the questions from residents, watermen, and town council officials. The month of April does not seem a reasonable time (30 days) to absorb all the information from the Newsletter No. 3 dated Winter 2016 together with the meeting discussion in order to submit input which will have an effect on Chincoteague Island people for the next 15 years.

However, I continue to support Plan A from the Fish and Wildlife Service of 2014 and Alternative 1 from the National Park Service and think that these should be implemented: And, I do not think that 30 days is a fair timeline for review by other residents and homeowners of Chincoteague.

Reasons: 1) Many people here are retired or have second homes here and are summer residents. They do not even know how important these decisions are right now. Many Republicans in Congress refute the scientific facts of global warming and sea level rise. People who do not know the importance of your plan now, could be signing away their economic futures. I predict that everyone will realize the impact of the scientific facts within the next two years. I know I do not want to lose my property and I am scared.

a) That March 31 meeting to tell residents that we have opportunity for input was not well-attended. It was held on a Thursday evening. Many people work and do not take the time to attend meeting that they think won't change much or even consider what they think. I used to teach and come to this island on Friday nights for the week-ends. I just had to trust that the Town Council would make the correct decisions for the safety and well-being of the people of Chincoteague. Now, I think they are re-active instead of pro-active and I cannot trust people who would elect a "con artist" for President.

2) It seems to me that the National Park Service is just accepting what the Fish and Wildlife Service has decided - that the beach should be moved 1.5 miles North. It seems that the philosophy is based on Rachel Carson's advocacy that the coastline

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

is ever-changing and should be free to move West if so inclined. That is so out-dated now that we know that the sea water is rising and that the protection that the South end of Assateague Island has given to Chincoteague will no longer be there.

a) I have observed that along the coast of Delaware they use plastic and wooden fencing and plant grasses to keep dunes built up in case of storms. At one time the Ocean was coming across the highway and due to their planning and work to hold it back, water no longer crosses the highway. I also came to the beach here when one had to walk up steps because the dunes were so high and then I later saw bulldozers taking down the dunes. I think they were protecting the plovers instead of the people. With new data, there has to be new thinking and new planning.

b) Years ago, I saw a documentary about the Eastern Shore that informed us that because we have no effective coral reefs like some of the Pacific islands, there have been huge locomotives placed underwater to hold back the sea. Why can't alternatives like that be looked into? And, I just read that Tangier Island has received approval from Virginia for a \$236,000. cost share to build a seawall for their protection. The Norfolk area received similar funds. Both Virginia and Maryland should be involved in protecting Assateague Island.

In summary, it is the economy and safety. If the beach is taken (man or nature) eventually asking tourists to ride a shuttle bus, they will go elsewhere. If nothing is done to save the dunes, restoring the South part of Assateague, our property values will diminish and moving away is the only alternative. The town of Chincoteague will become a ghost town. Federal and State officials need to get involved.

Donna Bakula, Assateague beach goer since 1984

Attachment

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 210

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Thomas Clark  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-21  
Date Sent: 05/02/2016 Date Received: 05/02/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Fax  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Faxed 5.2.16

Deborah A. Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Re: Response Letter to the National Park Service General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

I am opposed to the NPS setting any type of controls on harvesting and aquaculture activities that occur within the water column you claim ownership of. What a shame it is that the Government has- or thinks it has, the right to just take from the public. Oyster and Clamming have been done in Toms Cove for well over 150 years.

I am in favor in keeping the hook open to the public as long as possible. Hiking, 4 wheel and to horseback riders. If it should become non accessible by land; then by boat. Would not it be nice to have a place to land a boat and be able to walk on the beach?

Watch-houses and duck blinds should be allowed as long as they are off the park. Anything past the low water mark is ok. Control past low water is a over step and something the court should decide.

I believe the NPS should only have Legal Control in front of their area in which they control-to the low watermark.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

For any reason if the Government in not able to open the park- gov shutdown, strike or for any reason then the State of Virginia should have the right to allow public access to their land. It is the people whom own this land and was set aside for their enjoyment and pleasure.

Thomas Clarke

PoS Chincoteague, Va. 23336

Re: Response Letter to the National Park Service General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

I am opposed to the NPS setting any type of controls on harvesting and aquaculture activities that occur within the water column you claim ownership of. What a shame it is that the Government has- or thinks it has, the right to just take from the public. Oyster and Clamming have been done in Toms Cove for well over 150 years.

I am in favor in keeping the hook open to the public as long as possible. Hiking, 4 wheel and to horseback riders. If it should become non accessible by land; then by boat. Would not it be nice to have a place to land a boat and be able to walk on the beach?

Watch-houses and duck blinds should be allowed as long as they are off the park. Anything past the low water mark is ok. Control past low water is a over step and something the court should decide.

I believe the NPS should only have Legal Control in front of their area in which they control-to the low watermark.

For any reason if the Government in not able to open the park- gov shutdown, strike or for any reason then the State of Virginia should have the right to allow public access to their land. It is the people whom own this land and was set aside for their enjoyment and pleasure.

Thomas Clarke

PoS Chincoteague, Va. 23336


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 211

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: John Doerfler

Organization: Delaware Chapter Surfrider Foundation  Official Rep.

Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups

Address: P.O Box 1114  
Millsboro, DE 19966  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-22

Date Sent: 04/27/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 27, 2016

Surfrider foundation, Delaware Chapter  
P.O. Box 1114  
Millsboro, DE 19966

To Whom this Concerns:

The Delaware Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation supports Alternative 3 for the proposed sustainable recreation and climate change adaptation for Assateague National Park.

According to the programmable EIS on the project, the following objectives are in accordance with sustainable and long-term management of the natural barrier island ecosystem for evolving future conflicts. The Delaware Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation recommends the basic tenets of Alternative 3 along with public augmentation of the process at each juncture of yearly adaptation.

- Avoidance of natural coastline process interference; visitor use infrastructure to evolve into more sustainable designs. Relocation to more stable locations to facilitate educational experiences and outreach.
- Limited maintenance of the existing artificial dune system as facilities and infrastructure transition. Construction and logistical support of natural sand barriers; the primary and secondary dune structure which will provide both habitat for species, and proper sand transport.
- Breach management protocols which will balance the evolution of a natural systems, placing secondary concerns with human -resources demands and infrastructure.
- Impacts to natural sand transportation processes and the stabilization of Ocean City inlet.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

- Planning and development of alternative transportation to Assateague Island, including ferries/shuttles, and sustainable modes of visitor use.
- Sustainable access points on the land side of Chincoteague Bay, including kayak launch points, sailing, paddle board and other non-consumptive water transport modalities.
- Environmental education programs, including public interface, with additional scientific research opportunities incorporated into adaptive management policies.
- Public and media engagement of cost/benefit analysis regarding decisions concerning the public commons of the Assateague Island seashore.
- Support of natural recreational values. Non-Interference with sand-sharing beaches, including sand bars and near-shore habitat. .
- Reduction of visitor impacts with minimal-use facilities in the future. Portable, innovative and sustainable structures which will allow relocation, reuse and adaptation.

The future of contingency planning is an important and critical aspect to the millions of visitors of all stripes to Assateague Island. From the migratory and nesting bird populations, marine mammals offshore, and the indigenous horse community, guidelines for shaping policies and protocol of management practices are at a critical juncture.

Signatories


John Doerfler, Chair  
Delaware Chapter, Surfrider Foundation

CC: The Executive Board  
Delaware Chapter, Surfrider Foundation

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 212

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lynwood W. Lewis, Jr.  
Organization: Senate of Virginia  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: S - State Government  
Address: PO Box 9587  
Norfolk, VA 23505  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-23 and E-36  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 05/02/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 29, 2016

Deborah A. Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, Maryland 21811

RE: Comments to the National Park Service General Management Plan and  
Environmental Assessment for the Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

As the State Senator for the 6th1 Senate District in which the Virginia portion of the  
Assateague National Seashore is located and also as a life-long resident of Accomack County, I  
wanted to make some comments and observations regarding the proposed National Park Service  
General Management Plan.

I appreciate your having participated in earlier meetings arranged on Chincoteague and at the  
Eastern Shore Community College and also in the other efforts that you have made at community  
outreach regarding the General Management Plan.

Needless to say, any substantive changes in the status quo at Assateague have the potential  
for extensive and significant ramifications for the Town of Chincoteague, the County of Accomack,

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



the entire Eastern Shore as well as the Commonwealth of Virginia. I think at a fundamental level it is important to note in regard to all issues that this National Seashore has been in existence since the late 1960s and that generations of Chincoteague Island residents have made significant life decisions and investments based on the existence of this National Seashore and many visitors each year to the Island. In addition, the economic benefits generated by this National Seashore are an important part of the Eastern Shore and the Commonwealth of Virginia's tourism industry. Everyone should want it to continue to be a great success.

As to the proposed General Management Plan, one of the things that gives me great concern about the possible changes suggested in the General Management Plan was a question that I posed about the possible changes in our first meeting in the Council Chambers on Chincoteague and that was "What negative impact do any of these activities [fin fishing, aquaculture and horseshoe crab fishery] have on the Park Services' mission?" Thus far, I have not received any indication that any of these activities, which have gone on for generations, pose any threat to the Park Services' mission and, in fact, an important part of the economy and of the cultural heritage of the area.

As you know, I and others at the State level, including Delegate Bloxom, have raised jurisdictional issues in regard to the commercial fishing and aquaculture activities in the area. In fact, I introduced legislation during this last General Assembly Session, Senate Bill 643, which directed our Virginia Marine Resources Commission to monitor the Department of Interior's activities in the waters adjoining the Assateague National Seashore area and to further assert the Commonwealth's sovereignty in any jurisdictional issues so as to preserve the right and ability of Virginia watermen to use the waters. The Bill passed both Chambers of the Legislature unanimously and was signed by the Governor on February 29~'. From a public policy standpoint, if an activity has been ongoing for generations and poses no threat or impediment to the mission of the Park Service, I see no reason why it should not be allowed to continue to the extent the Park Service even has any authority to disallow it. It would further seem to be in the best interest of the Park Service from a community relations standpoint as well.

As to the duck blind and oyster watch house issue, I appreciate the "Working with Virginia... ." reference in the GMP, I believe the Town, has correctly and effectively outlined the historical and cultural reasons that these structures are important and I would fully adopt the Town's position as to these structures in that no action should be taken as to the oyster houses or duck blinds.

I concur with what I understand is the Town's position regarding the language of the preferred alternative in the GMP being changed to match the executive summary and Alternative One so as to recognize the rights of Virginia and allow the continued leasing of the submerged lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia for commercial aquaculture. Again, given the long history of such activities (which I would further submit are supported by the law) and use as well as the de minimis, if any, impact upon the Park Services' mission makes this the obvious and commonsense position.

A similar observation could be made regarding the horseshoe crab harvest. I understand that the distinction made with the horseshoe crab harvest and fin fishing and aquaculture activities is the somewhat unusual designation of the horseshoe crab as an "animal". That technical distinction should not overcome the reality of the situation which places the horseshoe crab in the same context and category, on a practical basis, as fin fishing and aquaculture. I support the Town's position as to the horseshoe crab fishery.

The approach which I understand is taken in the GMP as to fin fishing is, I would suggest, the approach that should be taken to all of the other aforementioned activities.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

It seems to me that if these activities and the Virginia state regulatory framework which exists for them have been in existence side by side with the Park Service for decades now that there would be little to be gained by raising the question of their continuing or being "allowed" to continue by permit.

Thank you again for the outreach efforts and the opportunity to comment. This issue is very significant for the people and the area that I represent.

Very truly yours,

Lynwood W. Lewis, Jr  
6th District

LWLjr./mmh

cc: The Honorable John H. Tarr  
Delegate Robert S. Bloxom, Jr.  
Senator Timothy M. Kaine  
Senator Mark Warner  
Congressman Scott Rigell  
Molly Ward, Secretary of Natural Resources  
Todd Haymore, Secretary of Agriculture  
Commissioner John M. R. Bull,  
Virginia Marine Resources Commission


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 213

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Madison J. Bunting

Organization: Worcester County Government  Official Rep.

Organization Type: T - Town or City Government

Address: One West Market Street  
Room 1103  
Snow Hill, MD 21863-1195  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-24 and E-30

Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 05/02/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Ms. Deborah A. Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811  
ATTN: Assateague GMP Comments

RE: Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS)  
Federal Register Notice #2016-02109

Dear Superintendent Darden:

The County Commissioners of Worcester County, Maryland (Worcester County) support the National Parks Service (NPS) in their efforts to adopt a new General Management Plan (GMP) for the Assateague Island National Seashore. As the gateway community for the northern end of Assateague Island, we take seriously our duty to maintain and improve the County's rural and coastal character while protecting our natural resources and ecological functions. We recognize that protection of our natural resources is critical to the quality of life and economy of Worcester County. These are the primary goals of our Comprehensive Plan, which also recognizes the importance of Assateague Island to the local tourism industry. Worcester County is optimistic that Alternative #3, if selected and modified by the NPS, will continue to enable us to achieve these goals in the future.

This letter shall serve to provide our comments relative to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP/EIS as a whole, and to address our concerns and proposed modifications to your preferred Alternative #3. Subject to the following comments and modifications, Worcester County is pleased to offer our support for Alternative #3 as modified.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

1. Management Zone for the North End Restoration Project - The Natural Resource Zone designation for the North End Restoration project should permit and encourage the restoration tasks to continue. Sand nourishment at the north end of Assateague Island helps to maintain a healthy beach and dune system, provide materials to fill areas that may be subject to breaching, and support the supply of sand material for the active recreational beach areas on this section of the island. We request that either by amendment, overlay, or designation, the tasks needed to continue this important sand nourishment project be specifically referenced as permitted actions within the Natural Resource Zone.

2. Land Acquisition (2.6.8) - We urge you to consider Worcester County as a local government partner and as a cooperating agency with regard to any discussions on land acquisitions to expand NPS properties in the general vicinity of the Maryland Headquarters. If NPS wishes to collaborate with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for points of departure on the mainland for mid-island access, we would appreciate if they would also include the County in these discussions. We have worked to preserve a scenic gateway to Assateague and have accordingly managed density and zoning along the corridor to avoid any negative impacts. The County Comprehensive Plan mentions the southern Rt 611 corridor's value as a gateway to the park and states that the southern half "should not be further developed other than its West Ocean City (northern) portion." We suggest that the NPS recognize that options for both the potential relocation of facilities off the island and the establishment of additional water-based departure points are extremely limited in the southern Rt 611 corridor. As a secondary point concerning land acquisitions, the GMP mentions support for mainland protection strategies and expanded land conservation in the local watersheds. We suggest that the NPS note that there is a highly successful Coastal Bays Rural Legacy Area in place in the Coastal Bays watershed that has a considerable portfolio of protected lands under easement.

3. The North End Restoration Project (1.9.5) - This is a very important project for the local area and we request recognition and support for continued restoration activities on the north end of Assateague Island in perpetuity. If anything, additional activities to support restoration are in order rather than any future reduction or cessation of these operations. We understand that the North End Restoration project is a six-mile area south of the inlet where dredged sand is placed near shore to mimic the north-south flow of sand disrupted by the inlet jetties. It is a project funded through 2028 between NPS and the US Army Corps of Engineers (COE). Specifically, we request that:

A. The NPS consider an overlay or other alteration of the management zone maps (especially Figure 2.3) which currently shows the area of the North End Restoration project as a "Natural Resource Zone" area. We request recognition in the GMP that this area will be subject to other actions with a more aggressive inlet shoaling management plan, and that such actions should be specifically referenced in the approved activities for this zone.

B. We request that the future budget for sand replenishment reflect continued funding beyond 2028. We further suggest that Table 2.7 be amended to include a working group that includes the Corps and local partners to review the future of sand replenishment activities and actions.

C. We request that that actions necessary to continue and expand the North End Restoration Project should be included in Table 2.7.

In support of the above referenced requests, we wish to make the NPS aware of the long-term planning and dredging efforts for the shoaling in the Ocean City Inlet (between the Town of Ocean City and Assateague Island) and the additional materials that may be generated if funding for more aggressive dredging actions are secured. This would provide additional materials for placement on the north end of Assateague Island, where overwash and breaching pose significant concerns for developed properties on the mainland adjacent to this area. These developed properties include housing developments on the northern portion of the Rt 611 corridor and the Ocean City Municipal Airport, among other significant investments on the mainland.

4. Alternative Transportation Strategies for Access from MD 611 - The County opposes redesigning the entrance to the park and establishing a fee/toll station for the Verrazano Bridge. The GMP recognizes that a joint entrance station could not be operated without amendments to the State legislation that authorized the bridge and which prohibits tolls. We respectfully

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

request that the NPS abandon any planning or programming measures for such a facility.

5. Wilderness Designations (2-52) - The County opposes the creation and/or expansion of any wilderness area designations on Assateague which we understand provides the highest level of conservation protection for federal lands and often restricts public use and enjoyment of these public lands. While we support managed use of the parklands to preserve and protect the natural environment, we believe that public access should not be prohibited in any areas of the park. If it is determined that wilderness designations must be considered, we urge that you complete an updated wilderness study, as mentioned in the GMP, to assess the true eligibility of the proposed portions of the island that do not have the wilderness designation. We have been notified of concerns from local recreational fisherman and off road pass visitors that the proposed movement westward of the eastern boundary of the wilderness area should be designed in such a fashion as to preserve these oversand vehicle (OSV) access areas. We agree with these comments and request that Table 2.7 be amended to ensure preservation of these OSV access areas with respect to any proposed wilderness area designation.

6. Floodplain Updates (3-19) - We suggest that NPS review the plan to account for any updates recently adopted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) last year. The management of the dune system provides protection to the mainland from coastal storms and storm surges. We are specifically concerned that if the dune management strategy was to be diminished, such actions would have a significantly negative impact on the ratings for our potentially vulnerable mainland areas adjacent to the northern part of the island.

7. Breach Management Plan (2-21) -A Breach Management Plan is referenced in the GMP, but specifics are lacking. We request that this section of the GMP recognize that the cumulative effects since the formation of the Ocean City Inlet, coupled with the impact from inlet jetties and other human operations, have altered the barrier beach and sediment transport processes. These impacts should be recognized for what they are and what they will continue to be in the future. The northern portion of Assateague Island currently serves to protect life and property on the coast and the mainland. We therefore request that the Breach Management Plan take into consideration the physical and ecological properties of the shoreline and strive to protect and preserve human welfare and developed properties on the mainland. We therefore request that the NPS makes such an accommodation to allow artificial closure of these breaches within the natural resource zone of the northern island and/or provides an overlay of this district to allow and encourage special activities within this natural resources zone to protect residents and properties on the mainland.

8. Recreational Impacts and Sustainable Recreation - Worcester County supports and promotes the State of Maryland's overall goals for recreation, parks, and open space preservation. Included as one of those goals is "Making a variety of quality recreational environments and opportunities readily accessible to all of its citizens." The comments below reflect our desire to strike the best balance between the protection of the natural resources and the enjoyment of the recreational opportunities of the island.

We are adamantly opposed to the proposed implementation of a docking/entrance fee and associated facilities on the bayside of the island, specifically along the northern end of Assateague, as referenced on page 2-50 and 2-56. The NPS must recognize that considerable water access is already conducted by boating visitors to the area and perhaps a different management approach would better address the strategies for that portion of the park.

The County supports an active defense of visitor areas in the park. Artificial dune fortification, habitat manipulation, and beach nourishment are tools to use to protect the developed visitor areas from the effects of natural coastal processes. We do recognize there may be temporary restrictions to the vehicular access portions if damaged by storms, but would urge the NPS to make necessary repairs as necessary. We believe that active management and preservation of the visitor assets on Assateague should be included as a necessary part of the GMP.

Our Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan notes that Assateague National Seashore is part of Maryland's Greenways and Water Trails Program. This Plan references a trails system for the Berlin to Assateague corridor. We request that the NPS recognize ongoing planning efforts underway to make that network a reality and include a reference in the GMP to assist us in providing any linkages necessary to connect with these trail systems on the mainland.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Thank you for your presentation of the Assateague GMP/EIS to the Worcester County Commissioners on April 19, 2016. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important plan for the future of this most wonderful asset.

If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact either me or Harold Higgins at ( 410) 632-1194.

Sincerely,

Madison J. Bunting  
President

BM/ks  
cc: Congressman Andy Harris (MD-I)  
Senator James N. Mathias, Jr.  
Delegate Mary Beth Carozza  
Delegate Charles J. Otto  
Robert Mitchell, Environmental Programs Director  
Lisa Challenger, Tourism Director  
Paige Hurley, Recreation and Parks Director  
Ed Tudor, Development Review and Permitting Director


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 214

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Steven B. Miner

Organization: Accomack County Government  Official Rep.

Organization Type: T - Town or City Government

Address: 23296 Courthouse Avenue  
Accomac, VA 21811  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-25

Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 05/02/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 2111

RE: Comments on Draft GMP/EIS  
Assateague Island National Seashore, 2016

Dear Ms. Darden:

Please accept the following on behalf of the Accomack County Government, particularly in regard to the Virginia portion of the area covered by the GMP/EIS.

First, please accept our appreciation for the process and for the opportunity to comment. Clearly the Park Service has put a lot of time and effort into this document and it is clear that the Service is taking its responsibilities very seriously. The document certainly contains a great deal of detail about future plans as well as outlining the Service's beliefs as to the effect of climate change on the island, the Service's legal authorities, and its mission. This transparency invites a dialogical response and we provide some comments below.

Before I begin, however, first know that the County is in complete support of the Town of Chincoteague's comments, as approved by the Town Council. We have traditionally been supportive of their position, as the Town is principally affected. Additionally, they have spent countless hours parsing the document and finalizing their comments. The County wishes to be clear that we support their position and hope that nothing contained herein is seen as drifting from that solid support. Nonetheless, the activities allowed there are also critical to the economy of the County and to our revenues as a government.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

It is a vital economic engine, helping to drive our economy in so many ways and we are very aware of that fact. Additionally, of course, many County residents outside of Chincoteague also use and benefit from the assets there, including some that the Service has claimed authority over.

It is important also to note our appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Service to better understand and react to the geomorphology of the beach area. Recognizing and reacting appropriately to what certainly appears to be worsening erosion of the beach area is both a wise use of resources and critical to continued beneficial uses of the beach as a primary driver of the regional and local economy. We must be aware of the danger to our economy when a single storm event can harm the visitor's ability to access and enjoy the Virginia portion of the beach on Assateague Island. The continuation of beach access parking is critical to the visitor experience and, in that way, sustains our brand. Efforts to support that are appreciated. Our separate comments are:

## 1. Description of Area

16 U.S.C. Title 16 Section 459f of the Federal Code indicates that:

"The seashore shall comprise the area within Assateague Island and the small marsh islands adjacent thereto, together with the adjacent water areas not more than one-half mile beyond the mean high waterline of the land portions as generally depicted on a map identified as "Proposed Assateague Island National Seashore, Boundary Map, NSAI-7100A, November, 1964", which map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Department of Interior."

If we were limited to only one comment, it would probably relate to this claim, as we believe the Service's interpretation of it is an overreach, in that it does not give the Service the authority claimed in this document. As a matter of State and Federal conflicting jurisdictions, it is our view that the state have never ceded this area to Federal control and, by the State Constitution, has responsibility over it. We have made our state representatives aware of our views and would strongly encourage their active resistance to this attempt by Congress (acting under color of Section 459f) to assert Federal dominion and control over this area when it makes no significant contribution to the purposes of the National Seashore.

Moreover, the commenter understands that Boundary Map, NS, AI-7100A seems to not be available, as the law requires. Certainly, the only map found in the document that relates to this area is within the signed MOU dated 2012 and is clearly not a replica of the original and for this reason, has no authenticity for legal purposes, it being, at best, a simple graphical depiction the claimed area. For all of these reasons, we object to the Services claims of dominion over State lands and waters within Yi mile of the shoreline. And while we understand that all of the options under consideration will either the State VMRC to continue to "permit" or allow use of its bottom, we remain of the view that the claim of right is unfounded and wrong.

## 2. Marine resource management:

According to the document, the Service's view that it may regulate aquacultural activities is further filtered through 36 CFR 2.60{3} (b), which in pertinent part says:

### § 2.60 Livestock use and agriculture.

(a) The running-at-large, herding, driving across, allowing on, pasturing or grazing of livestock of any kind in a park area or the use of a park area for agricultural purposes is prohibited, except:

- (1) As specifically authorized by Federal statutory law; or
- (2) As required under a reservation of use rights arising from acquisition of a tract of land; or
- (3) As designated, when conducted as a necessary and integral part of a recreational activity or required in order to maintain a historic scene.

(b) Activities authorized pursuant to any of the exceptions provided for in paragraph (a) of this section shall be allowed only pursuant to the terms and conditions of a license, permit or lease. Violation of the terms and conditions of a license, permit or

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



lease issued in accordance with this paragraph is prohibited and may result in the suspension or revocation of the license, permit, or lease ....

This commenter reads this language very differently than the Service. Clearly, if you were using this section to claim jurisdiction over agricultural activities on the land, you'd have a straight, clear argument. However, your effort to extend jurisdiction over activities not envisioned or stated in the regulation in such a manner is a significant overreach. Regulations should mean what they say, not what interpreters wish them to say. For these reasons, the statement on page 1-35 that aquaculture is considered agriculture is likewise unsupported and to our view, an improper overreach and assertion of authority.

While we understand and appreciate that the Service has found a way, for now, to "issue" a special use permit to VMRC, we question your right by law to do that. We strongly believe that the state should take a more firm view on this matter and wish very sincerely that you not mistake their seeming acquiescence to your position as acceptable to us. It is not.

### 3. Horseshoe crabs ban

The ban on horseshoe crab harvest seems unaligned with your mission. It is unclear if your proposed ban would include the taking of animals for bleeding (and return to the water). If so, the value of the fishery stated in the document appears to be very low, as one of blood is said to be valued at \$15,000. This use of the animal is very important to human life and safety. Blood removed from the animals has unique properties in the testing of medical equipment and vaccines for bacterial infections. See <http://www.iflscience.com/plantsand-animals/how-horseshoe-crab-blood-saves-millions-lives> for further information. According to this source, it saves millions of lives.

### 4. Oyster Watch Houses and Duck Blinds

These structures are not and should not be the subject of Federal regulation. They are allowed under local and state oversight and the Service has stated no legitimate basis for its assertion of authority over them. Any effort to remove or regulate them as opposed to local and state control should and ought to be resisted. The County welcomes any inputs as to claims of illegality on these or any properties and intends to fulfill its duties under state and local law regarding the use of structures falling within its jurisdiction.

### 5. Finfishing

Please note our support for the continuation of finfishing in the waters surrounding Assateague.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely

Steven B. Miner  
Accomack County Administrator

Cc: Accomack County Board of Supervisors  
The Honorable Jack Tarr, Mayor, Town of Chincoteague  
Federal and State Representatives


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 215

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Robert S. Bloxom, Jr.

Organization: Virginia House of Delegates  Official Rep.

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: P.O. Box 27  
Mappsville, VA 23407  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-26 and E-32

Date Sent: 04/25/2016 Date Received: 05/02/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 25, 2016

Deborah A. Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, Maryland 21811

Dear Ms. Darden,

I would like to open my response to the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP) regarding Assateague Island National Seashore by thanking the National Park Service for their commitment to keeping a public beach open with ample parking for visitors. It is vital to the economy of the Town of Chincoteague and Accomack County for seaside access. I do have concerns with many parts of this plan and I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address them during the open comment period.

The GMP is written primarily for the Maryland part of Assateague Island. The Maryland side of Assateague Island is wholly controlled by the Park Service and is focused on access to the Island by people. Overnight camping, access to the Bay, and seaside beaches are priorities for Maryland. This is not the case on the Virginia portion of Assateague Island. The Park Service only controls one mile of beach access and the rest of the Island is controlled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Historically, U.S. Fish and Wildlife only controlled to the high water mark because the wildlife which they protected could not nest below that line of delineation. The Park Service controls the water in front of public beaches which makes sense since this is where people have swimming access. Noone is debating the water off the one mile of swimming beach.

The concept that the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife are both under the Interior Department umbrella, Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

allowing their jurisdictional authority to be traded back and forth, is very disconcerting to me. This is a broad expansion of Federal authority that was feared and addressed in every document signed by the State of Virginia and the U.S. Government. The fear of Federal overreach was addressed in the 1965 Act which states "That nothing in this Act shall limit or interfere with the authority of the states to permit or to regulate shell fishing in any waters included in the national seashore...". The Act did not include other types of fishing because in that day oystering was the best option for watermen. The intent was to leave Virginia in control of the surrounding areas and have U.S. Fish and Wildlife control the Island. This control of the surrounding area by Virginia has been slowly eroding as the Federal Government claims authority over more and more activity as now they claim jurisdiction over water in a half mile circle around the Island.

In Virginia the water belongs to the Commonwealth. It is a constitutional right to have navigational access to the waters of the Commonwealth. The bottom ground has been surveyed and leased to the people of the Commonwealth for over 100 years.

Some of the following concerns are not in the GMP but show a pattern of slow creep of Federal overreach.

- Charter boats are being required to purchase yearly permits to use the water around your "park". I believe this is wrong and is a practice of extortion. They don't anchor nor launch from any federal facilities and only "cruise" around on open water. The highland is controlled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife but they are required to get a yearly Park Service permit.
- The National Park Service imposed a prohibition of personal watercraft around your "Park". In Virginia, personal watercraft has as much of a right to use the water as a kayaker. Even though they may be loud and obnoxious they should still have the "right" to use the water. I think this is a similar situation as the snowmobile ban in the parks out west that was defeated in court.
- The next practice of concern that is in the GMP is horseshoe crab harvest. This harvest of horseshoe crabs off the bottom ground has been occurring on Chincoteague for decades. The harvest is federally regulated by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Committee. A quota is given to participating States. In Virginia the Virginia Marine Resource Commission controls the catching by licenses and strict quotas are followed. This harvest happens off Virginia bottom ground as horseshoe crabs do not swim. Harvesting of horseshoe crabs started in the 80s and was not mentioned in the 1965 agreement as they had not begun harvesting them.
- Watch houses and concern for water quality is again a State issue. The Virginia Health Department began a shellfish sanitation division in 1920 which performs over 24,000 water samples a year and monitors pollutant levels in Virginia water. Watch houses were included within the Code of Virginia pursuant to §28.1-117 until 1975 and were encouraged to help protect the valuable oyster production within the Commonwealth.
- Duck blinds are again a State issue as they are anchored to Virginia bottom. Virginia Game and Inland Fisheries issues hunting licenses and regulations that control the duck blinds. Many of these locations have been handed down from generation to generation.
- Shellfish and the harvest of shellfish on leased bottom has been occurring before Colonel Baylor surveyed the productive oyster grounds in Virginia for the use by the public. Areas not outlined in Baylor ground were then leased to the people of Virginia so they could invest in shell and start propagating shellfish. This survey was completed in 1894. The shellfish beds and control of the bottom are specifically exempted from control by the Federal Government in an agreement signed between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the U.S. Government. I find it ludicrous Virginia needs to get a permit to do something that we already have the authority to do.

In conclusion, the main question is how the National Park Service (whose main focus is on public access) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife (whose main focus is on wildlife protection) interchange jurisdiction to whichever agency has the most authority. Water column jurisdiction makes sense when people have access for their safety. The perplexing situation to me is when the high ground is controlled by U.S. Fish and Wildlife and I cannot anchor to nor walk across it. How can the adjacent water column need this water jurisdiction by the Park Service for the protection of the people?

I thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the GMP. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments you may have.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Bloxom, Jr.

Cc: Senator Mark R. Warner  
Senator Timothy Kaine  
Congressman Scott Rigel  
Congressman Rob Wittman  
Senator Lynwood W. Lewis, Jr.  
John Bull, Commissioner, Virginia Marine Resource Commission  
Virginia Health Department  
Town of Chincoteague, Robert Ritter  
Accomack County Board of Supervisor Chair, Ron S. Wolff  
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries  
Shore Daily News  
Eastern Shore Post  
Eastern Shore News


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 216

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Michael Lipford

Organization: The Nature Conservancy, Virginia and Maryland Chapters  Official Rep.

Organization Type: P - Conservation/Preservation

Address: 490 Westfield Road  
Charlottesville, VA 22901  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-27 and E-37

Date Sent: 04/22/2016 Date Received: 05/04/2016

Number of Signatures: 2 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes: Email transmitting comments received on 4.29.16.

### Correspondence Text

April 22, 2016

Ms. Deborah Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Re: Assateague General Management Plan Comments

Dear Ms. Darden:

We are writing to submit The Nature Conservancy 's (Conservancy) comments to the National Park Service's (NPS) Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and associated environmental impact statement for Assateague Island National Seashore (Seashore). We appreciate this opportunity to offer comments and submit that, overall, the draft GMP is a well thought out, comprehensive plan for managing and prioritizing a number of natural resources and human-related challenges in the face of sea-level rise and extreme storm events. The Conservancy supports Alternative 3, the NPS's preferred alternative in the draft GMP.

The Conservancy has a direct interest in both the Seashore GMP and the recently approved Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP). That interest is based on our goal of protecting the ecological integrity of the Maryland and Virginia barrier islands and coastal bays, as evidenced by the Conservancy 's long history of engagement in, and stewardship of, the Virginia Coast Reserve (VCR). The Conservancy views the shoreline from the Ocean City inlet south to Fisherman 's Island as a unified coastal system, and as such, believes that it should be managed in a way that best maintains the ecological integrity and productivity of this barrier island complex.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

The Conservancy has been working to protect barrier islands and coastal habitats off the coast of Virginia for nearly five decades. Since our first project on Virginia's Eastern Shore in 1969, the Conservancy's ownership there has grown to encompass all or part of nine barrier islands and five marsh islands in addition to multiple preserves and conservation easements on the mainland. The Conservancy, in partnership with federal and state agencies, local governments, and other non-governmental conservation organizations, has protected more than 130,000 acres of lands and waters.

Our coastal land protection work has focused largely on Virginia's 75-mile long barrier island chain. The Conservancy's ownership includes Parramore, Hog, Cobb, Little Cobb, Ship Shoal, Myrtle, and Smith and joint ownership of Metompkin and Cedar. Together, these islands anchored to the north by Assateague, Chincoteague, Wallops and Assawoman and to the south

Lending credence to the importance of this area, the Eastern Shore of Virginia's coastal bays and lagoon barrier island complex has been recognized as a United Nations International Man and the Biosphere Reserve site, a U.S. Department of the Interior National Natural Landmark, a National Science Foundation Long Term Ecological Research site, and a Western Hemisphere international Shorebird Reserve Network site. These recognitions result largely from the fact that there is currently little direct human impact on the natural processes that maintain these barrier islands and associated habitats.

In Maryland, there are over 160,000 acres of protected properties in close proximity to Assateague and relevant to the GMP. The Conservancy has been most active in the Pocomoke River watershed, which is the primary river system providing freshwater for Pocomoke Sound. In addition to land protection and restoration work on the main stem, The Conservancy owns and manages its largest preserve in Maryland on Nassawango Creek, a tributary to the Pocomoke. Totalling over 10,000 acres, the Conservancy's Nassawango Creek Preserve encompasses most of Nassawango Creek and adjacent bald cypress swamp from its headwaters to the mouth, as well as large blocks of contiguous forest habitat, some of which the Conservancy is in the process of restoring from pine plantation to native hardwood forest. The Conservancy, working in close cooperation with many longstanding partners has a long and successful history of working to protect key habitats, and the larger ecological systems and processes of Maryland's lower Eastern Shore and the Eastern Shore of Virginia.

The Conservancy commends the NPS's longstanding efforts to manage the Seashore by accommodating compatible human uses with complex ecological requirements within the park. In Alternative 3, the draft GMP has thus recognized the importance of the Seashore for its recreational value and visitor experience, while balancing the many natural resource needs and actively seeks to enhance the values of each. The NPS has an admirable record of compatible management, to the greatest extent possible, and does not reduce or unduly restrict the visitor experience.

We applaud the NPS for recognizing the need to adapt to the many effects of climate change on the Seashore and surrounding communities, particularly accelerated sea-level rise and extreme storms. The Conservancy greatly appreciates that the NPS is both committed to enhancing and sustaining coastal resilience at the Seashore and to working with the community to reduce the risks of coastal hazards caused, in part, by climate change. This is entirely consistent with the Conservancy's approach to addressing climate change effects by promoting the use of nature based solutions to reduce the risks of coastal flooding associated with sea-level rise and storm surges. These nature-based solutions increase the adaptive capacity of the landscape, provide many other benefits to people and nature including water filtration, carbon sequestration, and increased productivity of fish and shellfish- all of which enhance the resilience for coastal communities in the face of climate change. Overall, the NPS demonstrates an earnest commitment to incorporating climate change science and sound adaptation alternatives in the draft GMP.

Although The Conservancy believes that Alternative 4 - Natural Island Evolution and Primitive Island Experience - is the most ecologically sustainable alternative, we recognize that the current recreational uses on Assateague are long standing and have broad public support. However, those recreational uses and the facilities that support them are under increased threat from normal coastal processes, now accelerated by climate change. The history of the island itself indicates that the costs of continuing to maintain and support the current recreational facilities and other infrastructure will become increasingly prohibitive in the future. Therefore, we submit that Alternative 3 - Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

(NPS Preferred) provides a long term goal of ecological sustainability, while also providing for a gradual transition off the island for more intensive recreational activities, as those facilities become more difficult to maintain on the island.

The Conservancy recognizes the importance of preserving the culture and economic impact of commercial aquaculture in the Virginia waters in and near Assateague. As stated in the GMP, the Commonwealth has leased bottom land for clam and oyster aquaculture, within what became Seashore waters, since the 1890's. The Conservancy values this industry and supports the recommended process of issuing a special use permit through the Virginia Marine Resource Commission that would allow for continued practice of commercial aquaculture in Tom's Cove and other areas in and around the Virginia waters of Assateague.

The following are items in the GMP are of particular concern to the Conservancy:

A. Under section(s) 2.6.1 [Overall Concept] and 2.6.2 [Visitor Use and Experience]

1) The Conservancy strongly favors development of an Inlet Breach Policy south of the Maryland Island Developed Area(s). It allows for new inlets to evolve naturally and takes into account natural coastal processes and westward migration of the island. Allowing a breach to remain open would potentially provide significant water quality and ecological benefits for the Chincoteague Bay complex. We also recommend the use of the best available climate science, modeling and analysis of coastal geomorphology in developing an effective Inlet Breach Policy in consultation with stakeholders and experts. We do, however, realize the sensitive political and economic nature of this issue particularly from the perspective of concerned mainland property owners, if a prolonged inlet breach north of the Verrazano Bridge should occur.

2) We encourage developing a plan to support and protect the shorebird and sea-beach amaranth habitats on the islands north end (between Ocean City Inlet and the Verrazano Bridge). This area is one of the premier nesting areas for piping plover and American oyster catchers (Figure 3.2a in GMP) on the island, in both Maryland and Virginia. Human access, whether by boat or Over-Sand Vehicles (OSV), should be limited to the greatest extent possible especially during the breeding season between April 1 and August 30.

3) While we realize the long history of OSV use on the island (currently from the MD developed area south to the state line) we want to stress the importance of limiting, or eliminating, this use as the island continues to migrate in response to natural dynamics and climate changes over time. We object to the use of OSV's north of the MD State Park, for the reasons mentioned in number two above.

B. Under section(s) 2.6.3 (Visitor Facilities and Infrastructure) and 2.6.4 [Natural Resource Management]

1) We understand and support the Alternative Transportation System (ATS) contingency planning proposal as described. As a public recreational area, providing for visitor access to, and on, the island in the future will likely become more challenging. Having a reasonable and all-inclusive plan in place when traditional transportation methods are no longer viable will be of the utmost importance.

2) We also support the proposed assessment and study to establish a Wilderness Area on the island. As climate change and sea level rise limit human use and access, and as the island evolves over time, large portions of the island will become more amenable to this designation. The ongoing restoration projects (removal of invasive species and wetland -mosquito ditch-restoration) should reflect positively on the eligibility for such designation. We believe this designation would not necessarily preclude human use and would provide limited opportunity for "low density, low impact" recreational uses.

C. Under section(s) 2.6.7 [Partnerships] and 2.6.8 [Land Acquisition]

1) We applaud the NPS/ AINS for their inclusiveness and desire to work with a wide array of partners. Through the continuation and growth of these partnerships the critical work of the Seashore to plan for mainland land conservation and facilities relocation, and the protection and restoration of upland and marine habitats for wildlife and water quality in the

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

coastal bays watersheds will be better served.

2) We support the proposed Land Acquisition plan(s) as outlined under 2.6.8. While the mainland land protection numbers (3,000-5,000 acres) are ambitious, we do not feel they are unattainable. With The Conservancy's history of land protection across the eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia, we propose the NPS undertake a rigorous review of Chincoteague and Newport Bay parcels, giving careful consideration to locations with sub-watersheds that provide intact, functioning and healthy perennial streams and tidal creeks. The land acquisition element should also take into consideration those properties that have the greatest adaptive capacity to allow for landward migration of salt marsh. With the possibility of a catastrophic storm event rendering the visitor facilities in-operable for a prolonged period we submit this review should be undertaken as soon as feasible. The Conservancy would be a willing partner in this effort.

Lastly, given the prodigious recreational, economic and conservation importance of the Seashore and its resources and the dramatic challenges it faces in the coming decades, a bold and visionary approach is necessary to accommodate all of the competing interests, in response to climate change. We look forward to partnering with the NPS as the proposals in Alternative 3 (NPS Preferred) are studied, planned and implemented.

In closing, we want to express our thanks for the opportunity to submit these comments. The Conservancy values greatly our longstanding partnership with the National Park Service locally and nationally.

If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Jill Bieri, the Conservancy's Director of the Virginia Coast Reserve at 757-442-5416 or [jbieri@tnc.org](mailto:jbieri@tnc.org) OR Joseph Fehrer, Maryland Coastal and Lower Shore Project Manager at 757-414-9225 or [jfehrer@tnc.org](mailto:jfehrer@tnc.org).

Most sincerely,

Michael Lipford  
Virginia Executive Director

Elizabeth Gray  
Maryland/DC Executive Director




# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 217

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Evelyn Shotwell

Organization: Chincoteague Chamber of Commerce  Official Rep.

Organization Type: B - Business

Address: 6733 Maddox Boulevard  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA

E-mail: eshotwell@chincoteaguechamber.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-28 and E-35

Date Sent: 04/25/2016 Date Received: 05/04/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes: Email transmitting same comment received 4.29.16.

### Correspondence Text

April 25, 2016

Deborah A. Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Re: Response Letter to the National Park Service General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

The Chincoteague Chamber of Commerce would like to thank you and your staff for conducting the series of Open Houses to discuss and answer questions regarding the recently released draft General Management Plan (GMP) for Assateague Island National Seashore. We would like to submit a few comments, if we may, that are of particular concern to the chamber board of directors as representatives of the business community of Chincoteague Island.

With tourism being the primary economic driver on Chincoteague Island, it is our desire that National Park Service staff will continue to support public recreational beach use (regardless of where that beach is located within Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge), OSV use and shoreline management in Virginia through cooperation with USFWS. This is of vital importance to the business community of the island and the Eastern Shore of Virginia as a region as visitation to Assateague Island National Seashore benefits all cities and towns from Maryland to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel.

Many Chincoteague families depend on local waters for their livelihood. The historical and cultural preservation of the Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

working watermen is of vital importance to the survival of our island. The Chincoteague Chamber of Commerce is pleased to see that commercial finfishing will continue to be allowed in Tom's Cove waters for generations to come through language incorporated in the GMP.

However, the Chincoteague Chamber of Commerce has some concerns:

- We ask that language in the GMP should state "no action will be taken relative to watch houses and duck blinds" due to their historical and cultural significance. Virginia Department of Health regularly monitors Chincoteague waters for contamination from wastewater discharge from such private structures, therefore no intervening action should be taken by NPS.
- We support the continued "leasing of submerged lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia within the seashore boundary for commercial aquaculture" as is stated in Public Law 89-195 Sec. 5 and ask that this would be stated in the final GMP and adopted in the final draft.
- With respect to horseshoe crab harvesting, the chamber requests that the "harvest of horseshoe crabs would continue within the seashore" due to the historical and cultural way of life on Chincoteague Island that has been handed down from generation to generation and is the only means of income for some island families. This is a livelihood issue and must be preserved. Otherwise, it would devastate families who have no other means of making a living.

As representatives of the business community, it is our obligation to reach out to NPS to consider the impact that this document will have on the people of Chincoteague Island and their way of life. You simply cannot take away a person's means of making a living. Aquaculture, horseshoe crab harvesting, and finfishing are all strong economic drivers in this area. As such, they must be protected for future generations or an entire way of life will be destroyed and lost because of short-sightedness by the NPS.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments regarding the draft GMP and areas of concern to the Chincoteague Chamber of Commerce during this comment period.

Best regards,

Evelyn Shotwell  
Executive Director

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 218

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Barry Frishman  
Organization:  
Organization Type: B - Business  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-29  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 05/04/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes: Correspondence is a duplicate of the correspondence provided by the town of Chincoteague (E-50).

### Correspondence Text

April 30, 2016

Deborah A Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

RE Response Letter to the National Park Service General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

On behalf of Captain Barry Frishman I am presenting a brief list of comments and concerns regarding the General Management Plan (GMP) Alternative Concepts, for the Assateague Island National Seashore.

After a 5-year wait, we learned about four alternatives as detailed in the plan. Some of the alternatives' planning processes are frustrating because there are very good ideas mixed with very bad ideas (from our perspective as the gateway community for the southern end of Assateague Island). The following list is provided to clearly identify those elements of the draft GMP that we hope the NPS will work on in more detail, with the Town of Chincoteague representatives.

Wilderness Area

The wilderness area in your preferred alternative makes clear and corrective steps to continue OSV within five hundred feet

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

of the water line on the ocean side and takes such territory out of the plan over the water, which we commend. Although we think that the land base is too small, and the proposed wilderness area should not be considered in any portion of Assateague Island National Seashore.

#### Oyster Watch Houses and Duck Blinds

In the executive summary, and alternative of the GMP it states "continue to take no action related to privately owned structures (oyster watch houses and duck blinds) associated with submerged land leases." However, in the other three alternatives (including the preferred alternative in the GMP) it states "to initiate an assessment of privately owned structures (e.g. oyster watch houses and duck blinds) located within Virginias seashore and work with Virginia to ensure appropriate wastewater treatment and disposal at authorized structures (e.g. oyster watch houses)." The town's understanding is the Virginia health department takes adequate samples per year of the waters around Chincoteague, to determine if it has contaminated discharge of nutrients, pathogens, etc. resulting from wastewater discharge. Wastewater treatment and disposal is and has been a function of the Commonwealth of Virginia, nothing in the Seashore Act gives joint or sole authority to the NPS.

Also, the GMP states "Working with Virginia, NPS would assess the legal status of privately owned structures (oyster watch houses and hunting blinds) located within the seashore's Virginia waters, and pursue removal of those found to be unauthorized." The town is taking a very strong position on the historical and cultural decisions set on oyster watch houses and duck blinds. Almost all oyster watch houses and duck blinds have been handed down from generation to generation, to those family members that live on Chincoteague Island. All of which precede the state code of 1975 allowing oyster watch houses, most of which also proceeded the Seashore Act of 1965 without requiring any kind of permits. Also, since annexation of the town's corporate limits in 1989, to the low water mark of Assateague Island the town currently allows oyster watch houses and hunting blinds within our town limits. Duck blinds and hunting are controlled by the Commonwealth of Virginia, they issue the License to hunt and enforce Virginia's laws as such. Hunting and duck blinds proceeded the Seashore Act of 1965 and before the creation of the National Wildlife Refuge.

The town insists the GMP preferred alternative language be changed throughout the GMP to match that which is stated in the executive summary and alternative one, where no action will be taken relative to oyster watch houses and duck blinds.

#### Aquaculture

The executive summary and alternative one of the GMP states leasing of submerged lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia, within the seashore boundary, for commercial aquaculture, would continue. The other three alternatives, including the preferred alternative, states "in recognition of this long history of use, NPS would issue a special use permit under 36 CFR 2.60(3)b to the Virginia Marine Resource Commission (VMRC) within the Commonwealth of Virginia to allow for the continued practice of commercial aquaculture and maintenance of the historic setting."

The town's position and as stated in Public Law 89-195, Sec 5, "That nothing in this Act shall limit or interfere with the authority of the State to permit or to regulate shell fishing in any waters included in the National Seashore." This is the same public law that sets up the boundaries of the national seashore on Assateague Island. 36 CFR 2.60(3)b would obstruct Virginia's authority in this matter.

The town insists the GMP preferred alternative language be changed throughout the GMP to match the executive summary and alternative one, where it states "leasing of submerged lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia within the seashore boundary for commercial aquaculture would continue."

#### Horseshoe Crabs Harvest

In the executive summary and alternative one of the GMP it states the harvest of horseshoe crabs would continue to occur within the seashore. In the other three alternatives including the preferred alternative, it states the "NPS would prohibit the harvest of horseshoe crabs."

The town objects to any reference of denying horseshoe crab harvesting in the GMP, which is a historical and cultural way of

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

life on Chincoteague. This harvesting has been handed down from generation to generation in Chincoteague Island families and would be a disaster to see a family's way of life discontinued. Horseshoe harvesting is controlled by the Commonwealth of Virginia, they issue permits, and set the quotas each year, nothing in the Seashore Act of 1965 gave that away.

The town insists the GMP preferred alternative language be changed throughout the GMP to match language in the executive summary and alternative one, where it states the "harvest of horseshoe crabs would continue to occur within the seashore."

#### Finfishing

We applaud your decision allowing commercial finfishing in Virginia and omitting all language that would prohibited such activity. The commercial fishing has been a historical cultural way of life for folks living in Chincoteague for centuries and we would like to see this activity be passed down through families for another century. Oyster Watch Houses, Duck Blinds, Aquaculture and Horseshoe harvesting should all be treated the same as finfishing, they all have the same historical and cultural values to our community, and all were a part of our way of life in the past and future. The Seashore Act of 1965 did not give up any of the Commonwealth rights to allow and control these activities, but actually promoted them.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft general management plan. Our main concerns and support are based on cultural and historical preservation of the working watermen, which for these men, is their families only income. A waterman's skills and livelihood are well documented throughout Chincoteague's history. The Town of Chincoteague will continue to rely on NPS staff to support public recreational beach use, OSV use and shoreline management in Virginia through the interagency agreement with the FWS.

If you need additional information, please feel free to contact the Town Manager at 757-336-6519.

Sincerely,

Captain Barry Frishman

Please see attached questions.

#### QUESTIONS

Page i, 1-8 with ownership to mean high water in Maryland and mean low water in Virginia

1. What Virginia law gave the right to mean low water?

Page xv 961 automobile parking spaces

2. A standard parking space will not work for campers, boats etc. Will there be any type of overflow parking considered? Even if further back from the beach?

3. Beach Restoration in the form of sand fence and dredging around the jetty is still continuing on the North end. Will there be a chance that these activities will be extended to the Southern end of Assateague Island?


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 219

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Barbara Rudnick

Organization: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  Official Rep.

Organization Type: F - Federal Government

Address: 1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-30 and E-47

Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/05/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes: Email duplicate of comment received on 5.2.16.

### Correspondence Text

May 1, 20 16

Ms. Deborah A. Darden  
Superintendent  
United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

Re: Draft General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement, for Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland

Dear Ms. Darden:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS), for Assateague Island National Seashore. The purpose of the GMP/EIS is to provide a decisionmaking framework that ensures that management decisions effectively and efficiently carry out the NPS mission at Assateague Island National Seashore into the future.

The DEIS evaluates four Alternatives:

- Alternative 1: NPS would continue to manage resources as it does today.
- Alternative 2: Most visitors would enjoy traditional beach recreation concentrated within a high density area accessible by private vehicles. This Alternative would likely require significant manipulation of the natural environment to protect facilities and infrastructure in the island developed area.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

- Alternative 3 (Preferred Alternative): Over time infrastructure would evolve to more sustainable designs and likely shift to more stable locations both on and off the island. New water-based points of access would provide access to additional low density visitor use in the backcountry. This alternative represents a long-term shifting of facilities and assets to climate change.
- Alternative 4: Visitors would continue using existing facilities and infrastructure until such a time as they were lost and /or damaged by natural coastal processes and /or the effects of climate change/sea level rise. Lost or damaged facilities would either not be replaced or would be minimally replaced with sustainable substitutes. Alternative 4 represents a quicker adaptation of seashore facilities and assets to the effects of climate change.

Based on our review we rate this Draft EIS, Lack of Objection (LO). A description of our rating system can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/comments/ratings.html>. However, we offer the following recommendations and suggest that additional information be provided describing future projects presented in the GMP/EIS.

- We suggest that the timeframe for this plan be clearly stated.
- It is suggested that additional information be provided in the Final EIS describing proposed stormwater management measures for future projects.
- Low impact development should be considered for future development.
- Air emissions and alternative fuel modes of transportation should be considered if and when ferry and shuttle services are developed. Also, the cost of these services to users should be included.
- The Final EIS should provide details on the environmental impacts (wetland, sub-aquatic vegetation, Aquatic Resources, dredging, etc) related to activities associated with the GMP/EIS. In addition, permits may need to be obtained as well as mitigation for unavoidable impacts. Impacts to species of concern, aquatic resources and other habitats should be avoided and minimized.
- The Final EIS should also identify seasonal aquatic construction restrictions related to fish, birds and other wildlife.

Please continue to work with EPA and other stakeholders as the Final EIS, Record of Decision and additional NEPA analysis for the various components of this plan move forward. Thank you for providing EPA with the opportunity to review this project. If you have questions regarding these comments, the staff contact for this project is Barbara Okorn; she can be reached at 215-81 4-3330.

Sincerely,

Barbara Rudnick  
NEPA Team Leader  
Office of Environmental Programs


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 220

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Susan Bachor

Organization: Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Representatives  Official Rep.

Organization Type: Q - Tribal Government

Address: P.O. Box 64  
Pocono Lake, PA 18347  
USA

E-mail: templet@delawaretribe.org

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-1

Date Sent: 03/11/2016 Date Received: 03/11/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 11, 2016

US Dept of the Interior  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
Att: Deborah Darden  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

RE: General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Assateague Island  
national Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden,

Thank you for inviting the Delaware Tribe in consultation. Upon review of the management plans the Delaware Tribe would recommend implementation of Alternative 4: Natural Island Evolution and Primitive Island Experience. The Tribe would also not be opposed to a comprehensive cultural resource study of the island that would identify and document culturally significant resources in the area.

We do ask that in the event a concentration of artifacts and/or in the unlikely event any human remains are accidentally unearthed during the course of the study that all work is halted until the Delaware Tribe of Indians is informed of the inadvertent discovery and a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the find.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact this office by phone at (610) 761-7452 or by e-mail at [temple@delawaretribe.org](mailto:temple@delawaretribe.org).

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



Sincerely,

Susan Bachor

Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Representative

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 221

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David T. Adams  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pine Grove Mills, PA 16868  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-3  
Date Sent: 03/19/2016 Date Received: 03/19/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 19, 2016.

Dear Ms. Darden,

My name is David Adams and this letter is in reference to the General Management Plan for Assateague Island National Seashore, specifically the Maryland component of said National Seashore. I enjoy the use of the island because it enhances three very important aspects of my health: my physical health, my emotional health, and my spiritual health. My ability to use the island enhances my physical health by providing me with opportunities to exercise in a beautiful, calming environment and by allowing me to "wildcraft" (harvest) various foods rich in protein and omega-3 fatty acids. The opportunity to hike and canoe provide me with exercise, and the act of collecting clams and mussels as well as the acts of angling with rods and throw nets are labor intensive and provide exercise as well. Being able to camp on the island helps with my emotional health for many reasons, not the least being that the cost of camping is much less stressful for me than having to pay for a motel room. If I had to pay for a motel, I probably wouldn't visit your island as frequently, my stays would be shorter, and the tremendous stress relief and subsequent emotional healing I enjoy as things stand would be greatly reduced as would my overall quality of life. Seeing birds on the makes me happy, building a fire makes me feel comfortable and collecting food from the ocean makes me feel competent. The spiritual healing I enjoy as a result from staying on your well-managed island is as important and as powerful as any other benefit I receive. While on Assateague, the profound is there to fill me with awe every time I care to experience my visit with an open heart and an open mind. The fish, birds, wildflowers, grasses, ponies, trees, other wildlife, tracks in the sand, shells, the waves, sun, the salt air...when I am on your island, my heart and soul is taken back to a much older place, and at the same time I become lost in the moment and am able to heal from the spiritual wounds working in healthcare has the tendency to inflict upon healthcare providers. In short, I feel I need your island, Assateague, to maintain my holistic health. While my experiencing is unique to me, I believe my family has experiencing while on this island which is just as valuable and all-encompassing as mine. My ability to access the island with an OSV is a very important part of my experience. I like to purchase the overnight pass even though I don't stay on the beach

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

fishing all night. I believe the island is worth supporting and I am willing to support this great and unique ecosystem with resources of my own. If OSV use is further restricted, then my ability to utilize your island as a source of healing, recreation, education, and family bonding will be reduced. When I am having hard days at work, when I am suffering the spiritual and emotional wounds of a career of nursing people when they are at absolute rock-bottom, I have visions of your island which fill me with hope and peace. I see my family and I driving out onto the beach in my Subaru. We set up the fishing rods, put out the chairs, and get the grill ready. We catch fish, we cook them on the beach, and life is really, really good. I need the OSV access to keep this dream alive. While there are many competing needs the island needs to be managed for, our human needs for physical, emotional and spiritual wellness and healing must be at least equal to the needs of a bird or any other form of life. The OSV access is a very important part of that human health need for many people. Please do not further restrict OSV access.


Thank you for your time,

David T. Adams

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 222

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Nekole Alligood  
Organization: Delaware Nation  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: Q - Tribal Government  
Address: 31064 Highway 281  
PO Box 281  
Anadarko, OK 73005  
USA  
E-mail: nalligood@delawarenation.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-5  
Date Sent: 03/28/2016 Date Received: 03/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good afternoon, I hope this message finds you well. I have reviewed the information sent pertaining to the above mentioned project and the only thing I would like clarification on is how the horse population will be reduced to accommodate a reasonable carrying capacity. Will the horses be re-located or put up for adoption?

As for the other changes or improvements to be made on the island, on behalf of the Delaware Nation, I can find no concerns. Please let me know how the horse population will be reduced; keeping in mind I understand the necessity of "thinning the herd" but do not want to see them killed.

Thank you.

Nekole Alligood  
Director of Cultural Preservation  
Delaware Nation  
31064 HWY 281  
POBox281  
Anadarko, OK 73005  
Phone: 405-247-2448  
Fax: 405-247-8905

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 223

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dennis W. Evans  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-6  
Date Sent: 04/07/2016 Date Received: 04/07/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The following statement came from the website:

[http://www.dnr.state.md.us/climatechange/data\\_guide.asp](http://www.dnr.state.md.us/climatechange/data_guide.asp)

"Current projections from the Maryland Climate Change Commission predict between 2.7 and 3.4 feet of additional sea level rise by 2100. Sea level rise affects coastal areas by exacerbating coastal flooding, influencing shoreline erosion, and submerging tidal wetlands and other low-lying lands". This is based on projections which is based on models. Since when are models accurate? Consider the difference in the European and American models predicting storm paths for hurricanes and nor'easters. While the storm is raging, they cannot predict it with accuracy. The European models have been more accurate than the American. Are we to believe that similar models can predict sea level rise for the next 84 years, ie. 2100? Please do not change the recreational activities you have in place based on this hysteria.

Sincerely,

Dennis W Evans, Berlin.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 224

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Floyd Morton, III  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Georgetown, DE 19947  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: P-108 and E-8  
Date Sent: 04/13/2016 Date Received: 04/13/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern,

I am commenting on the 2016 GMP for Assateague Island Md.

For generations families, businesses and the local economy has depended on Assateague Island to be there for them. Campers, OSV beach goers, fishermen, wildlife photographers, shell hunter, honeymooners, hikers and many more hobby groups use this Island for an escape from the daily riggers of every day life. This Island must remain open to all of these user groups and I just named a few.

I am a fisherman, but also a conservationist and a preservationist. I understand the importance of protecting our Wildlife, but at what expense? The Outer Banks just went through a change to the beach access and it has DEVISTATED the economy. There are businesses closing, homes in foreclosure and tourism is down 60%. I would hate to see that happen here in Maryland. I am hoping that the NPS and the public can come to an mutual agreement on how Assateague Island can be managed that is fair to everyone and help the local economy grow.

The four alternatives that were offered to the public in the GMP seemed to be one sided with a lot of "could be's" , "maybe's" and "if the appropriate funds are available". The OSV access was not guaranteed in any of the alternatives. I would like to see the OSV access a guarantee not only for the future generation of fishermen/women, but for the local economy, not to mention the revenue for the NPS.

My vote will be for Alternative #3 with the following considerations.

1) I am totally opposed to the idea of a "wilderness designation". Reasons for that is because the Island is in a constant state of change as the Island "rolls over itself". With Climate Change (Global Warming) and Sea Level Rise eventually there will be no beach access for OSV's once the ocean level has reached the "wilderness designation". There is no consideration for the

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

OSV access with Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming).

2) If a "wilderness designation" is created, there must be some consideration for the future of OSV access for generations to come. As the Island "rolls over itself", the carsonite markers must move West as well. If there is a "wilderness designation" created it should be located 300 yards West of the current position of the carsonite markers to account for Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming) to guarantee OSV access. The carsonite markers must be relocated West every year for maximum OSV access.

3) The bridge that connects Assateague Island to the mainland needs to remain in the sole custody of the state of Maryland without a cooperative agreement with the NPS.

4) The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to " OSV will continue until there is irreversible natural causes and OSV driving becomes unsafe"



5) The GMP states a "passenger ferry" is to be used to in the future for transportation to the island from the mainland. The wording needs to be changed to or add the wording "vehicle passenger ferry".

Thank you for allowing the public to comment,  
Floyd Morton III

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 225

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Gary Savage  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportsfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-9  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern,

I am commenting on the 2016 GMP for Assateague Island Md.

For generations families, businesses and the local economy has depended on Assateague Island to be there for them. Campers, OSV beach goers, fishermen, wildlife photographers, shell hunter, honeymooners, hikers and many more hobby groups use this Island for an escape from the daily riggers of every day life. This Island must remain open to all of these user groups and I just named a few.

I am a fisherman, but also a conservationist and a preservationist. I understand the importance of protecting our Wildlife, but at what expense? The Outer Banks just went through a change to the beach access and it has DEVISTATED the economy. There are businesses closing, homes in foreclosure and tourism is down 60%. I would hate to see that happen here in Maryland. I am hoping that the NPS and the public can come to an mutual agreement on how Assateague Island can be managed that is fair to everyone and help the local economy grow.

The four alternatives that were offered to the public in the GMP seemed to be one sided with a lot of "could be's" , "maybe's" and "if the appropriate funds are available". The OSV access was not guaranteed in any of the alternatives. I would like to see the OSV access a guarantee not only for the future generation of fishermen/women, but for the local economy, not to mention the revenue for the NPS.

My vote will be for Alternative #3 with the following considerations.

1) I am totally opposed to the idea of a "wilderness designation". Reasons for that is because the Island is in a constant state of change as the Island "rolls over itself". With Climate Change (Global Warming) and Sea Level Rise eventually there will be no beach access for OSV's once the ocean level has reached the "wilderness designation". There is no consideration for the

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



OSV access with Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming).

2) If a "wilderness designation" is created, there must be some consideration for the future of OSV access for generations to come. As the Island "rolls over itself", the carsonite markers must move West as well. If there is a "wilderness designation" created it should be located 300 yards West of the current position of the carsonite markers to account for Sea Level Rise and Climate Change (Global Warming) to guarantee OSV access. The carsonite markers must be relocated West every year for maximum OSV access.

3) The bridge that connects Assateague Island to the mainland needs to remain in the sole custody of the state of Maryland without a cooperative agreement with the NPS.

4) The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to " OSV will continue until there is irreversible natural causes and OSV driving becomes unsafe"

5) The GMP states a "passenger ferry" is to be used in the future for transportation to the island from the mainland. The wording needs to be changed to or add the wording "vehicle passenger ferry".

Thank you for allowing the public to comment,

Gary Savage  
AMSA Member #725


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 226

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Bill Justice

Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportfishermen's Association, Inc.  Official Rep.

Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups

Address: PO Box 106  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA

E-mail: amsapresident@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-11

Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Call for Action Requested before May 1st, 2016

Assateague General Management Plan Comments

As everyone knows AMSA has been very involved over the past several years in the GMP process.

Many steps have been completed and now the document is in the final phase. This plan is the guidelines the National Park Service will use to manage the island for the next 40 to 50 years.

AMSA representatives have attended and spent many hours in meetings and workshops over the years that led up to this time. AMSA asks everyone to please send in their comments on how you would like to see the island managed in the coming years.

Let us tell you a little about the GMP, it is almost a 700-page document that offers four alternatives which will govern the NPS on how they manage the island. After much consideration, AMSA has considered each of the alternatives that have been offered. The legislative committee and AMSA's Board of Directors has been meeting and discussing all of the alternatives in depth. They agree that alternative 3 is the better alternative. However, that being said, AMSA would like to see some consideration for changes within alternative 3.

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". Please include in your comments that the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. AMSA strongly opposes a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. AMSA feels very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. AMSA does not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. AMSA's greatest fear is the losing control of the bridge which could mean the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming it impassable.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

Last but not least, a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. AMSA would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is currently written.

Please, when you send in your comments, try to include these suggestions and ask for the changes to be made in the GMP. Any or all of these could remove your presence on the island/OSV in the years to come.

Your comments should be directed to:

Debbie Darden  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21801  
deborah\_darden@nps.gov

Also please send a copy to:

US Congressman Andy Harris  
212 W Main St  
#204B  
Salisbury, MD 21801  
bill.reddish@mail.house.gov

The Congressman has asked that he be copied on any and all comments as he and his staff have been monitoring the GMP process very closely during his tenure representing his district.

In closing, this is your chance to speak up and be heard one final time. If you truly love Assateague and its recreational opportunities send in your comments, PLEASE. Take an hour and write your comments. Tell your friends to send in their comments. It is our hope that recreational beach goers will stand up and be heard. You can't sit here silently on this one people, or you just might lose your OSV access on our beautiful Assateague.

AMSA Board of Directors

Should you have any questions feel free to contact:

Bill Justice  
AMSA President  
(302) 236-4333  
amsapresident@verizon.net  
president@keepersofthebeach.com

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 227

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Larry Gaigler  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-12  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Deborah Darden

Just wanted to thank you for all that you do to protect our natural resources here on our beloved Assateague Island and comment on the GMP.

From everything I've learned about the plan options I'm supporting the 3rd alternative with the exception of the following.

- No Ferry service
- Keeping the bridge as it is today, owned and maintained by the state of Maryland
- No Wilderness designations
- OSV will continue until conditions change, needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island"

My hope is to see many more generations can enjoy our resource here as I have since the 60's and they can see all the wildlife and beautiful beaches as it is today!


Again, Thank You for your time and work on our Island

Larry Gaigler  
[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 228

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ted Elder  
Organization: Worcester County Commission  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: T - Town or City Government  
Address: x  
x, MD x  
USA  
E-mail: telder@co.worcester.md.us

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-13  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As Worcester County Commissioner, I strongly support the recommendations made by A.M.S.A. They have consistently worked with the Federal, State and Local Governments for the overall good of our local treasure, Assateague Island and it's many visitors. I have reviewed their proposals and find them very thoughtful ,containing common sense solutions.


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 229

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Michael Magee

Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportfishermen's Association, Inc.  Official Rep.

Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups

Address: PO Box 106  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA

E-mail: rockmagee17@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-14

Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I would like to thank you for your time at the AMSA workshop to answer our questions. I truly believe this GMP has the potential to set a precedence for other national seashores. With that being said, here are my comments for the GMP.

Alternative #3 is my preferred alternative but I believe there are some things that need to be addressed.

First, wilderness designation has no place on Assateague Island. Assateague has never met the criteria for a wilderness. A barrier island is in constant flux and is always changing. A wilderness would hamper your flexibility in managing the seashore.

Second, the word "consider" is used far too many times in the GMP. This type of wording leaves too many issues up for interpretation for future superintendents, especially in regards to the moving of the carsonite markers each year. It is extremely important that it be stated the the carsonite markers WILL be moved each year as the island rolls over itself.

Third, The wording of "OSV will continue until conditions change" needs to be reworded to "OSV will continue until the natural causes makes use of OSV impossible".

Next, I do not support NPS acquiring the bridge or going into a cooperative agreement with the State of Maryland. I feel the goal of reducing congestion could be accomplished with a simple Park and Ride for the people wishing to do so. Ocean City does this over the route 50 bridge.

Last, I would also like a clear definition of the proposed ferry system to be a public vehicle ferry. As per our discussion in the workshop, section 4.4.5 pages 4-70 should be removed as it clearly states that the only vehicles on the island, should the bridge be lost, are NPS operations vehicles and beach shuttles.

Thank You,  
Michael Magee  
AMSA Director



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 230

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ty Wintermoyer  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-15  
Date Sent: 04/15/2016 Date Received: 04/15/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes: Commenter made two separate comments that are not the same. The other comment is P-15.

### Correspondence Text

Dear Debbie Darden and Congressman Andy Harris,

As a MD resident and active user of the Assateague Island National Park I support and share the AMSA's views and opinions of the proposed management plan.

Below are a few specific points that I feel need addressed in the plans.

The GMP states the NPS will "consider" repositioning the (carsonite) markers each year. I believe that this is a must as the island is "moved" by mother nature every year and the marks should move as well to maintain our access in a safe manner.

I feel that Assateague Island should not be given a wilderness designation.




NPS should not acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island. This would essentially eliminate the "State" park. One benefit to the State Park staying in operation would be in the event of another government shutdown (that has nothing to do with the parks) we would still have access to a portion of the island.

Finally, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island". "Until conditions change" is too open for interpretation...conditions change on the island almost daily.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 231

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Benny Bennington  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address:   
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-16  
Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

1. Alternative 3 is the better plan.
2. The carsonite markers in the OSV zone should to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future.
3. Strongly oppose any wilderness area at any time!
4. I do not support the cooperative with the state of MD. And NPS concerning the bridge acquisition.
5. The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change" needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV zone on the island".
6. A clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry to be a public vehicle ferry.

Thank you.

Stephen "Benny" Bennington

  
Berlin, MD. 21811  
  
AMSA 1033

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 232

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Georgia Perdue  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Salisbury, MD 21804  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-17  
Date Sent: 04/15/2016 Date Received: 04/15/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Ms. Darden,

#### General Management Plan Comments

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". Please change to: "The carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future".

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. I strongly oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island and feel very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

Last but not least, a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. I would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is currently written.

Thank you,  
Georgia Perdue

Georgia Perdue, DNP, CRNP

[REDACTED]



Salisbury, MD 21804

[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 233

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Joseph Benamati  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: x  
x, MD x  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-18  
Date Sent: 04/15/2016 Date Received: 04/15/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I would like to comment on what I have heard about the Assateague General Management Plan.

Based on the information I have gathered, alternative 3 seems the "best of the bunch." However, even it has room for improvement.

To begin with, "the NPS will consider re-positioning the [carsonite] marker..." is one of many (200+) times the word 'consider' is used within the document. A document of this magnitude should not be made weak and open to interpretation by the overuse of such a subjective 'requirement.' Will the plan include yearly re-positioning of the marker to allow continued OSV use, or will it include a loophole which would permit a future administration to leave the marker where it is as the island rolls past it.

Speaking of the OSV Zone and loopholes.... The current wording, "OSV will continue until conditions change" is also open to interpretation. Strictly speaking, if conditions IMPROVE the OSV Zone could be closed.. because conditions changed! (I hope that's not what it means, but that is what it says.) The intention of this statement should be more clear, such as "OSV will continue until natural causes create conditions which are irreversible and prohibit any safe OSV use on the island."

Something mentioned more times than the word 'consider' was used, is the idea of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island. In the last 35 years, has the island ever met the requirements for such a designation? I don't believe it has. It's instability makes it unlikely the island will ever meet the requirements. This plan is a good place to state that idea as an impossibility which does not need to be visited again.

Frankly, the wording in many sections of this document seem to support OSV and recreational use the first time you read it, but on further investigation, it leaves open many avenues for discontinuation of such activities. For instance, the notion that NPS should cooperate with the State of Maryland to acquire and control the bridge onto the island doesn't seem to make financial sense, so I question it's motive. Could cuts in federal funding limit repairs to the bridge, eventually 'forcing' it to be

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

deemed unsafe? Then the only access to the island would be the not-yet-realized ferry access. Which has been referred to as a PASSENGER ferry, not a VEHICLE ferry, and thus, OSV use on the island would be eliminated without actually closing the OSV Zone.

I am a resident of Wicomico County, an Earth and Space science teacher, and regular visitor to the Assateague National Seashore. I understand the area, the ecology, and the location. I've purchased an OSV pass for my vehicle every year since shortly after moving to Maryland almost 25 years ago. I couldn't even begin to calculate how many hours my family and I have spent on the island (I'm sure it rivals the amount of time I've spent in Ocean City in the last 25 years.) I am a member of both the NCBBA and the AMSA, but not because I enjoy surf-fishing. I maintain those memberships because I agree with their guiding principals of ecology and conservation. I have not seen creditable data which supports the claim that all OSV activities should be stopped. To the contrary, I have seen the efforts of both of these organizations improve conditions by respecting the needs of endangered and migratory species, and removing non-biological debris which washes ashore (presumably after it has fallen off a ocean-going vessels.)

A long range plan for the island is necessary. But it is essential that we have a plan that protects the island and its inhabitants as firmly as it maintains our access to it's bounty and beauty. Twenty years from now (God willing and the island hasn't rolled to the mainland) I would like to share this natural beauty with my grandchildren, the way I experienced it. Not with old pictures and a drone.

Thank you for your time,  
Joseph Benamati

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 234

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Brandy Parker  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-19  
Date Sent: 04/17/2016 Date Received: 04/17/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers. I, strongly oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. I feel very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited. Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this.


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 235

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Amy M. Ewing

Organization: Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries  Official Rep.

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: PO Box 90778  
Henrico, VA 23228  
USA

E-mail: amy.ewing@dgif.virginia.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-20

Date Sent: 04/14/2016 Date Received: 04/14/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Janine,

Please accept the below as an addendum to our comments on the subject project which were originally sent to you on April 4, 2016.

We note that the DEIS Preferred Alternative states that NPS would "Initiate an assessment of privately owned structures (oyster watch houses and hunting blinds) located within the seashore's Virginia waters to determine their legal status; pursue removal of any unauthorized structures." As stipulated, the pertinent hunting blinds are located in Virginia waters, and are subject to the jurisdiction of the Code of Virginia and to regulations of the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. We look forward to working cooperatively with USFWS and NPS regarding any issues that arise regarding siting, regulation, use, or management of such blinds.

Thanks, Amy


Amy M. Ewing  
Environmental Services Biologist/FWIS Biologist Supervisor  
Chair, Team WILD (Work, Innovate, Lead and Develop)  
VA Department of Game and Inland Fisheries  
7870 Villa Park Dr., Suite 400, PO Box 90778, Henrico, VA 23228  
804-367-2211 [ [www.dgif.virginia.gov](http://www.dgif.virginia.gov) ]



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 236

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Richard W. Meehan  
Organization: Mayor, Town of Ocean City  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: T - Town or City Government  
Address: 301 Baltimore Avenue  
Ocean City, MD 21842  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-21  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Deborah A. Darden, Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

RE: Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement Federal Register Notice #2016-02109

Dear Superintendent Darden:

The Town of Ocean City, Maryland supports your effort to adopt a new General Management Plan for Assateague Island National Seashore. As your neighbor to the north, we value the work of the National Park Service to maintain our shared landscape as a resource to the community and to all of our seasonal visitors. We hope that the preferred alternative, if selected, will continue to implement successful current management strategies for the future.

The following comments are provided on the Draft GMP/EIS for the Assateague Island National Seashore:

- 1) Partnerships - Please consider the Town of Ocean City, MD as a local government partner (Sec. 2.6.7), and as a cooperating agency for future studies such as the proposed Breach Management Plan (Sec. 2.4.2).
- 2) Management Zones - The use of zones and subzones to identify management approaches that are unique to a specific area is encouraged. Please consider the addition of a North End Restoration Project subzone that includes the northern 6 miles of Assateague Island in Maryland (Fig. 2.3).
- 3) USACE - Please clarify whether the North End Restoration Project will continue to be recognized by the preferred alternative, including the federal agency partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

- a. Please identify the USACE as a federal agency partner (Sec. 2.6.7)
  - b. Include both management actions and budget proposals necessary to initiate a renewal of the project with USA CE and other partners at least 3 years prior to expiration (by 2025) (Sec. 2.6.7, 2.6.11, Table 2.7)
  - c. Actions needed to achieve desired future conditions of the North End Restoration Project are missing from Alternative 3 table 2.7 (page 2-62) and under many of the 'coastal response management actions', add management actions that are specific to the north end of Assateague Island to resolve conflicting management approaches.
  - d. Coastal Response Management Actions (Sec. 4-17, 4-43, 4-70, 4-95, 4-169) indicate that Alternative 3 seashore management "would allow the island to evolve naturally ... (and) would no longer work with the USACE to provide additional sand to mitigate the erosional forces associated with storms and/or sea level rise. No new investment would be made in dune fortification through planting and fencing installation." Please clarify that this does not apply to the North End Restoration Project Area ( 6 miles from the Ocean City Inlet to Assateague State Park).
- 4) Ocean City Inlet and Municipal Airport- Please consider and include the Inlet and Airport as critical infrastructure which represents significant federal investment and impact to the 'socio-economic environment' that are directly related to management approaches in the GMP (Sec. 1.9.4, Sec. 3.14 and 4.11).

Thank you for your presentation to the Town of Ocean City and for your contribution to improving the draft General Management Plan.

If you have any questions, please contact me at ( 410) 289-8931.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Meehan, Mayor

Attachment

Town of Ocean City  
STAFF REPORT

DATE: April 12, 2016

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: William W. Neville, Director P/CD

RE: Comments on Draft GMP/EIS for Assateague Island National Seashore

A draft General Management Plan (GMP)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Assateague Island National Seashore is now available for a 90 day public review and comment period ending on May 1, 2016. Assateague Island National Seashore is composed of the 37 mile barrier island extending from Ocean City Inlet in Maryland, to Toms Cove Hook in Virginia.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

The draft General Management Plan is a policy-level document that defines the park's purpose and sets a management direction for decades to come. Four alternatives for future park management are described, one of which is identified as preferred by the National Park Service (\*) because it best meets the need to protect the seashore and provide great experiences for visitors.

Alternative 1 - Current Management

Alternative 2 - Traditional Beach Recreation

Alternative 3\* - Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation

Alternative 4 - Natural Island Evolution and Primitive Island Experience

Staff encourages participation by the Town of Ocean City in the review and comment period for the draft GMP/EIS for Assateague Island National Seashore. Several issues have been considered by the Coastal Resource Advisory Committee (Green Team), presented to National Park Service Superintendent Debbie Darden, and discussed at the public Open House held by NPS.

Based on these discussions, Staff has prepared proposed comments for review by the Mayor and Town Council to allow submission prior to the May 1, 2016 deadline.

Ocean City Inlet and the North End of Assateague Island are topics of mutual interest to the National Park Service, Worcester County and the Town of Ocean City, MD. The GMP takes the approach of asking important questions and then reviewing alternatives to evaluate the preferred solution. (see page 1-31) What questions should we ask?

How would a change in NPS management policy and management at the north end of Assateague Island National Seashore affect the Ocean City Inlet?

- Sand dredging/bypass through a long term USACE project keeps the navigation channel clear and provides access to West Ocean City harbor, commercial fishing fleet, charter fishing industry, Coast Guard, and recreational boating
- Sand nourishment at the north end of Assateague helps to maintain protective beach and dune systems, fill potential breach areas, and support active recreational beach areas
- Inlet management regulates tidal flow rate to the coastal bays with ecological, economic and hazard mitigation benefits/impacts
- A resilient, actively managed barrier island profile at the north end of Assateague Island provides storm surge and flood protection for downtown Ocean City's 'first to flood' neighborhoods, and the Ocean City Municipal Airport
- Ocean City Inlet and the navigable channel west of Assateague Island provides important recreational access for boating and fishing

Several elements of the GMP stand out as areas of concern where the management plan for the proposed Alternative 3 is unclear or is in conflict with other sections of the Plan.

1. 30,000 foot view (description of the level of detail in the draft GMP/EIS)

Google Earth provides an image of what is included in the 30,000 foot view. (See Exhibit)

Comment: The Town of Ocean City, MD requests to be included as a partner community, and as a cooperating agency for future studies such as the proposed Breach Management Plan.

2. Management Zones (described on page 2-19)

The NPS uses management zones to describe the resource conditions and desired visitor experiences to be achieved in various areas of the park. Alternative 3 (NPS preferred) designates the north end of Assateague Island within the Natural Resource Zone (green) and excludes a sliver of land adjacent to the Ocean City Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay (dark blue).

Comment: The use of zones and subzones to identify management approaches that are unique to a specific area is

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

encouraged.

Comment: The Natural Resource Zone, and the Sinepuxent Bay Zone describe a particular management approach (Table 2.4) "Natural processes are allowed to occur unimpeded" which seems to conflict with statements regarding community resilience (Section 2.4.2)

3. North End Restoration Project (described on page 1-57-58) 6 mile area south of the inlet includes the 'nodal point' where dredged sand is placed offshore. The USACE project will continue as planned for 12 more years. Common to all alternatives, the NPS would also continue to partner with the USACE to implement the North End Restoration Project that mitigates the continuing effects of the Ocean City Inlet and jetties by restoring/maintaining sand supply to northern Assateague Island at the historic, pre-Ocean City Inlet rate.

Comment: Add an overlay subzone to each of the Alternative Management Zone Maps (Figure 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4) which identifies the North End Restoration Project area as subject to more than just 'natural resource zone' policies (See exhibit)

Comment: Add North End Restoration Project subzone to Table 2.3 and Table 2.4 under Natural Resource Zone and Sinepuxent Bay Zone

Comment: Include both management actions and budget proposals necessary to initiate a renewal of the project with USACE and other partners at least 3 years prior to expiration (by 2025) (Sec. 2.6.7, 2.6.11, Table 2.7)

Comment: Actions needed to achieve desired future condition of the North End Restoration Project are missing from Alternative 3/Table 2.7 (page 2-62) and under many of the 'coastal response management actions', add management actions that are specific to the north end of Assateague Island to resolve conflicting management approaches

4. Alternative 3 - Sustainable Recreation and Climate Change Adaptation (NPS Preferred Alternative described on page 2-47) Concerns include visitor use of the north end via boating with new permit/fee to reduce visitor impacts (page 2-50), natural resource management excludes beach and dune systems from resiliency actions (page 2-52), possible expansion of wilderness would limit beach management options (page 2-52), USACE and OCMD are missing from partnerships (page 2-56), response to climate change (page 2- 84), limited dune maintenance (page 2-94),

Comment: Coastal Response Management Actions (4-17, 4-43, 4-70, 4-95, 4-169) Alternate 3 directs seashore management actions that would allow the island to evolve naturally... (and) would no longer work with the USACE to provide additional sand to mitigate the erosional forces associated with storms and/or sea level rise. No new investment would be made in dune fortification through planting and fencing installation.

Please clarify whether the proposed management actions in Alternative 3 are consistent with the North End Restoration Project, and whether this policy would apply to the north end of Assateague Island in 12 years?

"The north end Restoration Project and NPS management actions in the north end, aimed at restoring natural overwash processes interrupted by the 1999 emergency storm berm, would continue to facilitate evolution of sparsely vegetated overwash areas providing habitat for piping plovers and seabeach amarant." (see page 4-101)

5. Floodplains (page 3-19)

Description is not current and should include a section for new Coastal RiskMAP analysis completed by FEMA in 2015. Managed beach elevation and dunes under current management provide protection to coastal communities from coastal storms and storm surge, what will happen if NPS management changes?

Comment: Update section to include current FEMA coastal flood risk mapping to meet EIS requirement for use of best available information.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 237

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Craig Bream  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Lewisberry, PA 17339  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-22  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello Debbie,

I am writing today to provide my feedback on the Assateague GMP.

As an avid surf-fisher, nature lover and outdoor enthusiast, I have several concerns regarding the proposed GMP. Given the options presented, I prefer Option #3, but I still have concerns.

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will "consider repositioning the marker each year". The carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. I strongly oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. I feel very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. My greatest fear is losing control of the bridge which could mean the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming it impassable.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Last but not least, a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. I would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is currently written.

I hope that you will take these suggestions into consideration and hope that there will be access to Assateague for my family and many generations to come.

Thanks,

Craig Beam

[REDACTED]

Lewisberry, PA 17339

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 238

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bobbi Mozing  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Parsonsburg, MD 21849  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-23  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Ms. Darden,

I am writing in reference to the GMP, and some of the wording I find very disturbing in its contents. Please understand while I totally and completely understand the need to protect and preserve the beach and it's wildlife I am greatly concerned with the following issues that I feel are quite detrimental to the public access of the island. I will take this time now to thank you for your time in reading my concerns outlined below.

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP... This is rather vague and widest reaching term to actually use free flowing throughout the document... It leaves much to interpretation, and that is not clearly outlined. One instance of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". I feel the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers. The right and pleasure to drive upon the beach should not be infringed or slowly taken away.

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. I strongly oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. I feel very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, and I find I am quite curious as to what has changed that the island may for some reason now fall under this designation? Unless such is proven, the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. My greatest fear is the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

it impassable... this would completely destroy any and all access to the island itself.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island." The OSV zone is instrumental every year to numerous bird watchers, photographers, students, and numerous other beach enthusiasts and groups dedicated to the preservation of the beach, its habitat, and its resources. truly feel the idea of this wording and its implications should be abandoned and never be revisited. There is also note of a pedestrian only ferry being out into place... I would like to suggest a ferry for public vehicles be implemented as well if a ferry such as described actually is put into service.

Again I would like to sincerely thank you for your time in reading my comments... I am sure the NPS had been swamped with commentary from many sources, and my sincerest hope is that each are carefully read, and necessary revisions are made to keep the access to our most wonderful treasure on the eastern shore available to all its enthusiasts, from local and afar.

Bobhi Mozingo

[REDACTED]

Parsonsborg, MD 21849.



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 239

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bruce Lynch  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Frankford, DE 19945  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-24  
Date Sent: 04/20/2016 Date Received: 04/20/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good afternoon,

My family has enjoyed the Island for many years and our wish is that future generations can too. I believe by choosing Alternative 3 and making the below requested modifications to the GMP will be the best way to ensure the Island's health and recreation use going forward.

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP, again I prefer Alternative 3. I suggest revising the document as follows:

1-the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

2-A wilderness designation should be abandoned.

3-The NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. Suggest removing and I do not support this.

4-the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

5-Adjust the ferry comment to say a public vehicle ferry instead of passenger ferry.

Thanks for your consideration.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Bruce Lynch



Frankford, DE 19945

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 240

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Chris Baumbach  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Lewisberry, PA 17339  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-25  
Date Sent: 04/21/2016 Date Received: 04/21/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello Debbie,

I am writing today to provide my feedback on the Assateague GMP.

As an avid surf-fisher, nature lover and outdoor enthusiast, I have several concerns regarding the proposed GMP. Given the options presented, I prefer Option #3, but I still have concerns.

First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will "consider repositioning the marker each year". The carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. I strongly oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. I feel very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. My greatest fear is losing control of the bridge which could mean the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming it impassable.

Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Last but not least, a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. I would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is currently written.

I hope that you will take these suggestions into consideration and hope that there will be access to Assateague for my family and many generations to come.

Thanks,

Chris Baumbach

[REDACTED]

Lewisberry, PA 17339

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 241

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lang Rose  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-27  
Date Sent: 04/23/2016 Date Received: 04/23/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Debbie Darden

Looking over The Assateague General Management Plan. I would like to see some items changed. The carsonite markers should be moved as needed to allow maximum driving space. The mention of a wilderness designation should be dropped altogether, Assateague does meet requirements. The third item concerning OSV needs to remain open, a great amount of people enjoy the OSV zone and it is the main reason for their visit. The last item of concern is the bridge, we need to leave it as is under state control. If ever a problem arises with the bridge Maryland needs to be responsible for repairs. If repairs were overwhelming at that time the state could ask for federal assistance. We need to remember that Assateague generates over 90 million a year to our local economy.

Thanks

Lang Rose

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 242

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Earl Sager  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
Stafford, VA 22554  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-28  
Date Sent: 04/24/2016 Date Received: 04/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have been visting assateague island since 1972 , both camping fishing an hikeing, when it was first come first serve for camping . I belive that plan 3 that the park has chosen is also in the best interest of all concerned . the problem I have is that there are a lot of pages to read an that there is a lot more detailed information, that is in the plan that many will not even know about , as what is projected in the short summary of the plan to the public, unless you dig deeper in to the plan, like a wilderness area, believing that this will only inpair , the repair of the island in case of a breach of the island. it would also limit access to the bay side on the turn offs on the beach, where a handie cap person would not be able to visit , from beach access, in my many years of visiting the park, I have seen handie cap humans vist the OSV to enjoy the beach, other wise they could not have been able to to enjoy the same things as a non handie cap human could do. the OSV is a very inportane part of this, some years ago, when the last house on the island was pvt owned an given to the NP of AIMD , I belive there was a clause in there that the back road was to remain open for 10 years, it presented a work around on beach closers , for one reason or another , pipeing plover or high water , or turtle nesting . that work around is now gone. I was there when there was only 1KM of beach open, for 146 OSV an a bunch of people, it was like waiting for an accident to happen, parents where looking for the lost children, it was crowed to the point I thought I was in ocean city md. there for I belive that the NPS @ AIMD , should have a mim amount of KMS open before opening the beach to that many OSV users also looking at the plan, there are a lot of things that the NPS has as consider, like running fairies to an from the island if the bridge should fail inspection, owning the bridge by the NPS, would be a mistake, it would certainly cost the tax payer more money , an in crease the budget of the park, it would inhibit the first responders to the island more time to get there. I never thought I would have seen a concession stand on AIMD , maybe an ice machine, but that's it , it looks like it is being set up for some type of shuttle service ( is it run but the NPS or is it pvt , with a contract )an where there bids on it . keep the cold showers, when humans come off the beach to take a shower, it will bring there core tempture down, an lord only knows we can be stupid at times plover as a study that was done by Michal Patterson in 1986 to 1987 that 91% of the plover deaths where attributed to predators an 2.2% where done by human destruction. the rest could not be determand , one death was attributed to an osv , an that plover that hatched out on the bay side where more likely to survive . at around 64% . knowing that this study was done some time ago, but it was the latest one could find, most of the plover nest on the north an south side of the island

In finishing, I must remind you that you are stewards of the land that are payed for by the tax payer personally have had very pleasant exp, camping fishing an hikeing in the park, crabbing an a whole host of other exp, all pleasant an relaxing , I would like to see these exp continue for generations to come. I also realize that the state of MD an the NPS must work together , so these exp continue an that vistor to the island have the same exp as I have , let the NP run its end an the state worrie about theres , an common areas like the bridge be worked out by both partys

I am 67 yrs old I live in Stafford VA an I am dyslexi grammer has always eluded me spelling, an English , so please eccept my humble apologize . if this email is not very understandable

earl d sager , see you on the 28 of april, camping on A6 bay side

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 243

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Wanda J. Thornton  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Chincoteague, MD 23336  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-29  
Date Sent: 04/24/2016 Date Received: 04/24/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Deborah Darden Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Drive  
Berlin, MD. 21811

RE: General Management Plan Comments for Assateague National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

I am writing to offer my comments on the GMP Plan for Assateague Island National Seashore.

First I would like to state that the document is hard to read and understand because you keep referring back and forth between alternatives.

I fully support the comments that was submitted by the Town of Chincoteague and the County of Accomack.

Aquaculture

This has been a traditional and historical way for local residents to earn their living for many years. The State of Virginia under the supervision of VM RC has been in charge of all the bottom lands in Virginia long before Assateague National Seashore was established. It should continue without any interference or restrictions, including you claim of the water column.

Duck Blinds and Oyster Watch Houses

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



This has also been a traditional and historical way for local residents to earn a living prior to the Seashore Act and should continue. The State of Virginia controls the issuance of hunting license and the Fish and Wildlife uses all monies from the sale of Duck Stamps to purchase land for Conservation.

Wilderness area or Marine Sanctuary

I oppose any expansion of a Wilderness area or any attempt to establish a Marine Sanctuary in Chincoteague Bay, in Virginia. None of these regulations should be implemented without the consent of the local governing bodies and the State of Virginia.

The restoration project that was agreed upon between the Park Service and the U.S Army Corps of Engineers to replenish Assateague National Seashore in Maryland for 25 years needs to be studied to establish whether the changes that are occurring in the Southern portion of Assateague is being severely altered by this action. The cost of 2 million dollars per year for 25 years is not realistic when you are letting the southern portion of Assateague wash away wash away. This demolition by neglect is putting the health safety and welfare of the residents of Chincoteague in severe jeopardy. One severe storm could devastate the southern end of Chincoteague Island causing severe property destruction and loss of life.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments.

Wanda Thornton


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 244

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Frank Piorko

Organization: Maryland Coastal Bays Program  Official Rep.

Organization Type: P - Conservation/Preservation

Address: 8219 Stephen Decatur Highway  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA

E-mail: mcbp@mdcoastalbays.org

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-31

Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Deborah Darden  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811  
Attn: Assateague GMP Comments

Dear Ms. Darden,

We are pleased to express our full support for Assateague Island National Seashore's preferred General Management Plan (GMP) alternative, Alternative 3. As a National Estuary Program, Maryland Coastal Bays Program (MCBP) is a non-profit partnership among the towns of Ocean City and Berlin, the National Park Service (NPS), Worcester County, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Maryland Departments of Natural Resources, Agriculture and Planning.

The National Estuary Program was established under Section 320 of the 1987 Clean Water Act (CWA) Amendments as a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency place-based program to protect and restore the water quality and ecological integrity of estuaries of national significance. Section 320 of the CWA calls for each National Estuary Program to develop and implement a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). The CCMP is a long-term plan that contains specific targeted actions designed to address water quality, habitat and living resources challenges in its estuarine watershed.

The CCMP has been developed with assistance from natural resource experts, advocates, citizens and our partners. This plan reflects significant contributions from individuals, community groups and scientists who share a common interest in a healthy environment and a prosperous region.

MCBP supports Assateague Island National Seashore in their preparation for climate change as well as planning for the Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

continued westward movement of the island. Over the past century, the Mid-Atlantic coastal region has seen an increase in sea level. It is predicted that this trend will continue into the next century.

Increasing sea level can result in coastal erosion, exacerbated flooding and storm damage, inundation and loss of wetlands and other low-lying areas, salt intrusion into drinking water aquifers and streams and higher water tables. Higher sea surface temperatures associated with climate change are likely to increase the frequency and intensity of hurricanes.

The CCMP calls for enhancing the level of sustainability in land use decision making (CE 2). By planning for climate change adaptation, this alternative supports MCBP's Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) action item CE 2.2.2: "MCBP will work with city, county and state officials to ensure planning efforts include adaptation to climate change to protect infrastructure, public health, agriculture, wetlands and forests ... "

In addition to climate change, Assateague Island has been migrating westward primarily due to overwash. This landward migration has accelerated at the northern end since the opening and subsequent stabilization of the Ocean City Inlet in 1933, which disrupted sediment transport to the north end of the island.

The CCMP also calls for continuing to implement the Ocean City Water Resources Study recommendations (RN 3). Specifically, this alternative also supports our CCMP action RN 3.1.2: "ACOE and NPS will continue to facilitate the Assateague Island North End Restoration Project to restore the natural sediment supply to the barrier island." A commitment to these actions was made by our partners to include the National Park Service.

In addition, the CCMP states our goal of balancing resource protection with recreational use (RN 2). We believe that Alternative 3 best accomplishes this goal.

MCBP applauds the research, planning, and vision that went into defining Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Frank Piorko  
Executive Director  
Maryland Coastal Bays Program

#### References:


Cain, C. J., & Wilson, D. (Eds.). (2015). Our Path Forward: The Comprehensive Conservation & Management Plan for Maryland's Coastal Bays. Cambridge, MD: IAN Press, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.  
<http://www.mdcoastalbays.org/pdf/ccmp.pdf>

Dennison, W. C., Thomas, J. E., Cain, C. J., Carruthers, T. J., Hall, M. R., Jesien, R. V., ... Wilson, D. E. (2009). Shifting Sands- Environmental and cultural change in Maryland's Coastal Bays. Cambridge, MD: IAN Press, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 245

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Shirley Miles  
Organization: Eastern Shore Federated Women's Club ;  Member  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 19413 Fairfax Drive  
Fairhope, AL 36532-6969  
USA  
E-mail: shirley.cain@att.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-33  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I live in Alabama (Baldwin Country) and we are trying to save the delta of mobile bay from being taken over by the NPS

I, Shirley Miles, received this call to action request and I am familiar with the Assateague but would like move information before writing my comments and by the way the alternatives, are they reasonable, why does it take 700 pages of documents ?

GMP, it is almost a 700-page document

send them to :  
Shirley Miles  
Eastern Shore Federated Women's Club  
19413 Fairfax Dr  
Fairhope AL 36532-6969

Take an hour and write your comments. Tell your friends to send in their comments. It is our hope that recreational beach goers will stand up and be heard. You can't sit here silently on this one people, or you just might lose your OSV

Call for Action Requested before May 1st, 2016 Assateague General Management Plan Comments As everyone knows AMSA has been very involved over the past several years in the GMP process. Many steps have been completed and now the document is in the final phase. This plan is the guidelines the National Park Service will use to manage the island for the next 40 to 50 years. AMSA representatives have attended and spent many hours in meetings and workshops over the years that led up to this time. AMSA asks everyone to please send in their comments on how you would like to see the island managed in the coming years. Let us tell you a little about the GMP, it is almost a 700-page document that offers four alternatives which will govern the NPS on how they manage the island. After much consideration, AMSA has considered each of the alternatives that have been offered. The legislative committee and AMSA's Board of Directors has been meeting and

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

discussing all of the alternatives in depth. They agree that alternative 3 is the better alternative. However, that being said, AMSA would like to see some consideration for changes within alternative 3. First, the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP, one of which is where the white (carsonite) marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". Please include in your comments that the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen, as the island rolls over itself, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers. Second, there is mention of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP. AMSA strongly opposes a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island. AMSA feels very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited. Third, the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. AMSA does not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. AMSA's greatest fear is the losing control of the bridge which could mean the federal government might not free up funding to do any repairs to the bridge and deeming it impassable. Fourth, the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island". Last but not least, a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. AMSA would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is currently written. Please, when you send in your comments, try to include these suggestions and ask for the changes to be made in the GMP. Any or all of these could remove your presence on the island/OSV in the years to come.

- - - - -  
thank you for helping,  
VTY  
Shirley Miles

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 246

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bill Gross  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Harrisburg, PA 17112  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-34  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good Evening Deborah,

I am writing this evening to express my concerns for the impending changes that may be coming to my beloved Assateague Island National Park. I visit the park several times a year in pursuit of the surf fishing opportunities that are there year round. My "commute" to the island is over 4 hours, and I contribute to the local economy on every visit there. Lucky Angler and Buck's place Bait shops, Food Lion, Royal Farms, and a hotel room from one of the many places there in Ocean City. Just to name a few places that will be affected by this management plan, if the NPS decides to go against the sportsman and beachgoers wishes and limit our access to the Assateague National Seashore.

I truly hope the NPS does not consider shutting down the access to the island.

Alternative 3, seems to be the better of the alternatives for the sportsman's community. I have a few terminology items I would like you to change or clarify, as follows:

- 1) The White / Carsonite markers - should be positioned in the OSV zone to allow maximum room for beach driving during all "non extreme weather" related tidal conditions. These markers should also be able to be moved from year to year to compensate for changes to the islands shape and beach conditions.
- 2) Wilderness Designation - due to the possibility for the island and areas to change shapes from nature's forces, I request that this designation NOT BE assigned to Assateague Island.
- 3) The possibility that NPS will move the entrance to the park to the other side of the state owned Verazano Bridge, is concerning because of the maintenance required to keep the bridge passable and safe. I do not support this change as it could lead to the park being closed because of NPS budget cuts that lead to the lack of up keep on the bridge.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

4) The wording " OSV zone will continue until conditions change" needs to be changed to " until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV one on Assateague Island"

5) In Regards to the " Passenger Ferry" that would lead to the island, this should be changed to "Public Ferry".

I think that covers my concerns for Alternative plan #3. And the possibility of the park being closed.

Please contact me by replying to this email, or at bgross517@gmail.com.

Thank You for taking the time to read this letter, and please let me know if you have questions.

Bill Gross



[REDACTED]

Harrisburg PA 17112.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 247

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Patrick W. Townsend  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-38  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Superintendent Darden,

I am a second generation AMSA member who has enjoyed Assateague Island and the OSV zone for my entire life. My parents first brought me to Assateague Island as an infant and I have continue to enjoy the island for the past 48 year. Today, my wife, children and I enjoy the Island as family and intend to do so for many years and our wish is that future generations can do the same. While we understand the need for a GMP for the island and believe Alternative 3 to be the best option for continued use of the island as we know it there are concerns in this alternative that need to be addressed before being finalized.

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP, again I prefer Alternative 3 with the following considerations:

1. A wilderness designation should be abandoned.
2. The moving of the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone is mentioned in the wilderness section only. From point one above, the proposal to move the carsonite markers each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future must be included in the visitor use and visitor experience section. If this doesn't happen and the island move westward, eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive on the east side of the carsonite markers.
3. the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".
4. The NPS has a desire to acquire the state-owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. Suggest removing and I do not support this.
5. Adjust the ferry comment to say a public vehicle ferry instead of passenger ferry.

Thanks for your consideration.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



Patrick W. Townsend

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 248

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Tom Nelson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-39  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I support the national park services recommendation for option three in the GMP. What is most important for me is continue access to the OSV zone.

The OSV zone provides unique opportunities to observe wild life, especially bird watching. A few years ago I was able to see a snowy owl, the first time in my life, I was in my late 60s. I always enjoy seeing the flocks of swallows in the fall. Can't see that anywhere else.

Whenever children, grandchildren and visitors come one thing I do is to take them on a ride in the OSV zone, it gives them the unique experience of seeing a natural beach. My daughters always go to the beaches on assateague rather than Ocean City when they visit because they are so uncommercial.

My favorite walk is to Valentines hunting shack, it is unique going through a variety of habitats, fresh water marsh, forest and bay side wetlands. I am concerned that the discussion of establishing a wilderness zone will have a serious impact on impact on access to many parts of the island except by a few who are able to hike longer distances, I am 71 years old and cannot hike as long a distance as I would like. Restricting access by a wilderness zone designation would end my ability to explore many parts of the island. Likewise limiting OSV access in any would would have a similar affect. I do include the restrictions for plover nesting in this comment, I believe the park service does a good job in balancing access and threatened bird protection.

Missing in the GMP is the economic impact that the various options would have on the local economy. As recently reported:

"The report conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey and National Park Service economists showed the two million plus visitors to Assateague Island National Seashore in 2013 spent \$84.3 million in communities near the park. The direct and indirect spending supported 1,052 jobs in areas around the barrier island."

I also miss the opportunity to see the comments made by others. Part of my job was to review OSHA rule making. The

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

process used included a open docket and the ability to comment on what others commented. I know that the park service is not bound by the same rules, but open access would be beneficial.

Sincerely

Tom Nelson

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 249

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael R. Sapp  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-40  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Having been blessed with access to Assateague Island Nation Seashore throughout my lifetime, I would like to see that future generation of my family, as well as other responsible individuals are afforded similar opportunities. Unfortunately, my understanding of the GMP leaves me questioning future access.

Insomuch as I prefer Alternative Three, I am in favor of several changes. The GMP states "the NPS will "consider" repositioning the marker each year". This refers to the white Carsonite Markers. These markers are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area.

Assateague Island is forever changing. Over the last thirty-five years, Assateague Island has not met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation therefore this idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

The National Parks Service has expressed a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island, moving the fee area to the mainland. I do not support this cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition.

The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change" is vague and left to the discretion of the NPS. At a minimum this must be changes to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".



Sincerely,

Michael Raymond Sapp

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 250

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Dan Morris  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-41  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My family represents four generations of frequent visitors to Assateague Island. We mainly go to use the osv zone for swimming, sun bathing, water sports, camping, and of course fishing. I have read all the proposed versions multiple times and truly believe number 3 is the best for all of us. Although some adjustments should be made to ensure future administration can not change the way visitors access the island.

Because of the way the island moves constantly west and the entire island is used and visited a wilderness designation should not be considered and should be removed from being able to propose at any time.

The wording "osv will continue until conditions change " should be more specific in the type of conditions for example "irreversible natural causes that prohibit safe travel on the island "

The section that states the carsonite markers may be moved should be more specific and state that they "will" be moved to adjust with the movement of the island west

Any consideration for the NPS to acquire the bridge should be removed.

Also if there is ever a time when a ferry is needed to get onto the island a vehicle capable one should be used not just a passenger ferry.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Danny Morris  
AMSA #127

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 251

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jeffrey R. Stickle  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Rehobeth Beach, DE 19971  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-42  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Superintendent Darden,

I am writing to comment on the proposed General Management Plan for the Assateague Island National Seashore. I appreciate the opportunity to state my views on this important document that, if approved, will form the basis for the management of the Seashore for many years. The Assateague Island National Seashore is one of the many gems in the National Park System and I certainly hope that the future will continue to allow many of us here on the East coast to enjoy the Seashore.

I commend you on the tremendous amount of work that I know you and your staff have put into formulating the proposed General Management Plan. However, there are certain areas that, I think, need to be modified. I see the Plan has several alternatives to consider in adoption of the final plan. I think that Alternative 3 is the best choice for the plan BUT I have some reservations about the current Alternative 3. Let me tell you what they are:

1. The Ferry. The plan mentions a ferry that apparently is for passengers only as the term used is "passenger ferry." Currently vehicles are allowed on the island and I am concerned taht the current wording would be interpreted to prohibit vehicles from the Island. I think the "ferry" should be clearly worded to allow for continued vehicle use on the island. I would suggest the wording be changed so both pedestrians and vehicles would be included in the idea of a ferry to the island. Change "passenger ferry" to "ferry for vehicles and the public."

2. Wilderness Designation. It is my understanding that Assateague Island has been unable to meet the requirements for "wilderness designation" in many years. I think this is basically because of the nature of an island that has been used for public recreation. The island is a barrier island and is in constant flux. Yet, the proposed plan talks about "wilderness designation" many many times. I would strongly suggest the idea of "wilderness designation" be removed from the plan entirely. Let's face it, Assateague Island is not going to meet the requirements for wilderness designation, nor do I think such a designation practical or desirable.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

3. OSV Markers. The plan uses the word "consider" in talking about moving the white markers that define the area where vehicles (Over Sand Vehicles) may operate. One of the prime uses of Assateague Island for as long as many of us can remember was for fishing from the beach and, to that end, vehicles have been permitted to drive on the beach. The wording in the document about the markers should not use the word "consider" when talking about moving the markers each year. The markers should be moved each year, as needed, to provide for beach driving access. If the NPS can "consider" moving them a situation could develop where the markers would not be moved eventually leading to the markers being in the water, thus eliminating beach driving. Please remove the option for "consider" and mandate that the markers be moved to provide for beach driving access as conditions necessitate.

4. OSV Use. Item 3 leads me to wording that is vague with regard to OSV usage. I am speaking of the phrase "OSV use will continue until conditions change." I really think a more definite wording about what "conditions" would have to be present for OSV use to be restricted or prohibited would enhance the Plan. The wording needs to clearly state that conditions that would prohibit OSV use would be such that cause danger to the public or their safety. Such conditions also need to be defined as to duration. OSV use should not be curtailed unless the conditions for such restriction are permanent and caused by natural conditions on the Seashore.

5. The Bridge. NPS has expressed a desire to take ownership of the current bridge to the island operated by the State of Maryland. If such an acquisition is made, NPS would change the entrance to the island and move the fee area to the mainland. I am at a loss to see how this will benefit the Seashore. Maryland operates the bridge and if NPS took over, NPS would have to pay for the bridge upkeep. I think it a better idea to allow the State of Maryland to continue to take care of the bridge and keep control of the bridge in more local hands. I would suggest eliminating any change in the status of the bridge from the General Management Plan entirely.

To conclude, I feel that Alternative 3 is the best plan for the island provided the changes I have suggested above are made.

Once again thank-you Superintendent and also your staff for the many hours of work on this plan that will take the Seashore into the future for the use of all Americans.

Very truly yours,

Jeffrey R. Stickle




[REDACTED]  
Rehoboth Beach, DE 19971

[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 252

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Roger A. Steger, Sr.  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportsfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address:   
Ocean City, MD 21842  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: H-43  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 30, 2016

Superintendent Deborah Darden  
Assateague National Park  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, Maryland 21811

Dear Superintendent Darden,

I would like to take a few minutes of your time to address my concerns with the Assateague General Management Plan (GMP) currently being finalized at this time.

I have been going to Assateague for over 50 years, which was before the construction of the bridge. We used to go by boat and would fish on the beaches and hunt on the bayside with our friends that owned houses on the island.

The bridge was built and the island was opened to many local citizens and visitors from across the United States to enjoy the recreational activities of fishing, hunting, crabbing, clamming, hiking, camping (tents & campers), swimming and sun bathing. Our local and national economically has benefited with the purchase of four wheel drive vehicles, camping, hiking, fishing and hunting equipment over the past.

I feel any changes or plan that will limit the use of Assateague National Seashore Park to any one group will impact the economically and lives of many local business owners.

I would like to suggest you consider alternative 3 with the following up-dates:

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



1 - The carsonite white markers be repositioned each year or as needed to allow the maximum beach driving area in the Over Sand Vehicle (OSV) zone,

2 - Assateague has not met the requirements over the last 35 years to be designated a wilderness, so this should be removed from the plan,

3 - The bridge was built and is maintained by the State of Maryland and should remain property of the State, which will continue to serve the public with access to the State and Federal Parks,

4 - The plan should be written to read the OSV zones should remain until natural causes prohibits the safe use of the zones,

5 - The GMP should read if a ferry system in placed in service is will be a vehicle and passenger ferry and will be free for vehicles with an OSV permit,

I feel that Assateague National Seashore Park was designated a Federal Park and funded for the benefit of everyone who desires to use for their recreational needs. We need to work to preserve for our children and grand children for the next 40 to 50 years.

Thank you for your time and consideration into this matter.

Sincerely,

Roger A. Steger, Sr.

Roger A. Steger, Sr.  
AMSA # 750

Cc:

US Senator Barbara Milkuski's Office  
US Congressman Andy Harris' Office  
MD Senator James Mathias' Office  
AMSA President William Justice


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 253

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Bill Justice

Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportsfishermen's Association, Inc.  Official Rep.

Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups

Address: x  
x, MD x  
USA

E-mail: amsapresident@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-44 and E-60

Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes: This comment (which was emailed twice as E-44 and E-60) is by Bill Justice as an individual versus as a member of the AMSA Board of Directors in comment H-15 and E-11.

### Correspondence Text

April 30, 2016

Ms.Darden

AMSA representatives has attended spent many hours in many meetings and workshops over the years that lead up to this time and now that every workshop and meeting on the GMP has come to pass been offered. That being said AMSA would like to see some special considerations within alternative 3 however.

First off the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP and one is where the white marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP worded the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year. Please include in your comments that the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen as the island rolls over itself eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive east of the carsonite markers.

Secondly there are mentions of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP, AMSA strongly opposes a wilderness on the island dues to the instability of the island. AMSA feels very strongly that the island has never met the requirements that are desired over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.

Thirdly the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. AMSA does not support the cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. AMSA's greatest fear is the losing control of the bridge and the federal government would not free up funds to do any repairs to the bridge and deem it impassable.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Fourthly the wording OSV will continue "until conditions change" need to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone" on the island.

Last but not least a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. AMSA would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is written currently.

Thank You in advance,  
AMSA Board of Directors

Should you have any questions feel free to contact:  
Bill Justice  
AMSA President  
amsapresident@verizon.net or president@keepersofthebeach.com

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 254

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robin West  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: s  
s, MD x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-45  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I choose option #3 with consideration of changing verbage .

Thank you.

Robin West.

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 255

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lisa Justice  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Millsboro, DE 19966  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-46  
Date Sent: 05/02/2016 Date Received: 05/02/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Although I favor alternative number three I would like to offer a few changes to the final draft if I may.

I find no advantage to having the Federal government have control over the bridge that leads us over to the island. So I would like to see that effort aborted.

You know that I enjoy the beach in its 13-mile entirety, and have raised our children on this beach. I have no interest in the wilderness designation anywhere on Assateague and would like to see a reversal of any plans to have a wilderness designation on the island so that my grandchildren have the same opportunity to enjoy the beach as I have.

Remove the wording "consider" as many times as you possibly can especially when it pertains to the carsonite markers on the beach.

Any chance there could be a much smaller southern bullpen written in. It would save unnecessary beach travel while fishing near the Virginia line. There used to be one many years ago.

Thank you for the chance to comment

Lisa Justice  
[REDACTED]  
Millsboro, De 19966  
[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 256

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William R. Lowe  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Middleburg, VA 20117  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-48  
Date Sent: 05/03/2016 Date Received: 05/03/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I own a house at 7151 Sheepshead Lane Chincoteague Island, VA 23336. I am in support of the letter supplied to you by John H.Tarr Mayor

**PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269**  
**Correspondence: 257**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Karen R. Lowe  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Middleburg, VA 20117  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

**Correspondence Information**

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-49  
Date Sent: 05/03/2016 Date Received: 05/03/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

I am a Chincoteague home owner. I support the letter by the Mayor John H. Tarr If I had to chose one, I guess # 3 is best.


# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 258

### Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: John H. Tarr

Organization: Mayor, Town of Chincoteague  Official Rep.

Organization Type: T - Town or City Government

Address: 6150 Community Drive  
Chincoteague, VA 23336  
USA

E-mail: jtelec@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-50

Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 05/29/2016

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

### Correspondence Text

April 21, 2016

Deborah A Darden  
Superintendent  
Assateague Island National Seashore  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21811

RE Response Letter to the National Park Service General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Assateague Island National Seashore

Dear Ms. Darden:

On behalf of the Town of Chincoteague I am presenting a brief list of comments and concerns regarding the General Management Plan (GMP) Alternative Concepts, for the Assateague Island National Seashore.

After a 5-year wait, we learned about four alternatives as detailed in the plan. Some of the alternatives' planning processes are frustrating because there are very good ideas mixed with very bad ideas (from our perspective as the gateway community for the southern end of Assateague Island). The following list is provided to clearly identify those elements of the draft GMP that we hope the NPS will work on in more detail, with the Town of Chincoteague representatives.

#### Wilderness Area

The wilderness area in your preferred alternative makes clear and corrective steps to continue OSV within five hundred feet

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140



of the water line on the ocean side and takes such territory out of the plan over the water, which we commend. Although we think that the land base is too small, and the proposed wilderness area should not be considered in any portion of Assateague Island National Seashore.

#### Oyster Watch Houses and Duck Blinds

In the executive summary, and alternative of the GMP it states "continue to take no action related to privately owned structures (oyster watch houses and duck blinds) associated with submerged land leases." However, in the other three alternatives (including the preferred alternative in the GMP) it states "to initiate an assessment of privately owned structures (e.g. oyster watch houses and duck blinds) located within Virginias seashore and work with Virginia to ensure appropriate wastewater treatment and disposal at authorized structures (e.g. oyster watch houses)." The town's understanding is the Virginia health department takes adequate samples per year of the waters around Chincoteague, to determine if it has contaminated discharge of nutrients, pathogens, etc. resulting from wastewater discharge. Wastewater treatment and disposal is and has been a function of the Commonwealth of Virginia, nothing in the Seashore Act gives joint or sole authority to the NPS.

Also, the GMP states "Working with Virginia, NPS would assess the legal status of privately owned structures (oyster watch houses and hunting blinds) located within the seashore's Virginia waters, and pursue removal of those found to be unauthorized." The town is taking a very strong position on the historical and cultural decisions set on oyster watch houses and duck blinds. Almost all oyster watch houses and duck blinds have been handed down from generation to generation, to those family members that live on Chincoteague Island. All of which precede the state code of 1975 allowing oyster watch houses, most of which also proceeded the Seashore Act of 1965 without requiring any kind of permits. Also, since annexation of the town's corporate limits in 1989, to the low water mark of Assateague Island the town currently allows oyster watch houses and hunting blinds within our town limits. Duck blinds and hunting are controlled by the Commonwealth of Virginia, they issue the License to hunt and enforce Virginia's laws as such. Hunting and duck blinds proceeded the Seashore Act of 1965 and before the creation of the National Wildlife Refuge.

The town insists the GMP preferred alternative language be changed throughout the GMP to match that which is stated in the executive summary and alternative one, where no action will be taken relative to oyster watch houses and duck blinds.

#### Aquaculture

The executive summary and alternative one of the GMP states leasing of submerged lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia, within the seashore boundary, for commercial aquaculture, would continue. The other three alternatives, including the preferred alternative, states "in recognition of this long history of use, NPS would issue a special use permit under 36 CFR 2.60(3)b to the Virginia Marine Resource Commission (VMRC) within the Commonwealth of Virginia to allow for the continued practice of commercial aquaculture and maintenance of the historic setting."

The town's position and as stated in Public Law 89-195, Sec 5, "That nothing in this Act shall limit or interfere with the authority of the State to permit or to regulate shell fishing in any waters included in the National Seashore." This is the same public law that sets up the boundaries of the national seashore on Assateague Island. 36 CFR 2.60(3)b would obstruct Virginia's authority in this matter.

The town insists the GMP preferred alternative language be changed throughout the GMP to match the executive summary and alternative one, where it states "leasing of submerged lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia within the seashore boundary for commercial aquaculture would continue."

#### Horseshoe Crabs Harvest

In the executive summary and alternative one of the GMP it states the harvest of horseshoe crabs would continue to occur within the seashore. In the other three alternatives including the preferred alternative, it states the "NPS would prohibit the harvest of horseshoe crabs."

The town objects to any reference of denying horseshoe crab harvesting in the GMP, which is a historical and cultural way of

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

life on Chincoteague. This harvesting has been handed down from generation to generation in Chincoteague Island families and would be a disaster to see a family's way of life discontinued. Horseshoe harvesting is controlled by the Commonwealth of Virginia, they issue permits, and set the quotas each year, nothing in the Seashore Act of 1965 gave that away.

The town insists the GMP preferred alternative language be changed throughout the GMP to match language in the executive summary and alternative one, where it states the "harvest of horseshoe crabs would continue to occur within the seashore."

#### Finfishing

We applaud your decision allowing commercial finfishing in Virginia and omitting all language that would prohibited such activity. The commercial fishing has been a historical cultural way of life for folks living in Chincoteague for centuries and we would like to see this activity be passed down through families for another century. Oyster Watch Houses, Duck Blinds, Aquaculture and Horseshoe harvesting should all be treated the same as finfishing, they all have the same historical and cultural values to our community, and all were a part of our way of life in the past and future. The Seashore Act of 1965 did not give up any of the Commonwealth rights to allow and control these activities, but actually promoted them.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft general management plan. Our main concerns and support are based on cultural and historical preservation of the working watermen, which for these men, is their families only income. A waterman's skills and livelihood are well documented throughout Chincoteague's history. The Town of Chincoteague will continue to rely on NPS staff to support public recreational beach use, OSV use and shoreline management in Virginia through the interagency agreement with the FWS.

If you need additional information, please feel free to contact the Town Manager at 757-336-6519.

Sincerely,

John H. Tarr  
Mayor

cc: Elected Representatives

Please see attached questions.

#### QUESTIONS

Page i, 1-8 with ownership to mean high water in Maryland and mean low water in Virginia

1. What Virginia law gave the right to mean low water?

Page xv 961 automobile parking spaces

2. A standard parking space will not work for campers, boats etc. Will there be any type of overflow parking considered? Even if further back from the beach?



Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

3. Beach Restoration in the form of sand fence and dredging around the jetty is still continuing on the North end. Will there be a chance that these activities will be extended to the Southern end of Assateague Island?

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 259

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Tom Morris  
Organization: Assateague Mobile Sportsfishermen's Association, Inc. ;  Member  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: x  
x, MD x  
USA  
E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-51  
Date Sent: 05/01/2016 Date Received: 05/01/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Superintendent Darden,

I am a first generation AMSA member who has enjoyed Assateague Island and the OSV zone for the last 16 years of my life with my wife and son. My wife is a 3rd generation AMSA member. Her parents and grandparents along with her family enjoyed using the OSV zone for swimming, sun bathing, water sports, and fishing. Today, I along with my wife and son enjoy Assateague Island as a family and intend to do so for many more years and our wish is that future generations of our family and others can do the same.

While I understand the need for a GMP for Assateague Island, I truly believe alternative #3 is the best for all of us. However, there are concerns in this alternative that need to be addressed before being finalized. I feel adjustments need to be made to ensure future administrations can not change the way visitors access the island.

In regards to the Assateague Island National Seashore GMP, again I prefer Alternative 3 with the following considerations:

Due to the way the island constantly moves to the west and the entire island is used and visited - a wilderness designation should not be considered at this time and should be removed.

Any consideration for the NPS to acquire the bridge and redesign the entrance to the island should be removed.

The wording "OSV will continue until conditions change", needs to be more specific in the type of conditions for example "irreversible natural causes that prohibit safe travel on the island".

The section that mentions the moving of the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone needs to be more specific. This needs to state that the markers will be moved to adjust with the movement of the island west to continue to allow the same amount of space for the OSV driving area.

Correspondences - ASIS General Management Plan - PEPC ID: 26140

Also if there is ever a time when a ferry is needed to get onto the island a vehicle capable one should be used not just a passenger ferry.

Thanks for your consideration.

Tom Morris and Family  
AMSA #28

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 260

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Frank Morris  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, MD x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-52  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Deborah,

I am a surf fisherman who has frequented Assateague Island National Park for the last 6 years. A friend introduced me to the island and I was immediately captivated by the natural beauty and feel of the seashore. The access provided by the OSV zone is unprecedented in my surf fishing experience. In this short time I have seen many of the changes which you have described that prompted the NPS to develop a new GMP. First and above all, thank you for all the thoughtful work that has been put into this effort.

My comments are basically in line with those of AMSA, although I am not an AMSA member. I prefer alternative 3 with the following revisions:

1. Please change the wording "consider repositioning the carsonite markers in the OSV zone each year" to " repositioning the carsonite markers in the OSV zone to allow for maximum beach driving area" each year.
2. Designating the island as a "wilderness area" would prevent motorized vehicular access to the beach. Is this really necessary? Do you think that vehicles driving on the beach has anything to do with the westward movement of the island? Please leave that option open until there are no options left.

These are the only 2 items I have comments on.

Again, thank you for all the effort that has put into forming a new GMP.

Sincerely,  
Frank Morris

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 261

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David Lorenz  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Marlton, NJ 08503  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-53  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Ms. Debbie Darden  
7206 National Seashore Lane  
Berlin, MD 21801  
Subject: Assateague Island GMP

Dear Ms. Darden,

Thank you for requesting input for the General Management Plan for the future of Assateague Island (AI). My family and I have recreationally used the OSV area of AI for the past 15 years. Both of our children (9 and 13) have spent every summer of their life fishing, hiking the dunes, swimming, and, playing on AI. Our son is a fishaholic due to this and is forever asking when we will be heading to the beach. My hope is that the new GMP will permit this well into the future so our children can share these experiences with our grandchildren.

After reviewing the proposed GMP alternatives, alternative 3 appears to provide the best practices for maintaining and keeping the OSV portion of AI open so future generations can experience the goodness and serenity of AI on the southern end. There are a few areas of concern and vagueness, these are listed below.

1. There is mention of wilderness designation; this is somewhat scary as a "wilderness" would most likely close the OSV portion of AI.
2. The GMP mentions a passenger ferry; could this be changed to a public vehicle/passenger ferry?
3. Please specify that the carsonite markers would be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area for vehicles.

4. The wording that the "OSV will continue until conditions change" is very wide open to interpretation as the beach conditions change daily. This should be further defined and reworded to possibly say "until irreversible natural causes prohibit the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".

5. MD State Highway 611 and the bridge to AI should remain in control of the State of Maryland. Federal funding issues for the bridge could result in a bridge of disrepair and become impassable; I truly believe that the local/state level for this is best suited for this maintenance.

Thank you for considering the above comments and I look forward to many years of enjoyment on AI, the OSV zone.

Sincerely,

David A. Lorenz

[REDACTED]

Marlton, NJ 08053



# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 262

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kay Warren-Biondi  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Berlin, MD 21811  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-54  
Date Sent: 04/23/2016 Date Received: 04/23/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Darden,

I live very close to Assateague Island and would be lost if I could not enjoy this National Park every day of every year, and I cherish the recreational opportunities the Island provides.

I understand that the management of Assateague National Seashore is under review via the GMP process. As the document is reviewed, please consider my comments as follows:

Please include in the document the following:

1. The carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future;
2. I oppose a wilderness designation on the island due to the instability of the island; the island has never met the requirements and the idea must be abandoned;
3. I oppose the desire for NPS to acquire the state owned bridge. It is important for State of Maryland to continue owning and maintaining this bridge; and
4. OSV will continue until conditions change: must be worded to state that "until irreversible natural causes prohibit the safe use of OSV Zone on the island".

Thank you for your consideration.

Kay Warren-Biondi

[REDACTED]

Berlin, Maryland 21811

[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 263

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carol Mowers  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, UN x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-55  
Date Sent: 04/29/2016 Date Received: 04/29/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Darden,

Please give consideration to including the following comments in the GMP which will govern access to Assateague Island for 40-50 years.

The white carsonite marker in the OSV Zone need to be moved every year to allow maximum beach driving in the future. As the island changes, so should the markers be repositioned.

Assateague Island has never met the requirement to be a "wilderness designation" because of its instability. This should be removed from present and future consideration.

The ownership of the bridge to Assateague Island should remain in ownership of the State of Maryland.  
The desire ferry should be a "public vehicle ferry" and not just a "passenger ferry".

Thank you,  
Carol Mowers

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 264

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Vicki Baxter  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, NJ x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-57  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Good afternoon,

My name is Vicki Baxter and I am a 70 year old female who lives in New Jersey. Several years ago my son moved to Berlin, Maryland and I was introduced to Assateague by him. My joy at visiting Assateague has increased upon every visit. He has an OSV pass and just being in such a lovely part of the world and savoring the sea, sky and sand has been a wonderful thing. The ponies are my favorite of course.....such beauty and to see them in a natural environment is just wonderful. I was made aware that a 20 year plan is being proposed for Assateague. I certainly am not aware of all the benefits of these plans nor the things that may hurt Assateague. I just wanted to say to you to please keep it the way it is as much as possible. I understand that tides, storms, etc can alter the island in many ways over the years but it is important to keep in mid how beneficial it is to the public. In summary, I just love it. I just want it to stay the same for generations of families to come.

Thanks for listening.

Vicki Baxter

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 265

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John Baxter  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: x  
x, NJ x  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-58  
Date Sent: 04/28/2016 Date Received: 04/28/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter to encourage those in power to try to keep Assateague as is for as long as possible. I travel to Assateague from New Jersey to fish on the OSV shore and have been doing so for many years. It is as privilege and joy to be able to do so. I ask that you preserve this piece of land for generations to come and allow recreation, fishing and swimming to continue.

Sincerely,

John Baxter

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 266

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Beverly Fleming  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Pocomoke, MD 21851  
USA  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-59  
Date Sent: 04/18/2016 Date Received: 04/18/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The following is my suggested changes to the GMP alternative # 3:

1. I feel the word consider is used too many times. When consider is used, it leaves much to the interpretation of the park superintendent. A new superintendent may interpretate differently from a past park superintendent and the definition of the regulations changed.
2. The GMP states "the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year". This should be changed to that the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone will be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future.
3. I opposes the designation of a wilderness area due to the instability of the island. AMSA feels very strongly that the island has never met the requirements desired for a wilderness designation over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited.
4. The ownership, maintenance, and control of the Assateague Bridge will be kept as is. I oppose transfer of ownership, maintenance of the bridge, or control of the bridge in any way to the Federal Government and the NPS.
5. Clearly define the wording "OSV will continue until conditions change". Reword to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone on the island".
6. A clear definition is needed with regard to "passenger ferry" There should be a list in the GMP with the types of vehicles that will be allowed on the ferry.

I appreciate for your hard work, your dedication, and your time that you have invested to the passing of the Draft GMP. Thanking you in advance for your consideration.

Beverly Fleming

[REDACTED]

Pocomoke, MD 21851

[REDACTED]

# PEPC Project ID: 26140, DocumentID: 70269

## Correspondence: 267

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bill Justice  
Organization:  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Millsboro, DE 199966  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log: E-60 and E-44  
Date Sent: 04/30/2016 Date Received: 04/30/2016  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes: This comment (which was emailed twice as E-44 and E-60) is by Bill Justice as an individual versus as a member of the AMSA Board of Directors in comment H-15 and E-11.

### Correspondence Text

Ms. Darden,

As you know I have been very involved in the GMP process from the beginning. I agree that alternative three has the best interest in mind for everyone going forward, however I would like to see personally the following tweaks:

First off the word "consider" is found 206 times within the GMP and one is where the white marker is to be relocated each year. The GMP worded the NPS will consider repositioning the marker each year. Please include in your comments that the carsonite markers in the OSV Zone are to be moved each year to allow maximum beach driving area in the future. If this doesn't happen as the island rolls over itself eventually the ocean will touch the carsonite markers and there will be no room for vehicles to drive

Secondly there are mentions of a wilderness designation on Assateague Island a total of 252 times within the GMP, AMSA strongly opposes a wilderness on the island dues to the instability of the island. AMSA feels very strongly that the island has never met the requirements that are desired over the past 35 years, so therefore the idea should be abandoned and never be revisited

Thirdly the NPS has a desire to acquire the state owned bridge and redesign the entrance to the island which will move the fee area to the mainland. AMSA does not support the cooperative with the State of Maryland and the NPS concerning the bridge acquisition. AMSA's greatest fear is the losing control of the bridge and the federal government would not free up funds to do any repairs to the bridge and deem it impassable:

Fourthly the wording OSV will continue "until conditions change" need to be reworded to say "until irreversible natural causes prohibits the safe use of the OSV Zone" on the island.



Last but not least a clear definition should be inserted in the GMP about the desired ferry that is mentioned within the document. It speaks of a passenger ferry that would lead to the island. AMSA would like to see a public vehicle ferry in the description instead of the passenger ferry as it is written currently.

Bill Justice

[REDACTED]

Millsboro, De 19966

[REDACTED]

">