

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Miccio, J

**Outside Organization:** Davis Park Association Civic Groups

**Received:**

May,10,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I do not think the National Seashore should have any say in the Established Communities on FI. They have restored the dunes, planted sea grass, renourished their beaches & maintained sand fencing over the years with no help from the Seashore or the federal government.

Let the local towns and communities regulate themselves! Also -- no bike trails through our communities. Put it through the National Seashore Wilderness Property.

J. Miccio Director, DPA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

May,11,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I received and reviewed the Preliminary Management Alternatives that was recently sent to me and would like to comment as to which of the plans I feel would be the best for FI. There is only one plan that I would support since there is only one plan that states "Within the communities,properties damaged or destroyed by over wash would continue to be allowed to be repaired or rebuilt, consistent with existing zoning standards." The other three plans all prohibit or restrict in some way reconstruction of houses lost during storms, an option I cannot endorse. I would like to see many ,if not all, of the ideas stated in #4 adopted but include "Within the communities,properties damaged or destroyed by over wash would continue to be allowed to be repaired or rebuilt, consistent with existing zoning standards." We should expand access to people and have as many people as possible enjoy the natural beauty here on the Island without destroying it, but do not take away the rights of private property owners while doing so. Thank you.

**Correspondence** 4    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Annichario, Unkown

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** May,13,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Park Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** We feel that Preliminary Management Alternative 1 (Status Quo/ Current Management is the best plan to follow for Fire Island.

---

**Correspondence** 5    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Ginther, NA

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** May,18,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Park Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** We would support Alternative 3 or 4. From my point of view and the view from others who frequent the National Seashore we enjoy and deserve the services that are and would be available under these alternatives. These incorporate the wonderful natural resources along with the comfort and facilities needed to support visitors. We realized that the National Seashore's dedication to wildlife and preservation needs to be addressed. If Plan 1 or 2 would be adopted, people and visitors will stay home. Why would visitors besides the tree huggers visit. Let's hope plan 3 or 4 are adopted. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence** 6    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Abeles, Dr. Francine

**Received:** May,18,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Park Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** In the good weather months we have spent weekends in our Fire Island home (Ocean Bay Park) for over 35 years. We raised three children there and in NYC who, now grown, continue to promote the positive connection between the use and protection of natural resources in their own communities. As busy professionals in public service, Fire Island provided a respite from our hectic workday schedule. In just boarding the ferry, we began to relax.

Fire Island is a vital, affordable get-away location within reasonable commuting distance from NYC which should be maintained. So it seems to us that PMA #3 is best suited to our vision of Fire Island for the future.

Francine Abeles [REDACTED]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 7    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Honican, Albert E.  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,19,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I write in regards to preparation of a new general management plan. Please consider Alternative 2 Enhancing Natural Resource Values. You need to seek a way to restore degraded ecosystems and reduce impacts on all resources. Cultural resources important but believe should envision natural history for your interpretive purposes. Cultural resources would best be stored on the mainland. Community resources would best be served with protection of natural resources over human use. We are not gardeners. The better word should be managed so as to be unmanaged in the words of Howard Zahniser, the author of the Wilderness Act. As in other such resource values the visitor experience clearly we must have an immersion in the natural landscape that is lighter on the physical landscape. Facilities could best locate administrative, transportation options in a single location and away from the floodplain. Green upgrades should be looked at as they are scheduled for rehabilitation. Wilderness protection must be given an edge by minimizing development near or within the boundaries. Removal of existing Wilderness visitor center. As with other sections of the GMP, a small kiosk would serve as information reminders. The key words natural and bold to allow the landscape to revert to Wilderness over time.

Kind regards, Albert E. Honican

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Levenson, Lewis  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,19,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Gentlemen, Please look into the removal of groins built during WWII near Shinnecock Inlet. Their removal will allow the natural east to west flow of sand to build up in the western part of Long Island where it is needed.

Thank you.

Very truly yours, Lewis Levenson Resident of Seaview, F.I.

**Correspondence ID:** 9    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Burzo, Patricia  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,20,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I am basically comfortable with #3 with the following questions, natural resources "A moderate level of natural intervention . . . as long as this is just for health and safety and does not extent to "comfort" as i #4. I believe #4 would increase the destruction of natural resources brought on by "visitation". I have come to find as a young daytripper 25+ years ago and a homeowner for 12 years. You care more about the environment here when there is a personal stake. I do like several aspects of #2, actually most of it with the exception of "no reconstruction after storms" along the bay and ocean. I understand though owners should be compensated but not if that means inland homes that do not affect the shorelines. I would truly love to see a more natural Fire Island and less destruction by visitors. If it were possible for visitors to see and /or learn about their potential destruction (i.e. garbage, disregard for beaches and dunes, etc.) at points of departure maybe they would be more considerate. All in all, #2 and part of 3 seem best of all worlds to my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 10    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Alvarez-Rashid, Joan  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,21,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I filled out the long computerized survey with photos early this year or late last year. I enjoyed being able to give input. I would be in favor of Alternative #3 --which seems like a good balance between nature and humans. I have been coming to F.I. (Corneille Estates + Ocean Beach) every summer since 1980 and bought a home in 1997. I am concerned about the "big" storms and fear losing my home. I am located midway between the bay + beach. I did not understand some things in the report like LEED and mosquito ditches. I was able to get clarification by calling the office. I would love to be able to ride my adult tricycle from the Lighthouse to Point of Woods -- but am concerned re: racing 2-wheel bikes, etc. Some rules would have to be in place. I use my Fire Island home April- November. Good luck with plan. Joan Alvarez-Rashid, Ocean Beach

**Correspondence ID:** 11    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Marks, Linda  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,24,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I would support a walkway/ bikeway the length of Fire Island. As a homeowner/summer resident of Ocean Beach, I would enjoy day trips to other villages for wilderness education areas and walking on the beach does not allow for very many or far destinations. More reliable and/or frequent lateral ferry or water taxis would also be helpful in this regard, especially if they extended to Watch Hill and/or beyond. Are there or could there be excursions by boat from the Floyd Estate to Smith Point Park and/or Otis Pike Wilderness, Watch Hill, Davis Park? Maybe I'm being unrealistic, but it seems to me that very few people who don't own boats or campers have access to the Wilderness areas. I do think limits on expansion of existing villages should be strictly enforced. -- Linda Marks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Gregory, Patricia and Paul  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,26,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** My husband, Paul, and I have lived on Long Island for 35 years. Originally, we were from Rome, NY. We have used the National Seashore on numerous accounts. Besides visiting Sailors Haven, we spent weekends camping in a tent on the beach with our 4 wheel drive, 2 daughters & dog out of Smith Point when our family was young. We have since graduated to a house at Davis Park. I have gone on numerous "Treks" sponsored by the Seashore. I never tire of the beauty of Fire Island and all there is to learn in our cohabitation with nature.

Our grandchildren visit us in Bayport or Davis Park. We make use of the Watch Hill learning center and nature trail. They are now old enough to climb to the top of the Fire Island Light House.

My birthday gift this year was a walk from Smith Point to Davis Park and back on February 7. Not our first winter walk on the beach.

We are in favor of Alternative 4. Please allow us the privilege of guided exposure to a natural treasure. We hope to continue to enjoy!

Patricia Gregory [REDACTED]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Kahn, Charlotte

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,26,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Park Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Alternative 3. It appears to me to be equally respectful of environment, existing communities, and other visitors and campers.

I welcome an upgrading of existing facilities and the collaboration with the communities.

Charlotte Kahn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 14    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Azzaretti, Anne and Larry

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,01,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep up the good work at Sailors Haven. We love going there.

Please publicize the hours and days when the William Floyd Estate is open. We always seem to go there when it's closed.

Anne & Larry Azzaretti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 15    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Asherman, Georgette

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Jun,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Park Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** This was confusing. Keep the status quo where people can use the Island for different reasons. There is no point in removing facilities in order to shift from recreation to nature. We don't need another Catalina.

**Correspondence ID:** 16    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Thornberg, Beatrice  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

1) Under Natural Resources I would prefer Alternate 4.

2) Under Cultural Resources I would prefer Alternate 4, but would prefer to see more storage facilities on Fire Island -- either the Greenberg tract or the lighthouse tract.

3) Under Community Resources, I would prefer Alternate 3 with no rebuilding in CEHA after storms and no re-insuring. I'd like to do away with dual tires on the Burma Road and limit vehicle size to size of walks. The wide vehicles are ruining the walks and Burma Road. I am a year round resident.

4) Visitor Experience - Alt 4 -- encourage residents to participate in FINS experiences; ie. lateral ferries to seashore facilities.

5) Facilities -- Alt 4 -- especially the bike trail

6) Wilderness -- Alt 4

---

**Correspondence ID:** 17    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,22,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Of the 4 Preliminary Management Alternatives presented, my family is most strongly in favor of Alternative 3. We feel that both elements....ecological landscape and human inhabitation.....need to be balanced, with a future emphasis on rebuilding the existing facilities to be "greener". It seems to us (residents for 40 years) that the inhabitants (owners of homes) of FI are, in general, respectful and cognizant of their impact on the environment and can be brought in to be fuller partners, with the government and environmentalists, in protecting FI. The status quo is unacceptable and Alternatives 2 and 4 go too far in either direction. In particular, we are not in favor of "expanding" the visitor experience beyond its current levels. To a certain degree, the "isolated" nature of the Island is one of its main attractions and should be protected as much as the eco-habitat.

An additional concern of ours is the use of the survey information as regards to "design" of homes on the island. If there are "rules" regarding the kinds of building designs that can be used, they need to be carefully thought out. There needs to be balance between maintaining the historical "look" of FI and individual rights. This is a tough "row to hoe" and requires much sensitivity which, we hope, will be shown by all involved. Certainly, the height and size of buildings must be controlled.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 18    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** National Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jul,10,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read the April newsletter describing Preliminary Management Alternatives and suggest adoption of Alternative #1, based on the need for society to understand and appreciate the basic elements of our natural environment. While outreach programs in other alternatives may seek to do the same, only by experiencing the natural conditions at their most elemental can people grasp the full nature of our earth. The National Wildlife Refuge system is a good model. Similar programs exist in a number of preserve and park areas around the world and have in no case imposed long-term hardship or deleterious effects on humankind. Objections from those who live either part or full time in the FINS environs and those who would develop further human impact on the land and sea serve only to protect individual interests rather than enhance and improve the collective and common good. This applies to humanity as well as the natural environment. Effective communication of the values of Alternative #2 can be achieved to bring understanding from the community. I would be happy to apply my own experience in public relations and communications to assist in this on a volunteer basis. Details about me are available in part at

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/globalwriter>

I have spent over 3-1/2 decades on the Great South Bay seeing how exposure to untrammled land and sea areas have influenced my children and those of my neighbors and friends. We owe future generations an even better experience.

---

**Name:** Tarpey, John M  
**Received:** Jul,19,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence:** (As per page 11)

Any plans to close or reduce the Sailors Haven or Watch Hill marinas would impact thousands of boaters who use these facilities, in fact it would be better to modernize them. I have alerted my Congressman and both U.S. Senators regarding any plans to close or reduce these facilities in size. Thank you for your consideration.

John M. Tarpey Massapequa, NY



---

**Correspondence ID:** 20    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Pachomski, Amanda  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,09,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** The preliminary management alternative 2 emphasized being "green" and increasing the visitor centers' use of technology. I don't like the idea of replacing physical exhibits with personal media because park visitors, especially children, enjoy and are actively engaged by the seashore's current exhibits. Also, if we are encouraging connecting with nature, shouldn't we avoid using technology? Also, if the Wilderness Visitor Center already exists then what's the harm? To knock it down and build a new building would just require the usage of more natural resources. With Alternative 4, I dislike the idea of increasing the number of Wilderness camping permits. The whole idea of Wilderness camping is that visitors can be isolated from other people and just live in tune with nature for a few days. A reservation system would be great because it's really hard to turn away campers who have travelled with all of their gear just because there are no permit spots open, but adding sites and more permits would ruin the point of back country camping. Many of the alternatives have components that would benefit the park, so perhaps the ideas that prioritize nature and visitors' appreciation for nature could be combined.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 21    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** N/A, N/A  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** The "progress report" actually shows that really nothing instructive has happened in the last two years. It's amazing how slowly you people work. Everything is a "study" but nothing gets done. Incredible waste of your time, taxpayers' money, and intellectual resources. You could have summarized all this in one well written paragraph. Instead, you dragged out the obvious to sixteen pages of fluff.

Please be more efficient, less contemplative, and more proactive. Appreciate the update but there really isn't much to report. Meanwhile, the beach is washing away, while you are planning, planning, planning! Very concerned!

**Correspondence ID:** 22    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Biegen, Robert J  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jul,12,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Transportation and Access Goal:

Synchronizing the ferry boat schedules to the Long Island Railroad schedule would help meet the above management plan goal. It would reduce the number of vehicles on the road, preserve our oil supply, reduce carbon emissions and greatly reduce human aggravation. Last weekend I witnessed many families with small children who missed by only a few seconds their train ride home. They had to wait one hour for the next train.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 23    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Sperenza, Joseph  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,17,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of Alternative No. 2. There are entirely too many visitors to Fire Island causing it to now lean toward being just another developed beach as opposed to the National Park that it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 24    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Savelighthousebeach.org Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,22,2010 19:32:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a beach ambassador for Savelighthousebeach.org and a long time user of our clothing optional beach. I moved to Long Island in 2001 from Connecticut after being laid off. I picked Long Island for the sole reason of the clothing optional Lighthouse Beach. I used to attend the clothing optional beach in Rhode Island called Monnstone Beach. This beach was also on federal land was closed in 1993. It would be devastating if we lost Lighthouse beach as a clothing optional beach. This is why I am a beach ambassador and will do whatever is necessary to keep this beach clothing optional.

**Correspondence ID:** 25    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** li travasuns Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 05:35:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Lighthouse beach at Robert Moses Park should stay clothing optional. I've been going there since the '70's. It's a clean beautiful and safe environment for a family to enjoy on long island. I've even seen people coming there from Queens and Manhattan. So a lot of people can enjoy it.

Please keep it open. We are all tax payers and should be able to enjoy a nice location /park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 26    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 05:36:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

As A NY resident & taxpayer, I feel it is essential as part of the developing plan for FINS to maintain its use of Lighthouse beach as a traditional clothing optional beach along with other areas along FINS by the diversity of its resident & non- resident population, as a planning priority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 27    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 05:38:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I realize there are four alternatives being considered. No matter which is selected, I request that you maintain the traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach as well as the other currently clothing optional portions of Fire Island.

Thank you, Tom Limoncelli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 28    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 05:59:42

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

I am writing to express my support for maintaining the Clothing Optional areas at Lighthouse Beach and other portions of the Fire Island National Seashore. These areas are used extensively by a diverse resident and non-resident populations in the Tri-State area.

The most limiting factor in the use of these facilities at Lighthouse Beach is the limited amount of parking available on any given day, especially in seasons where Field 4 is closed, which puts a greater burden on Field 5 to support the parking of the traditional beach at the Pavilion at Field 5.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 29    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Long Island Trav Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 06:29:13

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY. We as an organization are willing to maintain this part of the seashore in the condition that the NPS asks. I do believe we have more concern than the average beach goer. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 30    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 06:36:11

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I hope you do not see a need to make any changes to the character of the beach between Robert Moses State Park and Kismet.

**Correspondence ID:** 31    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Save Lighthouse Beach Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 06:36:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been enjoying the beauty of Lighthouse Beach for about 7 or 8 years now, and while I know of many natural "beauties" here on Long Island, my time there is very special to me. I can't explain the incredible feeling of being a naturist in a setting as pure and inspiring as this part of our national seashore. It is very important that we preserve the clothing optional areas of our seashore, so that our future generations can have the freedom to enjoy the wonders of this special place. I am told that the opponents to the naturist status of this section of national seashore are rallying their voices to change the status of the beach. WHY???...or better yet, WHO?...it's obviously not the naked people who gather there to have fun, so it can only be those that walk through the beach to gawk at the naked bodies, and who even drag there impressionable children along with them...they supposedly walk through the beach on their way further down the beach to other communities...but they do this by choice...there is also a road the runs parallel to the beach which they choose not to use...I'm sure that this is not the first time that we naturists' habitats have been threatened...but, there is no reason for a change to the status of this beach...PLEASE...consider the rights of all the people effected by this attack on American freedom, and continue the clothing optional status of Lighthouse Beach...Thank you

---

**Name:** -

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 06:43:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge the National Park Service to maintain the traditional clothing optional status of portions of "Lighthouse" Beach between Robert Moses State Park and Kismet and other traditional clothing optional areas of the Fire Island National Seashore.

I use the clothing optional portions of "Lighthouse" Beach several times every summer.

Each time I do so I pay for parking in the Robert Moses lot (which while not part of the Park Service is used by almost all Park Service users, and my fee therefore helps maintain the experience of Park Service users) and often spend money at local businesses.

When at the beach, I strictly abide by the clothing optional area designation rules and insist that others do so as well. I care for the beach by staying within designated areas and by cleaning up my own trash and cleaning up stray garbage when I see it.

Clothing-optional users make up a significant majority of users of "Lighthouse" Beach - there are always hundreds of beachgoers on the clothing-optional portion and never more than a handful at the clothing-required area. Therefore I urge the NPS to maintain the clothing-optional areas that have been traditionally used by tax-paying citizens, including myself, for many years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 33    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 06:57:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the clothing optional section of the beach open, I visit it every year, Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 34    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** li traversons Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 07:08:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** freedom is why we live in america if our freedom continues to be taken away where do we go life has changed so much in the last decade and our freedom has been threatened by others dont take away our rights at the beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 35    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 07:24:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a big supporter of the National Parks Service. I have enjoyed visiting many parks, monuments, forests, recreation areas and seashores. I have plans to visit many more. Each one is unique and special, they each have something special to offer.

Fire Island National Seashore is a very unique asset to the park system offering history, nature and recreation.

I would like to offer my support for keeping the section of the beach at the Fire Island lighthouse as clothing optional.

On any given weekend in the summer the Clothing optional beach is very crowded.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 36    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 07:57:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm am writing this comment in support of the clothing optional section of Lighthouse beach. The fact that Lighthouse beach has a clothing optional section is the main reason I visit this beach and the area. It's a long drive for me to get to Lighthouse beach, but I do it because it's got clothing optional areas. If these areas were to be taken away, then I would no longer be visiting or spending my money on Fire Island. It's much easier for me to get to Rhode Island beaches and they're just as nice. So by taking away the clothing optional areas would give me no reason to return.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 37    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 08:03:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has been coming to the clothing optional beach for over 20 years. We have developed a comradely with many of the other families on the beach which would not be possible on a clothed beach. Please do not change the clothing optional status of the beach so my 4 year old son can experience the kindness and friendless that is our beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 38    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 08:49:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have left New England for Florida two years ago but have spent lots of time on Long Island from Suffolk to Nassau County. Without the National Seashore there is not much left for this island. I understand the Gateway National Seashore developed by the Reagan Administration was to be open to all types of peoples and recreational activity. The Lighthouse Beach area is among the finest areas along the coast and if it is closed or restricted it will be another loss of Freedom and another advance by the Government in developing a Totalitarian System. We have currently unlimited beaches with exactly the same criteria in undeviating sameness and the lack of clothing optional beaches is beyond my understanding as a normal human being. Keep Lighthouse Beach as is and leave the people alone!

**Correspondence ID:** 39    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 09:07:48

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service is currently in the process of updating its General Management Plan (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore.

WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 40    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 09:51:55

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE FOR RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 41    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

savelighthousebeach.org Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 09:59:17

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS AS A PLANNING PRIORITY, THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS. THANK YOU.



**Correspondence ID:** 42    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Friends of Lighthouse Beach Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 10:44:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To The National Parks Service: For over 25 years I have enjoyed the freedom of the beach areas between ParkingField 5 at Robert Moses State Park and the village of Kismet on Fire Island. I enjoy the clothing optional status and the opportunity to sit quietly in uncrowded areas to read or rest and sometimes walk from one end to the other.

The clothed beaches are almost always crowded and noisy. I am uncomfortable having to wear a suit and put up with the general population on a clothed beach.

In my many years at Lighthouse Beach I have never seen any crime. There has occasionally been unacceptable behavior by some, but that is quickly stopped by the regulars at the beach who follow the rules and tell the offenders to stop.

From time to time there is talk of the clothing optional status being stopped. This would deny a sizable number of people from enjoying the beach as they like it. In no way would it open the area to the greater population who, by choice, stay closer to Field 5 or Kismet. There is an area in front of the Lighthouse that is not clothing optional and that is very lightly used.

Those who are offended by the clothing optional use are, in my opinion, offended because they choose to be. They have every opportunity to enjoy themselves in the much larger areas that are not clothing optional. People are usually offended by the things they hear or know about, rather than that which directly affects them. We do not like to offend others and thus keep to our area.

We hope to keep it that way and sincerely hope the NPS will allow us to continue enjoying the freedom of clothing optional use on Lighthouse Beach as well as other remote areas of Fire Island.

Sincerely, Wilhelm Kruysman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 43    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 10:53:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the clothing-optional areas at Lighthouse Beach open!!!

---

**Correspondence** 44    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** -

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 11:22:26

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY. Thank you B. Gray

---

**Correspondence** 45    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** -

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 11:39:51

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern at the NPS:

I hereby, respectfully request that, WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

I will appreciate your support on this request.

Yours,

Jose P. Posada

**Correspondence ID:** 46    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 12:16:45

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

I am registering my support for the continued traditional clothing optional use of LIGHTHOUSE BEACH and other areas of the Fire Island National Seashore. Whichever of the four alternatives is chosen, it is essential that the National Park Service maintain the traditional clothing optional use of LIGHTHOUSE BEACH and other currently clothing optional portions of the Fire Island National Seashore by the Diversity of its resident and non-resident populations, as a planning priority.

Mahalo, Larry, Honolulu

---

**Correspondence ID:** 47    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 13:07:30

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

Please keep the National Seashore beach by the Fire Island Lighthouse clothing optional. My wife & I have enjoyed this beach since 1994. We have never observed any problems. All of the regular attendees are friendly & courteous, aware of the manners required to get along in a clothing optional situation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 48    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 13:55:22

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

Good Day:

As a tax paying and voting citizen, I fully support the continued and expanded clothing optional opportunities in the Fire Island National Seashore.

The clothing optional areas of FINS, including Lighthouse Beach, provide healthy recreational opportunities to thousands of individuals and families. There are no other places on Long Island for such activities. Eliminating the clothing optional areas would deprive people of this healthy way of enjoying the natural beauty of the seashore.

Lighthouse and the other clothing optional beaches should be improved with:

- better signage informing the public of the beach's clothing optional status - posting the rules and regulations for use of the beach - garbage collection bins on the beach to help protect the environment - convenient, clean and environmentally friendly restroom facilities

Our seashores are beautiful natural resources that belong to the public and should serve the many varied needs of different groups. There are many miles of some of the nation's finest beaches in FINS that can be protected while still providing opportunities for the public to enjoy in many different ways.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	49	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	-				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,23,2010 14:12:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please maintain the clothing optional nature of Lighthouse beach				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	50	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	-				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Save Lighthouse Beach Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,23,2010 14:12:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the continued traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach, as well as other portions of the Fire Island National Seashore. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 51    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 14:27:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the clothing optional use of the beach recently known as Lighthouse Beach. I have been a user of this facility for 30 years. This location, and it's accepted use, makes it trully a gem here in the northeast. DB

---

**Correspondence ID:** 52    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 14:49:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to maintain the traditional clothing optional use of the Lighthouse beach and other currently clothing optional areas of the Fire Island National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 53    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 14:56:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please maintain the clothing optional beaches....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 54    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 16:30:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Whichever of the four alternatives is chosen, it is essential that the national park service maintains the traditional clothing optional use of lighthouse beach and other currently clothing optional portions of the fire island national seashore by the diversity of its resident and non-resident populations, as a planning priority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 55    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 16:42:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the continued traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach, as well as other portions of the Fire Island National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 56    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 17:21:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not a nudist, but I do believe that those people who wish be nude in designated public areas should have the right to do so. If non-nudists feel offended by nudity, they can avoid the designated nude areas. Nudists have families, work and pay taxes and are for the most part law abiding citizens; just like those who are non-nudists. Hence, why are nudist discriminated against, why can they have a small confined section to themselves if they wish to be nude .. non-nudists are NOT forced to ogle, or pass through under the guise of "talking a walk". Being nude is not lewd, it's what one does nude that can become lewd .. but this also can apply to non-nudists. Please consider favorably on behalf of those who wish to exercise their option to be nude.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 57    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** AANR Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 18:26:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

My wife and I are 66 years old and have been married 44 years. We love going to clothing optional beaches, which, as you know are few and far between. We are not weird, we are not odd, we are not swingers, we just like to go to these beaches. We have been to Lighthouse as well as Gunnison and Apollo and Haulover. We sometimes travel specifically to visit these wonderful places.

We are asking that, regardless of your various options, you keep Lighthouse beach as a clothing optional beach and more importantly that you not move it to a more remote location. My wife has MS and, while she can navigate the boardwalk from the parking lot to LH beach, it

is fairly difficult for her and will get worse as time goes on.

We realize that the clothing optional beaches must be a bit more remote but we are just asking that they remain legal and accessible to all who want to use them.

Thanks for your consideration,

Roger and Jeanne Gordon [REDACTED]

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	58	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	-		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,23,2010 18:29:16		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am hoping that you keep the section of Fire Island National Seashore clothing optional, as it currently is. My wife and I visited there a few years ago, and found it to be a pleasant and wholesome experience. It was certainly a family friendly and healthy environment.		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	59	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	-		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Save Lighthouse Beach Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,23,2010 18:58:18		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern: Please keep the portions of Fire Island National Seashore that are now designated as clothing optional status quo. There are not many places where naturists can go to enjoy the great outdoors in such a beautiful setting such as FINS, particularly Lighthouse Beach. For the most part, everyone is well behaved and respects the natural setting that is afforded to us for our enjoyment. Please do not punish the masses for the sins of a few. There will always be a few miscreants who threaten the welfare of the many simply because they bring the greatest attention. Consider the statistics when deciding the fate of the thousands of people who enjoy the unfettered use of Lighthouse Beach simply based on the actions of a few. As opposed to the events that happen at the adjacent state park, Lighthouse Beach is a very orderly and cleanly kept beach. It has been that way for quite a few years. Even though I have only been a patron for sixteen years, I have come to realize what an important part Lighthouse Beach has played in my life and upon my recollection, it has always been fairly peaceful. Thank you for your consideration in this matter and I hope that I have given you food for thought.		

---

**Correspondence ID:** 60    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,23,2010 19:39:17

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 61    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,24,2010 02:31:28

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 62    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,24,2010 05:10:50

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

Although I have not used the beach in all to many years, my memories are quite fond. I fortunately have neighbors that have endeavored to do so. One of their fondest experiences, is the tolerance they have experienced among other things, is the "clothing optional" opportunity this particular beach affords them. As so many of our freedoms it seems to be slowly whittling away, I would greatly lament our ability to doff ones clothes if one so wishes. Please allow "Clothing Optional" to remain on the beach. Thank you. Sincerely, SaraAnne Grossman



**Correspondence ID:** 63    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 07:36:54

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I would hope that the current use of the Lighthouse Beach will not change. My wife and I enjoy being able to spend time at the traditionally clothing optional beach.

Please Keep it that way.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 64    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside** AANR Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 08:02:25

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I feel it would be ashame to close the only legal clothing-optional beach in NY. I think it would send a message the nudity is bad and I disagree. Nudists are people too, we should be allowed to relax on beach and enjoy the ocean like everyone else. If people are offended by nudity, they can stay away from the nude section.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 65    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside** Friend of the Lighthouse Beach Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 08:49:26

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Since I arrived in the US from Germany in 1969 I have been enjoying the Friend of the Lighthouse Beaches. Hope our ambassadors will keep order so we can enjoy the clothing optional beaches forever.

Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 66    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 10:52:30

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Whichever management plan is utilized I would like to voice my support for the continued traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach, as well as other portions of the Fire Island National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 67    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside** self Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 14:15:00

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Please continue to keep some portion of the beaches on Fire Island National Seashore as clothing optional as you prepare the future plans for this park space. Lighthouse Beach has been used for this and would be great to have clothing optional use allowed in the future also. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 68

**Name:** -

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 16:47:59

**Correspondence** Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I grew up on Long Island and still continue to visit the clothing-optional beach at Lighthouse Beach on Fire Island. Whatever management plan you choose for Fire Island, I urge you to continue to allow the clothing-optional beach on both sides of the Light House.

As your own documents recognize, most of F.I. is not very diverse, especially considering its proximity to NYC, and almost all of it is not accessible to people of limited incomes. A notable exception is the clothing optional beach by the Lighthouse, which draws a remarkably diverse set of visitors, who vary widely by race, ethnicity, income, and home location (L.I, NYC, and tourists from elsewhere).

Over the years, the people drawn to the clothing optional beach have kept it clean, pristine, safe, and are protective of the natural habitat. The clothing optional beach would win in any contest with the nearby state-owned beaches on all of these dimensions.

The clothing-optional beach is a national treasure and I urge you to keep it that way.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 69    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,24,2010 17:28:32

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

I feel it's our right to be nude if we want! The feeling of the wind blowing over your body is the BEST feeling I can think of. The people that I have met and made "forever friends" with is the best! If you would open your mind and go home "at first" and take you clothes off... set and relax and few minutes....get in your hot tub... stand in the wind and feel God's work...then you'll understand how good being nude feels, you'll probaly join the cause to keep nude beaches! Can you emign " no sand in the suit" laying on the beach and getting a no tan line. even Benjamin Franklin enjoyed being nude. Please do not take this right from the ones that really enjoy it and while no one is hurt whats the beef. If some one don't agree then go to another beach of your choice, you have many we have few.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 70    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside**

Opera/Musical Theatre SIG of The Naturist Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**

Aug,25,2010 11:06:53

**Correspondence**

Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

TO: Superintendent Chris Soller & Project Manager Ellen Carlson Dear Mr. Soller and Ms. Carlson: I have read with great interest the projected FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN and its four alternatives, and have been impressed with its conscientiousness, and with your request that the public send you comments. Here are mine. While I appreciate the Parks Service's concern with protecting wildlife and nature, too often in other places this has been used as an excuse to shut out or hamper human enjoyment of recreational areas. I would thus very much favor your Alternative 3, or possibly Alternative 4, which is very similar, but seems to include "providing more amenities and improvements" than Alternative 3. Please allow me to suggest what some of these improvements might be. Firstly, perhaps Parking Field 5 could be expanded, so it does not need to close so often. It would also be nice if hot water could be provided in the showers near Parking Field 5. It would be even nicer if showers could be provided in the area near the 1st Boardwalk, so folks did not have to leave the beach and don bathing suits to use said showers. And it would be nice if the ramp that used to be at the 1st Boardwalk could be rebuilt, and the sign alerting folks of the beach's traditional clothing-optionality could be reinstated. Lighthouse Beach, especially the clothing-optional portions of it, in many ways serves as a model for what a clothing-optional beach should be, and is, in many, many places in Europe, Canada, Australia, and the U.S., though more on the west coast and Florida than in the northeast. Thousands of people in the U.S., millions worldwide, enjoy the benefits of swimming and sunbathing without having to wear bathing suits, which has been shown to be much less healthy, causing skin rash irritations, etc., than not wearing them. And a clear majority of folks, according to the latest polls,

support people's right to clothing-optionality in designated areas, even if only a minority exercise that right. In the New York area, there is no other place quite like Lighthouse Beach, except Gunnison Beach in Sandy Hook, NJ, which has a much longer, more arduous walk, along sand, than the delightful path on the boardwalk to Lighthouse Beach, where deer can frequently be seen, and flora and fauna enjoyed. The only similar place in the east superior to Lighthouse would be Haulover Beach in North Miami Beach, Florida, where showers have actually been built on the beach, a project of organized local naturists and park service folks in friendly collaboration. Local naturists in our area are also organizing, in groups like the Travasuns and SaveLighthouseBeach.org. In doing so, they are getting help and advice from national organizations like The Naturist Society, to which my wife & I have proudly belonged for over 20 years. In 1989 we formed the Opera/Musical Theatre Special Interest Group of TNS, and have performed at dozens of facilities across the U.S., Canada, France, and Australia. The Valley Stream Herald recently ran an article on our 500th concert together. Whatever alternative you decide upon in your plan, please do not change the status quo in ways that could affect the continued enjoyment of Lighthouse Beach by members of the naturist community, who come from all over the metropolitan area to do so. Over the years we have been delighted to meet and mingle there with artists, jewelers, guitarists, teachers, opera singers, radio hosts, athletes, dancers, teachers, and many more delightful individuals. Please be cognizant of the reason so many free-spirited folks come there from so far so often, and don't do anything to discourage them. Sincerely, Dr. Leonard J. Lehrman, [REDACTED]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 71    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,25,2010 13:04:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are against all changes; we love it just the way it is. Don't want to see it change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 72    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** LI Beach Friends, Inc Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,25,2010 21:27:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

Bill Kozack President LI Beach Friends

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	73	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	-		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	American Association for Nude Recreation Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,25,2010 21:28:30		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>I write to express my desire that the traditional clothing optional area be included in the management plan for Lighthouse Beach. Nudists value this wonderful opportunity and want the nude recreation user group included.</p> <p>I travel from Oregon to visit Gunnison Beach in NJ and Lighthouse beach on Fire Island. I want to be assured that nude recreation is included in management plan that is a work in progress at this time. While Oregon has two legal nude beaches the East Coast beaches are special to say the least.</p> <p>Thank you for including nude recreation and the continuation of the clothing optional area in the master plan.</p>		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	74	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	-		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	SavelighthouseBeach.org Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,26,2010 08:00:23		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	75	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	-		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	LITrivasuns Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,26,2010 09:35:06		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I feel that the clothing optional area of Lighthouse BEach should be kept. It is a small area,and maintained by attendees. Attending this beach,as any other beach,is there for public use and as long as there are no problems,(sexual,alcohol,misbehaving,or disrespectful), this area		

should be kept for the small amount of people who enjoy being a naturalist.

Larry Gilbert 8/26/10

---

**Correspondence ID:** 76    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside**                Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**            Aug,26,2010 10:16:07

**Correspondence**    Web Form

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**    My wife and I are occasional LightHouse Beach goers. While there may be a fractional minority who flaunt propriety, frankly we've never seen them!

The same can be said for any place where people gather, which is why ANY park, beach and picnic ground is patrolled. Keep the beach clothing optional for the majority... not close it because a few.

Hal Hansen Joan Hansen New York City

---

**Correspondence ID:** 77    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**                Remington, Galeyn

**Outside**                Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:**            Aug,26,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence**    Fax

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**    Galeyn Remington [REDACTED]

tel 212 371 3730~ fax 212 3716358

August 23. 2010

National Parks Service

Regarding Fire Island Wilderness management Plan Your work protecting wilderness while making it minimally accessible is appreciated. Please keep to the basic principle that people want nature as wilderness, with nothing manmade except a TRAIL for ACCESS by foot.

I urge you to: 1. protect the Wilderness Act and do not undermine its intention to preserve a "wilderness experience" 2. build nothing new in Fire Island's wilderness 3. do not make more campsites and do not require "designated" campsites, let freedom to be in nature without

impediments guide. 4. no signs or structures are needed; make maps and a compass and pedimeter for distances available at the present (or a smaller) visitor center, instead of signs for those worried (but Fire Island is small). 5. better maintain a single foot trail to campsites and remove brambles from the trail. 6. brambles and ticks do not enhance wilderness experience on Fire Island and the trail should be maintained with that focus -- otherwise a "rough" disappearing trail is fine if the direction to walk is easily seen and there are no destructive impediments like brambles.

Option one is therefore the best choice.

Option two is fine if a trail is maintained while removing other manmade structures.

Option three I strongly oppose except it has one good idea to add a sand trail on the Old Burma Road as long as there are no signs nor markers added nor "amenities and improvements" nor designated campsites.

Option four is disastrous, please remove from consideration.

Those who want "something added to make hiking easier" may misunderstand what they need, only a good trail is missing. That hardship can make people think they need "many" improvements. Hikers and campers want to see the beauty of nature, on their own, without "paternal guidance" and signs. ----- Re: Removing Japanese pines That is a waste of resources and harm to the beauty of the Island. The trees roots are intertwined and have grown together sharing sunlight as part of the beauty of "groupings of trees". Trying to take out some and not others is absurd and harmful and will destroy the natural beauty that has evolved by trees "growing as groups".

Instead, remove some brambles near the trail so they don't take over when maintenance flags. Ecology changes as weather conditions change; brambles are "doing better" than some other vegetation and that is not reason to decide the brambles are "natural" so should be allowed to take over.

Attend to a balance of nature, so no plant or animal species dominates. Only remove what does harm to the ecological balance. Imposing a purist "idea" that "what used to be" is the only ideal denies the basic principle of "integrative change over time" that is evolutionary. Let mankind's standards of "maintaining beauty and ecological balance as wilderness" be the standard.

Fire Island wilderness and all wilderness should be preserved. It is most important that you not consider "option four", it would require permanently altering the Wilderness Act. Please help people transcend "modern laziness" by providing opportunities for people to visit wilderness, and they will experience and realize they do need "amenities". Without the Wilderness Act protections, the wilderness will be changed and destroyed for future generations.

Sincere Regards, Galeyn Remington

**Correspondence ID:** 78    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** TNS Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,27,2010 11:34:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing the Park service to keep the clothing-optional areas at Fire Island National Seashore. Skinny-dipping and sunbathing are valid recreational choices and is the main reason that my family and I visit Fire Island. Thank you, Bob Hojnoski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 79    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** The Naturist Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 11:46:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to encourage the inclusion of clothing-optional recreation as an important part of ANY plan for Fire Island National Seashore.

Sincerely ,

Charles Conley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 80    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 12:09:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please make provision for clothing-optional recreation in the formal General Management Plan. Although it is more than a day-trip for me, I enjoy the clothing-optional advantage as often as I can.



**Correspondence ID:** 81    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** American Association for Nude Recreation (AANR) Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 14:54:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, as a concerned citizen and an AANR member, I'm writing to respectfully request that the NPS maintain the clothing optional status of Lighthouse Beach at the Fire Island National Seashore in Long Island, NY. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 82    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 20:41:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, My name is Rob Colbert and I am a 44 yr old architect living in Waterbury Vermont. I was born and raised on Long Island and practically grew up on the beaches of the Fire Island National Seashore. Many outings included visits to the Lighthouse Beach area and specifically the clothing optional areas. It is with great concern that I recently learned that the new General Management Plan options being proposed for this area DO NOT include any considerations for the generations old nude-use areas.

I have not lived on Long Island for 26 years, but I still make annual visits with my wife and two children to visit family in the area. Many of these visits still include time spent on Lighthouse beach enjoying the sun and surf in the nude. I would urge you, and fully support any GMP that includes the continued clothing-optional use of these beautiful areas.

Clothing-optional recreation is enjoyed by millions of people worldwide and Lighthouse beach is one of the premier east coast locations for enjoying this wholesome and family friendly lifestyle. I am sure that you are aware that a significant income stream is brought to this area each year by locals and visitors that wish to experience the beautiful beaches of the Fire Island National Seashore without the confines and constraints of soggy bathing suits.

I for one would be greatly saddened if this ability was not considered, or worse.. eliminated. I urge you all to include provisions for continuing the tradition of clothing-optional use on the already established areas of Lighthouse Beach.

Thank you for your attention and consideration,

Warm Regards, Rob Colbert Waterbury, VT (Formerly of East Meadow, NY)

**Correspondence ID:** 83    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Naturist Chrisians (Naturist-Christians.org) Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 03:51:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I encourage you to provide for naturist use. Naturism is family friendly and all studies have confirmed that naturism actually reduces unwanted sexual activity.

Further, it is entirely consistent with early Christianity. We have a dedicated website with over 35,000 subscribers wo share this view.

Yes, there are those who would use the cover of naturism for improper activiities - but no different that many persons using any activity as a cover for their inappropriate actions.

I would submit that current bating attire is far more sexually provocative than 1000 nude bathers.

My wife and I have been to numerous beaches in Europe and Australia as well as the very few in the United States. We were last at Vera, Spain where the naturist section is almost 2 miles. In Denmark, virtually all of the thousands of miles of beach permit naturism. It is only natural that in countries where naturism is accepted, there are far fewer inappropriate sexual activities than here in the US and even Britain which like the US continues to attempt a strong Puritanical influence. For example, the teen pregnancy rate in Holland is only 1/11 of that in the US. Nowhere in western Europe is the teen pregnancy (and abortion rate), is less than 1/5 of the rate in the US.

For the first three centuries of Christianity, nudism was accepted. This was only changed when Constantine made the Christian Church a state church and many other aspects of Christianity were changed to gain favor with Constantine. As in Naturist resorts, they are probably the safest place for children.

My own church, the Religious Society of Friends (aka Quakers) provided the only church related (and perhaps the only) camp where nudity was the norm since about 1945. The persons who attended this camp became much more stable and leaders of their communities. It should be noted that many famous person both in the US and the world have been naturists.

I have had some medical problems in the last few years and have seen about five doctors. Once they found that I was a naturist, they then told me that they were naturists - one asking me where to take his family (wife and three children) in Hungary and I was able to recommend a very family oriented area on Lake Balaton south of Budapest. While I haven't been three, a close friend, author of the book, "Nakedness and the Bible" had sent some time there and found over 10,000 naturists, about half were children.

In a recent poll conducted by a travel organization, nearly 50% stated that they would use a naturist beach. Other studies have found that about 80% of the American population support setting aside areas for naturist use and 20% of the American public (much higher for persons under 40 ears o age) would use naturist facilities if there were convenient located and the cost was reasonable. Today, the cost for a naturist

resort membership is just out of the means of many persons. As equal citizens aren't we entitled to consideration - to practice our beliefs, and in many cases to practice their religious beliefs?

I urge you to provide for naturist use in all public lands.

William R. Martin Founder of Naturist Christians, an ecumenical organization of Christians.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 84    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Long Island Travasuns Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 05:15:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have been going to lighthouse beach for over 10 years, The beach is peaceful with no loud radios or dogs running around. The people are very friendly and people clean up after themselves. I hear that planning is going on for the Fire island Seashore and i just hope that the clothing optional section of the beach will be perserved.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 85    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 11:23:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are in full support of the continued use of Lighthouse Beach as a clothing optional beach. This particular beach is probably the nicest beach we have been to and continually has the nicest crowd. As with any public area, occasionally there will be an issue that must be dealt with, but they are few and far between.

We have been enjoying this beach for many years as a family and hope to continue to do so in the future. Any restrictions of the beach's clothing optional status would be an injustice to the predominantly calm, family minded users of the beach.

**Correspondence ID:** 86    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** The Naturist Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,28,2010 12:34:15

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

My name is Les Dearing. I live in La Mesa, California and have visited Fire Island National Seashore. As a naturist, I have enjoyed clothing optional recreation on the island's beaches. I have found the regular community of naturist beach users responsible, respectful, and friendly.

Clothing optional recreation is a wholesome and historically valid form of recreation. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. The survey also revealed that a clear majority of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation. I strongly recommend that clothing optional recreation be included in the General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 87    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** The Naturist Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,29,2010 12:56:28

**Correspondence Type:**

Web Form

**Correspondence:**

In my opinion, you should include clothing-optional beaches in your recreational plans. I've been to Fire Island's (c-o) Lighthouse Beach and, as is the case with most of these kinds of beaches, people are generally well-behaved, usually better than at "textile" beaches. There's enough shoreline in this country to provide areas for c-o use as well. Survey after survey shows that the general public is positive about designated, clearly-marked c-o beaches. After all, naturists/nudists pay taxes as well and deserve to be considered when the pie is sliced up regarding funds dedicated to the recreational use of public lands. Specifically, the naturists who "watch over" Lighthouse Beach have done a great job of "policing" and working with you to keep the beach safe and to keep improper behavior at a minimum. It would be unfair to fly in the face of that and slam the door to c-o use after so many years of positive work. As a naturist, who frequents c-o beaches with his wife, I for one would like to see more of them in this country.

**Correspondence ID:** 88    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,29,2010 21:44:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi just would like to request that you would make plans for the area to be clothing optional recreation so many tourist are getting into the naturist life and we need more places to go. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerly, Matthew Holbrook

---

**Correspondence ID:** 89    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,30,2010 09:21:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NPS GMP, While reviewing the GMP, there was a notable missing item: the clothing optional beach bordered by Robert Moses State Park and the town of Kismet (except for the immediate Fire Island Lighthouse beachfront area). This has traditionally been a clothing optional area, and while I do not know the history of this clothing optional beach, however, we need to keep this resource open for those of the public who enjoy this resource. As the park is for all people to enjoy, having this beach designated a clothing optional area would be to the service of all. Please address this issue in the General Management Plan. Thank you Stephen Lisanti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 90    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Long Island Bares Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,30,2010 09:34:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, I am writing to express my concern about the possibility that the clothing-optional beach currently on the Fire Island accessed from Field 5 of the Robert Moses park may be removed. I have been going to that beach for about 12 years and always have a good time. Clothing-optional areas, like the Lighthouse Beach, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks. I think that clothing-optional recreation should be included in plans for the Seashore, REGARDLESS OF WHICH MANAGEMENT OPTION IS ULTIMATELY CHOSEN. S

kinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose.

In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

I think the numbers suggest that the

existence of a clothing optional beach is still warranted and should be retained.

Thank You.

Steve Frey Rockville Centre, NY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 91    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,30,2010 10:02:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan proposals.

I am surprised and disappointed that none of the plans include clothing-optional recreation.

In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. According to that survey, seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

The harsh, and seemingly moralistic tone of recent political discourse may have made it uncomfortable to propose such an aspect. However when the facts are examined, clothing optional recreation is not only a viable and important aspect, it is an economically beneficial one. Because we work to get clothing optional spaces, we naturists take on the role of stewards. We pay a little extra and we bring friends who bring tourist dollars, and who take good care of where we stay.

For the sake of a diversity of use, and for the stewardship and economic benefits, I ask that you please include clothing optional recreation in

the plans moving forward. Clothing optional recreation needs to be in WHICHEVER management option is selected.

Thank you for listening,

William D. Cattey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 92    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,30,2010 19:26:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In regards to the status of the clothing optional areas on Lighthouse Beach and Fire Island I feel that keeping these areas open to legal nudist is imperative to our freedoms we fought for and continue to do so. Please do not change the status of these areas as they are enjoyed by many who live with in the lifestyle.

Thank You , John Mallard [REDACTED]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 93    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,31,2010 06:22:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of NYC who has been a frequent visitor to Fire Island and in particular Lighthouse Beach for the last 25 years. I wish to express my conviction that clothing-optional recreation must be included in plans for the seashore, regardless of whichever management plan is ultimately chosen. Polling by the Roper organization in 2006 clearly established that a majority of Americans believe that governments should set aside designated public lands specifically for clothing-optional recreation. Traditional clothing-optional areas like those at Lighthouse Beach contribute to the wonderful diversity of our national parks. I have always witnessed a peaceful coexistence between clothed and nudist visitors to Fire Island. Skinny-dippers and nude sunbathers deserve to be considered and eventually included in the General Management Plan.

**Correspondence ID:** 94    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,01,2010 18:32:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS:

Given that there has been a long standing history of use of part of Fire Island for clothing-optional sunbathing, I encourage the NPS to preserve this use by including this in the general management plan. There are few such facilities on the east coast, and is part of the attraction of Fire Island to tourists coming from beyond NY.

I understand the need to balance preservation of the natural resource with recreational uses, and believe that this can be accommodated.

Thank you, Tim Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 95    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,02,2010 10:25:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I AM A NATIVE LONG ISLAND RESIDENT AND BEACHLOVER WHO ENJOYS GOING TO LIGHTHOUSE BEACH FOR A CLOTHING OPTIONAL DIP IN THE WATER. WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN FOR THE USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH, I BELIEVE IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAIN THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE. THIS IS ONLY FAIR WAY TO REPRESENT THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AND SHOULD BE A PLANNING PRIORITY.



**Correspondence ID:** 96    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,02,2010 17:00:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am a life long New York State resident, having lived on Long Island or in New York City for almost 70 years. I have been a member of the naturist community for over 30 years and have utilized the Parks Service's facilities at both Sandy Hook and Fire Island. I am concerned that the proposals for park service management do not include specific reference to the maintenance of clothing optional recreation at Lighthouse Beach. Whichever option is eventually accepted, it must include a provision for the continuance of this valid recreational choice. Polls tell us that over 70% of Americans believe that nude sunbathing should be available for all who wish to participate in it, and the majority believe it is the proper use of government land to set aside areas where this is possible. It is a valid form of recreation and as such deserves to be included in any management plan going forward. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter. Edward J. Dunne, Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 97    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,02,2010 20:53:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Hi!

We were informed that you are considering different General Management Plans to update operations at Fire Island National Seashore.

Although we have only been there a few times in the past several years (whenever we were in that part of the country), the only area we ever spent time in has been the clothing-optional sections of the beaches.

It would be a shame and a disservice to many visitors if the clothing-optional sections were not included in the updated General Management Plan and possibly expanded upon.

All we know is that if clothing-optional areas of any NPS controlled lands were ever closed, we wouldn't have a reason to visit even though we have enjoyed our National Parks for many decades.

Thank you.

Mike & Susan Jan

**Correspondence ID:** 98    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,06,2010 19:30:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I'm writing in support of preserving the traditional clothing-optional use of various parts of the FINS including Lighthouse Beach and other areas where such use has long been permitted between the towns. I have owned a home on the western edge of Fire Island for nearly 20 years and my family and I have used Lighthouse Beach throughout this period. Whichever plan is pursued (and I would favor the more balanced plans), clothing optional beach use should continue to be permitted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 99    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,06,2010 19:33:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Please continue to permit clothing-optional sunbathing at the western edge of the National Seashore (near Robert Moses). Fire Island is one of the few and by far the nicest places where this is permitted in the Northeast. Let's keep it that way!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 100    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:**

-

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,06,2010 21:52:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear NPS,

I did not see any plan for accommodating the thousands of beach goers who trek to the Fire Island National Seashore from the State park to the west. Certainly, if you are expanding facilities, it would make sense to provide parking and use the associated revenue to enhance the visitor's experience and protect the wilderness.

A crowded beach, such as the one at the western end of park, is worthy of life guard protection for the sake of the swimmers. The dunes are also worthy of protection. Additional parking and concessions for and that stretch of beach, along with the concomitant increase in revenues,

would save two birds with one stone.

Regards, Craig Mitchell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	101	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	Martin, Ron				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Fire Island Pines Property Owners Assn Civic Groups				
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,19,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Statement To National Park Service Regarding Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan				

The Fire Island Pines Property Owners Association, representing the owners of 700 homes and other residents in Fire Island Pines, commends the National Park Service for undertaking to update the General Management Plan (GMP) for Fire Island National Seashore with the goal of providing management direction for the Seashore well into the 21st century. As a group of major stakeholders in the Seashore, we have been committed to protecting and preserving one of our country's most cherished barrier islands for 58 years.

In general, we applaud the Park Service's recognition of the unique character of Fire Island National Seashore, with the 17 communities that pre-existed the Seashore representing a fundamental element to be valued and protected. Going beyond mere acknowledgement of the communities' right to exist as specified by the Congressional legislation that created the Seashore in 1964, draft materials and statements during the planning process seem to have embraced a broader management perspective than in the past. What was once viewed primarily as a natural resource now appears to be regarded as a dynamic environment where cultural and human resources are integrally interwoven with natural resources. We vigorously advocate and support this new perspective as an underlying principle in a new GMP and that an overarching management objective be to foster a balanced relationship between people, including community residents and visitors, and the natural environment. We are especially gratified by the Community Character Analysis that has been occurring and that is intended to preserve the special qualities and unique cultural resources of each of the 17 communities.

On behalf of our community, we are pleased to provide more specific comment on the proposed management alternatives issued as part of the Park Service's planning and preliminary public comment process.

We assume that Alternative Number One will be as easily rejected by the Park Service as it was by us. We understand that a "status quo" alternative must be considered as a baseline under federal guidelines. We believe that continuing under the current management plan would fail to recognize changes that have occurred in recent decades and ignore the revisions in policy and practices that are required to sustain a dynamic, valued national resource.

We believe the approach in Alternative Number Two that de-emphasizes the human environment is retrogressive and unenlightened. It is inconsistent with both the letter and the spirit of the enabling legislation of 1964 and ignores the Park Service's new and progressive acknowledgement of Fire Island's cultural resources. We will strongly oppose government acquisition of private lands, and we will

vigorously reject any attempt to deny homeowners the right to reconstruct their homes after a major storm event. Disregard of private property rights will simply devolve into protracted and costly legal battles and divert scarce government resources from the true mission of the Park Service in serving the public. The management approach suggested by this alternative would destroy the collaborative stewardship of the barrier island that has developed over many years and that characterizes the current relationship between the Park Service and the resident communities. The residents of Fire Island have always been its staunchest protectors, beginning with the fierce battle that led to the creation of the National Seashore and more recently with the millions of dollars for self-funded projects to replenish sand-starved beaches and restore dunes that are essential in protecting the Great South Bay ecosystem and the infrastructure of the South Shore of Long Island.

We endorse and support the management approach outlined in Alternative Number Three. We believe it is essential to acknowledge the connection between environmental resources and human use and to recognize the long history of human habitation and use of Fire Island. The Park Service should seek to protect both the island's natural resources and the character of its communities. The Seashore should continue to work in partnership with the communities and the towns to ensure that the communities evolve in a responsible and sustainable manner. For example, our community wants current zoning regulations that control building and development to be reviewed, clarified and enforced more fully. In addition, we strongly support this alternative's allowance for measured intervention in natural systems and for beach nourishment projects, at least until comprehensive actions are taken to restore the natural westward flow of sand that was disrupted long ago. Because mosquitoes represent a significant public health risk to residents and visitors, continuing mosquito control measures are critical. With visitors, the Seashore should stress education that connects both the natural and cultural environment. With the communities, it should emphasize collaborative stewardship of the island's resources.

While the close proximity of Fire Island National Seashore to an urban population of millions makes it even more of a national treasure, the possibility of broadening public use as suggested in Alternative Number Four raises concern because of that very proximity to millions of people. We fully support the public's use of the Seashore, acknowledging of course that the public does in fact own a national seashore. And we commend the objective of making the natural experience available to a diverse public, particularly to underserved populations and without regard for visitors' incomes. However, the limitations imposed by transportation to and from the island, minimal infrastructure and public facilities, and communities already overburdened by visitor requirements, mandates caution and restraint in expanding opportunities for public use. The natural environment can only sustain a limited number of visitors without destroying fragile ecosystems. And the communities can only sustain a limited number of visitors without destroying their character and way of life. To that end, we support maintaining the "roadless" character of Fire Island and ensuring that water-based transportation is the primary form of access. Our Association appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments on behalf of all our members, and we will encourage our members to respond individually as well. Further, we look forward to commenting on the draft and final plans when they become available later this year and in 2011.

August 19, 2010

**Correspondence ID:** 102    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Johnston, Mary  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,20,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** The mission of the FINS is to protect the Seashore for the enjoyment of the 300 million people of the United States ... the primary partnership must be consistent with that mission.

? Clearly, at a time when many civic and environmental groups all across Long Island are working aggressively on the mainland to limit higher densities and intensified development; it is inconceivable that the FINS should be working to transfer that density onto the fragile ecosystems that comprise this wondrous natural resource .. known worldwide as the Fire Island National Seashore. ? Development must be limited, and the FINS must now take an active role in ensuring new development is restricted and limited to previously developed sites and footprints ? The lot area of 35%, contained in the original enabling legislation, must now be strictly codified and enforced. The FINS must actively pursue its mission to protect the seashore .. ? Any new plan must include precise and clear definitions for lot occupancy, structure, and wetland protections as well as a methodology by which the FINS can legally and forcefully compel local zoning authorities to conform decisions to the overall intention to PRESERVE and Protect the National Seashore .... not to develop it for the next generation and profiteers as a commercial recreational resource. ? The FINS exists solely to preserve and protect the national interests and this environmental resource for the American people ... if it is unwilling or unable to do so then it may well have failed in its primary mission and may have wasted millions of dollars. ? ALL construction forward of the Atlantic Dune Line must be stopped and immediate steps taken to remove any construction that will clearly pose a threat to the natural balance and protections for all the communities on the seashore and the main island itself ? The dunes are the last vestige of protection from the Atlantic and must be jealously guarded. The FINS continues to fail miserably to take any necessary enforcement or protection steps to prevent the continued random destruction of both the bayside the dune lines both in Islip and Brookhaven Towns. ? Spending millions to replenish beaches is necessary to keep the FINA from the ravages of winter and spring storms, these steps are taken to protect the seashore not to facilitate development ? The American people expect that the agency entrusted with the protection of this vital natural resource will seek the funding necessary to accomplish its mission. ? Stewardship of the FINS must be viewed as impartial, independent and autonomous. Having a good working partnership with the existing communities is a laudable goal, but cannot supplant the primary mission which is to preserve and protect the resource, clear boundaries for cooperative efforts need to be identified.

**Correspondence ID:** 103    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Spotts, Richard  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Fire Island National Seashore GMP

Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager

15 State Street Boston, MA 02109

RE: My comments on the Fire Island National Seashore GMP

Dear Ms. Carlson and other NPS FIIS officials:

Please accept this letter with my comments on the above-referenced subject, and include it in the appropriate administrative record.

At the outset, I have a longstanding interest in Fire Island National Seashore (FIIS). I have been on the FIIS planning newsletter E-mail mailing list for many years, and I submitted some previous comments during an earlier round of this FIIS GMP planning process. The purpose of this letter is to augment and expand upon my earlier GMP comments.

I carefully reviewed the latest FIIS GMP planning newsletter that described the preliminary management alternatives. I strongly support and urge NPS to adopt the draft park purpose, draft management philosophy, and draft park goals stated in this newsletter. I believe that these draft statements are well-written and succinctly establish a reasonable and appropriate vision for future FIIS management.

Of the preliminary management alternatives, I strongly support and urge NPS to adopt as its Preferred and Environmentally Preferred Alternative going forward #2: "Enhancing Natural Resource Values." I believe that this alternative would provide the best combination of future management directions given the many internal organizational challenges of limited FIIS staff and budgets, as well as the many external challenges, such as from climate change, rising sea level, invasive species, excessive deer browse, and great recreational pressures. This alternative would also best fulfill the objectives of new executive and secretarial orders on energy efficiency, green building, and sustainability.

For example, Preliminary Alternative #2 contains some specific components that would better prepare FIIS for future changes. Transitioning away from older, permanent structures on a dynamic barrier island and toward temporary, removable structures makes good economic and environmental sense. This is also consistent with the Coastal Barriers Resources Act, which Congress passed many years ago to discourage permanent buildings out on exposed barrier islands, given the obvious public safety, insurance liability, federal disaster relief, and environmental benefits. Like floodplains and steep slopes, it is very risky to build on barrier islands, and if you must do so, an alternative for

temporary, removable structures is the safest choice. Indeed, former FIIS Superintendent Constantine Dillon frequently advocated this transitional approach. Since most of the public visitation out on the island is during the summer months, temporary structures could be erected in the spring and removed in the fall. If a major storm or hurricane is forecast to be approaching, these structures could be taken down and safely stored.

In addition, I believe that it is inappropriate for FIIS to maintain an ongoing dredging effort to keep the Watch Hill and Sailors Haven harbors open for deeper-draft vessels. This is enormously expensive, and disrupts the natural littoral movement of sand along the bay-side shoreline. Instead, again primarily for summer peak use, temporary extended floating boardwalks and offshore moorings can be used to accommodate visitors.

Moreover, I support all FIIS efforts to acquire or exchange private parcels, on a willing seller or exchanger basis, to consolidate NPS ownership of inholdings on primary dunes or in other environmentally important areas. Some isolated NPS parcels located in narrow strips between developed communities could perhaps be used to facilitate an exchange option for private landowners.

I believe that the two chronic and toughest management issues for FIIS are when or under what circumstances to approve special use permits or otherwise authorize ocean-side beach scraping or nourishment projects and bay-side bulkhead projects. In my view, these projects are clearly contrary to the NPS FIIS charge of maintaining natural beaches, shorelines, and disturbance processes such as erosion and accretion. Of course, I realize that NPS FIIS officials are under enormous political pressure from wealthy community leaders and landowners to approve these projects. Nevertheless, President Obama and Interior Secretary Salazar have made it clear that they expect greater fidelity to law and the best science, as well as greater transparency and accountability from government. As such, I think that the FIIS GMP planning process needs to be much more candid and specific about these two issues, and describe what criteria or decision-making process would be used to decide whether these types of proposed projects should be approved, and, if so, under what conditions or with what mandatory mitigation measures. As one example, I believe that past FIIS approval for bulkhead construction and replacement on the bayside contributed to the erosion inward into the Sunken Forest.

Finally, I think that much more could be done to protect and restore wilderness characteristics like naturalness and solitude in the FIIS Otis Pike High Dunes Wilderness Area. As New York's only federal wilderness area, it deserves and needs greater management attention. For example, NPS should work with the FAA under both the NPS Air Tour Management Act of 2000 and Section 4(f) of the Federal Transportation Act of 1966 to reduce the incompatible, lower-altitude aviation noise that is sadly so ubiquitous over and near this wilderness. If possible, there should also be a maximum required setback distance ? on both the ocean and bayside ? for loud motorized watercraft from the wilderness. The historic structures at Old Inlet should be fully inventoried for cultural purposes, but then removed. A few low-profile and camouflaged pit or composting toilets should be allowed in the wilderness to meet visitors' needs. An offshore-mooring system could be used off the Old Inlet site so that boaters could moor and then take a dingy or swim onto the island.

Please keep me on the E-mail notice list for further news on this FIIS GMP planning process. And I hope that my comments are helpful.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard Spotts



---

**Correspondence ID:** 104    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,08,2010 08:46:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support SPLASH & its efforts to help restore waterways with controlled "Tidal Flushing"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 105    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,08,2010 09:59:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm a member of SPLASH & strongly support it's efforts to help restore our waterways with controlled "Tidal Flushing".

Let me know if you need more information from me.

Have a great day.

Sincerely.

Chuck Cohen Just one of many concerned SPLASH members.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 106    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Wells, David  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Please include clothing optional recreation in the general management plans being considered for Fire Island National Seashore. Skinny dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices and in polls American believe that those who want to sunbathe nude should have a place to do so.

Lighthouse Beach has traditionally been used as a clothing optional area and this activity adds to the diversity of recreational choices offered by the National Park system.

When I travel I look for clothing optional recreation areas to use, because they are often cleaner and less "wild" than other beaches. Oregon has some beautiful ocean beaches but none are designated clothing optional, by including clothing optional recreation in your General Management Plan you have the opportunity to have a recreational offering that is truly rare in America.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 107    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Zysman, Joseph  
**Outside Organization:** Fire Island Wilderness Committee Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Comments on the Fire Island National Seashore Preliminary Management Alternatives submitted September 5, 2010 by the Fire Island Wilderness Committee 325 Beaverdam Road Brookhaven, NY 11719

Submitted herewith are the comments of the Fire Island Wilderness Committee on the Preliminary Management Alternatives for the Fire Island National Seashore (FIS) Our comments are addressed primarily to the various proposals in the alternatives for the Otis Pike Wilderness area7(OPW). While in detail, they are not meant to be exhaustiive.

The Fire Island Wilderness Committee has a long history of involvement with FIS mangement with regard to the OPW, from the time of its designation in 1980; we were actively involved in the planning process for the current Wilderness Management Plan (WMP) and in subsequent planning initiatives as well.

## Summary

In the almost 30 years since its establishment, the Otis Pike Wilderness, with very few exceptions, has been well managed by the National Park Service and FIIS. For this reason, while the proposals in these alternatives offer a fairly wide selection of approaches to management of the OPW, Alternative #1, the retention of the Status Quo/Current Management, is a clear preference, among the options. With some qualifications and changes, it would form the core of a "preferred alternative. "

We find no reason to believe that the adoption most of the other alternative proposals would enhance the wilderness experience of future visitors to the OPW. Indeed, many of the proposals are inconsistent, to varying degrees, with key provisions of the Wilderness Act, which is the benchmark that all of the proposals must be measured against. Some of the other proposals are confusing and many do not contain enough detail to understand what the Seashore has in mind.

## The Planning Process

Before reviewing some of the specific proposals, we must note that the discussion of the Wilderness proposals together with those for the rest of the Seashore is somewhat problematic because, unlike the General Management Plan (GMP) which will basically be a policy document and "a foundation for decision making," the Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP), as it is now called, will be a fully detailed document that will commit to specific actions, similar to the existing plan that it will be replacing.

For that reason, the inclusion of only one or two brief paragraphs for each of four Alternatives for wilderness is largely inadequate to serve as meaningful guidance for public input on what will be a very detailed final plan. Therefore, the formal draft WSP for the OPW, unlike the draft GMP, needs to contain a level of detail commensurate with the content of the final plan.

## Other Sections of the "Alternatives" document

At the same time, we note with some dismay that in the seven pages of text that precede the wilderness alternatives discussion, the word "wilderness" appears only once. Given that the OPW is the only federal wilderness area in New York State, one of the few barrier island wildernesses in the country, and that it comprises about a third of the land area of the entire Seashore, and half of its federal land, one would have imagined that considerably more space in these pages would be devoted to a recognition of its value and importance to the Park Service and the Seashore.

## Wilderness and Isolation

In the only place in these pages that the word "wilderness" appears., in the "Draft Park Purpose" section, the context of its use is misleading:

"Fire Island National Seashore preserves the primitive and natural character of the Otis Pike Fire Island High Dune Wilderness and protects its wilderness values of solitude and isolation." (p. 3).

In this regard, the word "isolation" is totally absent from the Wilderness Act. Moreover, the OPW is one of the least isolated areas in the entire Seashore. Unlike most of the other FIIS recreation sites, which are accessible only by seasonal ferries, access to the OPW is available

all year round, from its eastern boundary at Smith Point. The word "isolation" should therefore be deleted from this section, and certainly more could be said about the nature of other wilderness values found in the OPW.

### Organization and Common Proposals

Our comments are basically organized in sections for each alternative. However, many proposals dealing with the same subject are found in more than one alternative, and comments on them in one alternative may also be referenced in another. Two subjects common to several alternatives are discussed here:

#### Trails

The Old Burma Road would continue to be minimally maintained where it remains to allow for passage as a footpath. (Alternative 1)

The Seashore would re-establish a sand trail along the old Burma Road, where feasible. (Alternative 3)

The Seashore would . . . develop a through trail using the old Burma Road as feasible.<sup>77</sup> (Alternative 4)

All of these proposals are misleading, as they are inconsistent with the reality on the ground. A trail along the old Burma Road already exists, and it is both a sand trail and a footpath .. It is also a through trail, ie., it runs the full length of the wilderness area, and it has been used by hikers and campers in the area for nearly 30 years. No trails need to be "re-established" or "developed."

However there is a problem with this trail. Maintaining it "minimally" has not worked in recent years, to the extent that in some sections, vegetative growth on it has rendered it impassible. Active trail maintenance through removal of vegetation for the entire length of the trail should be an ongoing activity for Seashore staff, and there would be little problem finding local volunteers to assist them. Provision for this ongoing maintenance needs to be included in the WSP. However it should be commenced as soon as possible, before the completion of the final plan.

#### Bellport Beach

The Seashore would work with the Village of Bellport to expand their role as stewards in the Wilderness Area. (Alternatives 3 and 4).

This proposal is confusing. The Bellport Beach is a bay to ocean parcel that bisects the OPW. While it lies within the authorized boundaries of FIIS, it is owned by the Village of Bellport and not by the Park Service, and is therefore not subject to wilderness laws or regulations.

The Wilderness Act delegates stewardship responsibilities for wilderness areas exclusively to the federal agencies whose lands include such areas--in this case, NPS. In order to implement this proposal, it would be necessary to amend either the Wilderness Act or the legislation establishing the OPW.

We are unaware, however of any wilderness stewardship function performed by the Village of Bellport in the past or at present, as implied

by these proposals, as indeed such a role would be inconsistent with applicable law. Nor are we aware that officials of the Village of Bellport have expressed any interest in undertaking such a role in the future. If they do have such an interest, information regarding it needs to be disclosed in detail in subsequent planning documents.

At the same time, while not subject to any wilderness laws or regulations, actions undertaken in their tract by the Village of Bellport do have the potential to impact the adjacent OPW. This concern might be effectively addressed by adopting the language used in the current WMP:

The National Seashore will work closely with the Village of Bellport to encourage only minimal development of this area. (WMP, p. 6)

There is also no mention here of the potential impacts of actions taking place in the several other areas adjacent to the OPW, e.g., Smith Point County Park on the east, the FIIS Watch Hill facility on the west, and the ocean beach seaward of the dune line on the south. Activities in all of these areas have an equal, if not greater potential to impact the OPW, and this subject needs to be fully addressed in the draft WSP.

#### Alternative 1: Status Quo/Curent Management

This is the only option that will ensure the continued preservation of the character of the OPW, as mandated by the Wilderness Act. The proposals here could serve as the core of a "preferred alternative," and some proposals from other alternatives can beneficially be incorporated into it. These include designating limited dune crossings where they have existed and renovating the Visitor Center at Smith Point to meet ADA and LEED standards, both found in Alternative 3.

At the same time, several of the proposals require some qualification or change, summarized here, and further detailed elsewhere in these comments, as indicated:

Wilderness camping would continue to be permitted.

Camping in the OPW has been a major recreational activity since its designation, and should be continued. However, as presented here, the proposal lacks necessary details: Will the number of camping permits be increased, decreased, or remain the same? Will the number of campsites remain the same? A detailed discussion of camping appears in the comments on Alternative 4.

Existing boardwalks, signage, and the concrete pads would be retained, as would any historic relics and remnant structures.

There are several problems with this proposal. For boardwalks and signage, see our comments at Alternative 4, below; as mentioned in comments at Alternative 3, we do not know what historic relics and remnant structures are being referred to, so we are unable to comment on them.

The concrete pads, which are at Smith Point, cannot be considered eligible for retention as part of the Status Quo. They are designated as "Potential Wilderness Additions" on the legislative map, and as such are to be removed. There is a specific provision in the current WMP that also calls for them to be removed (P. 18), which should be duplicated in the new WSP.

The Old Burma Road would continue to be minimally maintained where it remains . ...

This proposal is misleading; see the comments at Trails, above.

#### Alternative 2: Enhancing Natural Resource Values

This alternative reveals a basic misunderstanding of the purpose of the Wilderness Act, as its main proposals would constitute the end of the OPW as a viable wilderness area. There is no requirement in the Wilderness Act for an area to be returned to a totally natural state. On the contrary, key provisions of the Act require that wildernesses also be managed for a number of public purposes, including, prominently, recreational purposes. (Section 4(3)(b)).

The alternative is also inconsistent with the requirement in the Wilderness Act that wilderness areas have "opportunities for solitude or for primitive and unconfined recreation" If the Burma Road trail is removed, how would anyone take advantage of the opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation in the area, when they wouldn't be able to get into it in the first place?

The existing Wilderness Visitor Center would be removed and replaced with a small outdoor information plaza with a kiosk and restrooms.

If the area is rendered inaccessible, why would these facilities be needed at all?

#### Alternative 3: Recognizing the Relationship Between Human Use and Nature

This alternative contains several beneficial proposals, while others, though appearing beneficial, are far too vague to justify meaningful comment, let alone support. For example:

..... this alternative would provide a few new or updated amenities . ....

Just what are the "amenities" referred to here? Are they the same ones as in other alternatives, or different ones? Without knowing the details of what the Seashore has in mind, neither we nor anyone else is in a position to comment on this proposal intelligently. Consequently, any endorsement of this proposal, or of the alternative as a whole without qualification, must be considered invalid.

. . . . . and the Seashore would take steps to improve the sense of entry into the Wilderness.

We also don't know what this statement means. Is the "sense of entry" just a question of perception, as opposed to actual entry? What are the "steps" being considered? Whatever the meaning here, there has in fact been no problem with entry, or access to the OPW, except that in recent years, entry at the trailheads at either end of the trail have been concealed by excessive vegetative growth. Whatever a "sense of entry" may mean, actual entry will be much improved once the vegetation on the trail is cleared on a regular basis.

Other proposals in this Alternative

Dune crossings that connect to the through trail would be designated.

Dune crossings would serve a useful purpose. The proposal does not indicate the need for any installation or structure, however if that is what is intended, any such crossing would need to be minimally obtrusive so as not to alter the natural profile of the dune line; narrow width corduroy planking would serve that purpose. They also should be limited to the locations of the three or four such crossings that already exist, but may no longer be easily discerned.

Mosquito ditches would remain as would historic relics and remnant structures.

Leaving the mosquito ditches is preferable to their removal, which would involve the use of heavy mechanized equipment, and damage to the resource might outweigh the benefits of removal.

We do not know which "historic relics and remnant structures" are referred to here; details need to be provided in order to make any meaningful comments.

At Old Inlet and at Bellport Beach, existing facilities would remain.

It is misleading to include Old Inlet and Bellport Beach in the same sentence. The Old Inlet area is entirely within wilderness, while Bellport Beach is entirely outside the area, and therefore they are subject to completely different laws and regulations.

The existing Wilderness Visitor Center would be rehabilitated to meet ADA compliance requirements and guidelines for LEED certification.

We support the proposal to rehabilitate the Wilderness Visitor Center at Smith Point to meet ADA compliance requirements and guidelines for LEED certification, provided that the footprint of the facility is not enlarged in the course of rehabilitation.

#### Alternative 4: Exploring New Opportunities for Public Use

At the outset we emphasize that the proposals in this alternative are not inherently detrimental. They would be fully appropriate for other areas of the Seashore or for other National Parks. But wilderness areas are supposed to be very different from other park areas. That is the core issue. Here are some of the proposals in this Alternative 4:

The Seashore would restore the bay side boardwalk configuration . ...

The legislation establishing the Fire Island Wilderness specifically provides that boardwalks in the area- as structures, which are prohibited by the Wilderness Act- be removed, and with one exception they have been. This proposal violates that law.

Some trail markers would be installed . ..... .

NPS Wilderness policies state that "signs detract from the wilderness character of an area .... " Given the small acreage and narrow linear

configuration of the OPW, trails markers or signs would be an unneeded, visual intrusion. For nearly 30 years, there have been no permanent signs or trail markers in the area, because it is virtually impossible to get lost in it. Temporary signs or markers may be needed when active trail maintenance is resumed.

Further, signs and trail markers are installations, prohibited by the Wilderness Act "except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for purposes of the Act." (Section 4(3)(c). The basic stated purpose of the Act is to preserve an area's "wilderness character," and the absence of permanent signs or markers in the OPW is a defining element of that character. Attention must also be paid to the nature of any signage that might be placed adjacent to the wilderness, at it's boundaries, as they also have the potential for visual impact.

. . . . . and spur trails would be developed"

Spur trails don't need to be developed in the area, because, like the main "Burma Road" trail, they also already exist. However, as is the case with the main trail, they have not been adequately maintained. While acknowledging the value of the spur trails, new spur trails are neither needed or justified; the existing ones just need to be maintained, by regular removal of vegetation.

The Seashore would increase the number of Wilderness camping permits ....

This is an extremely troubling proposal, as it is flies in the face of a key provision of the Wilderness Act mentioned earlier, the requirement that wilderness areas provide "opportunities for solitude or for primitive and unconfined recreation" (Section 2(c)

In recent years, opportunities for solitude in the area have already been compromised due to an increase in the number of camping permits issued. In our January, 2007 Scoping Statement (included here by reference) we demonstrated that the density of overnight camping in the area, on a per acre basis was already double that of several of the most popular NPS wilderness areas in the country. (pp. 13-15) . Since then the situation has deteriorated further. In 2009, camping permits issued in for the OPW, on a per acre basis, are almost three times the level of such permits issued for all National Park wilderness areas, excluding Alaska. (see endnote on p. 10)

Increasing the number of camping permits will effectively eliminate opportunities for solitude in the area. What is needed, in order to preserve opportunities for solitude in the OPW, is a reduction in the number of camping permits issued, ideally to half the present level.

. . . with a system of designated ampsites. . . "

Given the priority that wilderness management places on the quality of the visitor experience and resource condition, it would be a mistake to established fixed designated campsites in the OPW. In this smallest of all NPS wilderness areas, without any rivers to ford or mountains to scale, there aren't many opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. The ability of campers to pick their own campsites has been one of the very few such opportunities, and changing the existing policy to establish designated campsites will significantly degrade the quality of the wilderness experience for campers.

"(locations would be rotated to limit resource degradation) ..... "

Under the present campsite system, with no fixed campsites, there has not been any resource degradation at all in the area for nearly 30

years. The proposed change is therefore providing a solution to a problem that does not presently exist- but, as is tacitly acknowledged, will be created. The operative precept here seems to be "if its not broken, its not a problem to break it, because we will be able to fix it"

#### "Wilderness Character"

The most important provision in the Wilderness Act regarding the stewardship requirements for the federal agencies managing wilderness areas reads as follows:

??? each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area."  
(Section 4(3)(b))

In the opening sentence of this Alternative 4, the claim is made that the ensuing proposals will be "continuing to protect the area's wilderness character . . ."

Regrettably, this Alternative 4, as demonstrated above, does not preserve the wilderness character of the area at all. On the contrary, most of the proposals contained in it, if adopted, would transform the area's character substantiaUy, adversely, and permanently.

#### Additional Concerns: Recent FIIS Management Actions

Outside the current planning process, the Seashore has made several policy decisions over the past two years that we believe to be out of compliance with current NEP A and management planning guidelines, and therefore should be withdrawn or suspended pending evaluation in the WSP. In particular, we are concerned that FIIS has instituted several new visitor use policies with little or no planning, public involvement or Notice.

One of these actions allows, for the first time, public dispersed camping on the Seashore beaches that lie parallel to but just outside of the wilderness boundary. This new policy has the potential for significant impacts related to sanitation, i.e, human waste, as campers will not likely use the beach for that purpose; instead, they will traverse the dunes and enter the wilderness. The impacts of this have not been evaluated.. Another recent action has increased the number of permitted campsites in the OPW from 9 to 36-- an increase of 400%, which will preclude the possibility of campers in the area experiencing any sense of solitude. Each of these apparent policy decisions, if they are to be continued at all, should have been subject to consideration in the new WSP, or some other tiered NEPA documentation, rather than adopted by executive fiat with no Notice or compliance.

In this regard, our endorsement of Alternative 1 as the core of a "preferred alternative" does not apply to policies initiated subsequent to the commencement of the GMPIWSP planning process in 2006, and for which there was no NEP A compliance.

#### Conclusion

We reiterate our statement in the introduction, that over the nearly 30 years since its designation in 1980, with few exceptions, the OPW has been managed well by NPS and FIIS. Almost all nonconforming structures or installations have been removed, and the "wilderness character" of the area has basically been preserved. The area today is probably closer to its natural condition than at any time in the past 200



years.

It is therefore both surprising and disconcerting to find that a great many of the proposals presented in the "Preliminary Management Alternatives" document offer changes for the future management of the area which would result in significant transformation of the character of the OPW, and the diminution of the quality of the wilderness experience for visitors to it.

This need not happen, and the adoption of a "preferred alternative" in the forthcoming draft and subsequent final WSP, based on the retention of current management practices as outlined in Alternative 1, and incorporating the changes suggested above, will assure that it does not happen.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these Alternatives.

2009 Levels of Wilderness Camping The visitation figures are from the NPS' Public Use Statistics web pages, The NPS wilderness acreage is from the Carhart Center website, [www.wilderness.net](http://www.wilderness.net) The NPS statistics are presented as "backcountry" camping. NPS total wilderness acreage = 43,890,590 acres NPS wilderness acreage in Alaska = 32,979,406 acres The difference- all US minus Alaska= 10, 911,184 acres OPW wilderness acreage = 1380 acres The Alaskan acreage is deducted because it contains 75% of NPS wilderness, but with less visitation, and would skew the results considerably, and make the difference between wilderness camping overall and the figure for OPW much greater.

Overnight camping in all NPS wilderness areas in 2009 was 1,860,162 In the OPW in 2009, it was 692.

To obtain the densities, we divide the acreage by the number of overnight camping visits.

For the NPS wilderness system,  $10,911,184 / 1,860,162 = 5.9$

For OPW,  $1380 / 692 = 1.99$

Comparing the two results, the level of overnight camping in OPW is 300% over the level of total NPS wilderness camping.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 108    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Anonymous, NA  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,20,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 35% MAX!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 109    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Anonymous, NA  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,20,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Based on the information I have read, I think the best way to move forward is Alt #3. It is important to recognize and work with FI community, particularly since they were on FI first. However, b/c FI is a Nat'l Seashore, it is also important to focus on natural resources in the wilderness and large undeveloped tracts (Talisman, Sailors Haven). Then work with the communities to preserve the community and visitor experience in those areas, while working on \_\_\_\_\_ and responsible development and community protection. Work together for a single FI, as opposed to pulling it apart.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 110    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Anonymous, NA  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,20,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** I think there are positive ideas included in all four alternatives. Generally speaking, I feel alternative #2 is not feasible for FINS. It has positive ideas for maybe a diff national park, but I do not believe the movements included in Alt #2 would work at FINS. With that said, I think Alts #3 & 4 have some good ideas. Specifically a greater emphasis put on education and community outreach. I believe may people who live and visit FI are severely uneducated about FINS and its environmental issues. The only way to make a positive change would be to educate people about what's going on.

**Correspondence ID:** 111    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Malinowski, Steven A  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Fax

**Correspondence:** First, I want to say that this message is about the GMP, for Fire Island.

I've long taken for granted the freedom of the naturist lifestyle, here in California. I was introduced to it by a friend, in 1973. That's 37 years that I've casually taken naturism for granted, here in California, and I was late to the scene, only because of my age. It was going strong at least as early as the 1940's, at Black's Beach, California. I met an older man at that beach, decades ago, and he told me about it. He was there himself to witness it in the 1940's.

If naturism were to be abolished in the U. S., I'd have no reason to remain in this country, because without freedom, this land is no better than an oversized fire ant hill on steroids. Naturism has been one of the rare freedoms really allowed in this country, but on far too small a scale. Naturism is really a First Amendment freedom, as much as any other freedom. This country has had far too much of a tradition of persecuting nudity, and naturism has been one of the few exceptions and relief from it.

If naturism were to be abolished after the many successful years we've enjoyed it, this country would be a GIANT step closer to the legendary Dark Ages, which we are vastly better off avoiding.

So, in conclusion, my import should be obvious, as to what this has to do with the GMP currently under consideration. I emphatically support naturist freedom on Fire Island, on the WHOLE island, not just at Lighthouse Beach. I emphatically support the inclusion of naturist rights and freedom in the new/developing GMP for Fire Island, without restrictions of any kind.

Sincerely, Steven A. Malinowski



---

**Correspondence ID:** 112    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** -  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,15,2010 15:04:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for all your dedicated work around this planning process and for the opportunity to comment.

I often refer to Fire Island as a gem and a treasure. Mother Nature has given us an amazing piece of seashore, and-thankfully-we were able to protect so much of it from concrete, black-top, and gruesome homes!

And the gem and treasure is also accessible. It is not hidden away for the few, but can be quite easily reached by car, railroad, and public ferry.

In reviewing the alternatives presented, I found myself grimacing with pain as I read Alternative 4. In my view and based on my values, the further development of Fire Island (e.g.: eco lodge; camping resort; expanded marinas; more boardwalk & trails; etc.) does not build on its natural beauty (which is its most valuable gift to us) and, in addition, such amenities can be accessed at other state parks on Long Island.

When reading Alternative 2, on the other hand, I went all misty and wistful. Land protection! No reconstruction! Immersion in the natural landscape! Oh, if it could be possible!

I realize Alternative 2, for many, may most represent a management plan consistent with a wildlife refuge mandate and not a national seashore/park. In that case, I would support Alternative 1 (status quo) as the next best plan to Alternative 2.

Again, many thanks for this opportunity to share my thoughts. All the best to the management team as your planning process nears its end.

---

**Correspondence**    113    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**  
**Name:** -  
**Outside** SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Sep,15,2010 15:11:55  
**Correspondence** Web Form  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Soller,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments on this most important general management plan for our Fire Island National Seashore. As a lifelong resident of Long Island and south shore waterfront resident for over three decades, I have witnessed many changes to our bays and the areas surrounding them, sadly, not all of them for the better. As a long time boater and recreational fisherman, I have visited many parts of Fire Island and utilized Sailor's Haven Marina often as a weekend vacation destination. I am personally in favor of Alternatives 3 and 4. I do note in all 4 of the alternative plans, as well as in the common actions on page 7, little if any reference is made to restoring the ecosystem and preserving marine resources on the bay side of Fire Island. There is some discussion of plans for marina and ferry service improvements that will enhance access to and visitor experiences on Fire Island but little attention is given to the deterioration of the sea water quality in Great South Bay. Studies have shown the water borne oxygen levels have reached a point where some parts of the bay can no longer sustain the marine life indigenous to our waters. As I and many of my neighbors know, this body of water is a major nursery area for many species of fish and mollusks as well as crustaceans and other marine animals. Many species are endangered if not already extinct in our waters and the deterioration continues unabated. I am a member of an all volunteer conservation group called SPLASH for Stop Polluting, Littering And Save Harbors. I am also a member of the Memorare Council 3476 KofC Fishing Club. Our Conservation Chairman for both groups, Mr. Victor Consiglio, has created a presentation called "Saving the Great South Bay" and has been working with local government officials to promote a plan for "Tidal Flushing" of the Great South Bay and western bay areas. This plan would restore the lost natural tidal action that allowed fresh ocean water to replenish the back bays and estuaries and provided the life sustaining oxygen and nutrients lacking today. I would like to see the team who will develop the "Marine Resource Management Plan" (Ref. Page 7 under "SUBMERGED MARINE RESOURCES") consider incorporating "Tidal Flushing" as part of their plan or include Mr. Consiglio as an active or consulting member of their team. Please visit the SPLASH website, [www.operationsplash.org](http://www.operationsplash.org) for more information. Two other considerations during this action planning process should be the elimination of ocean dumping off Long Island waters and providing a marked east-west channel for safe navigation between all of the various Fire Island communities. Hardly a season has gone by when I did not have to collect hospital waste or debris from a beach while surf-casting or tow some unwary boater off of a sand bar because they thought they could follow the ferry or water taxi to Saltaire or Kismet. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment and kudos to all who contributed to the alternative GMPs for this most valuable and beautiful natural resource right in my own backyard. Please feel free to contact me or publish any of my comments should you find them of some merit or value to this worthy cause. Please keep me posted on your progress as noted below. Regards- Bob Wahl

**ID:**

**Name:** Bo, Joann  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,13,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am writing with hope that you will implement the plan that Vic Consiglio of SPLASH has proposed to create a system to help increase the flow of water in and out of the bays....our bays are in terrible condition and as the west end of fire island continues to grow and allow less water flow and at a slower rate to enter our bay. Our estuaries suffer, oxygen is depleted, the temperature rises...contributing to the desperate situation that the Great South Bay is in. I believe that making a cut or installing an inflow/outflow pipe is excellent management of the Fire Island National Seashore and the Great South Bay benefiting all of Long Island and the future of the bay.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 115    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Lifavi, Dan  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,13,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Other

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** FIIS must maintain its marinas, as it's the only access for public boaters on Fire Island.

Island should never be returned to a "natural" condition by removing marinas.

Friends of Watch Hill, the primarily boaters community there, take excellent care of the marina, and he can see no damage to the environment as a result of having a marina there.

Marinas are a good "marriage" between the NPS and its patrons.

Although he would like to see Watch Hill expand, finances could preclude that, so his preference would be to go with Option 1, maintain the status quo. "it works."

**Correspondence ID:** 116    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Parham, Jr, Johnny E  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Nov,05,2009 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** In order to preserve the character of this unique island, the FINS should require building material requirements on all FI communities. Ocean Beach, offers a glaring example of the absence of standards, the result being structures that are totally out of context with a national seashore. The absence of standards imposed on FI communities will only serve to exacerbate a mounting threat to the "character of place" that people most love about the Village of Ocean Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 117    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Schappert, James  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** May,19,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to send feedback. Please consider removing the cement walkways in Fire Island. Something gets terribly "lost" when wooden boardwalks are removed and cement "streets" put in. I am sure this was done for easier vehicle access, perhaps even for fire truck access, but they are awful. Communities like Ocean Bay Park struggle to match the beauty and quaintness of other FI communities primarily because it has become a cement jungle. At the very least, consider using a recycled plastic plank but keep the historic look and feel of a boardwalk community.

Keep up the good work! Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 118    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Luss, Carl  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am a homeowner/resident of Cherry Grove, FI, NY. I think the PMA #3 is the alternative that most closely meets the expressed goals of FINS/NPS and those of the Fire Island property owners. I find it hard to believe, however, that more than a modest maintenance of the 'status quo' (PMA #1) can be achieved absent a huge infusion of federal funds. In the 16 years of my home ownership, the response to various requests for FINS's assistance (beach debris storm clean up of FINS beach frontage), intervention (visitors walking over dunes; Town of

Brookhaven permitted construction of new houses on or proximate to the dune line), repair (the Carrington track house; FINS dune cross-over boardwalks) have been blunted by the excuse of lack of funds for personnel, materials and enforcement. In Cherry Grove, 'The Dunes Fund' charity secures and nourishes the primary dune system, cleans its beaches (including the FINS beach frontages), repairs/extends dune crossings (including those under FINS jurisdiction and monitors, to some extent, the piping plover nestings--mostly without assistance (but with enthusiasm for its efforts) from FINS. If FINS and NPS want to make the nation's park system work again, you need to dedicate significant funds to staffing community outreach and partnering programs that can enlist the support (both volunteers and financial) of the environmental organizations that every community has. A 'Smokey the Bear' advertising campaign about "How You Can Help Rebuild Our Nation's Parks" would be a great way to encourage national park neighborhoods to volunteer time and resources under guidance by park personnel. Look to New Orleans for the power inherent in ordinary folks volunteering in the face of a national emergency. The National Parks Service is facing a national emergency owing to decades of inaction in Congress and the bunkering down attitudes of many NPS superintendents and personnel. No one wins when a culture of 'them against us' prevails whether its Congress vs. NPS or NPS/CEHA proponents vs. Fire Island communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 119    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Widdicombe, Sara  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,12,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I was most interested in the front cover photo on your "Fire Island National Seashore Preliminary Management Alternatives" Newsletter of April 2010. The cover photo is of the healthy and robust dunes here in Cherry Grove. It is certain that without the continuing and unrelenting long-term efforts of the Cherry Grove Dunes Fund -- generously supported by the Cherry Grove Community -- the dunes would in no way be as vigorous as the ones we see in the picture. For over forty years, the Dunes Fund has been protecting and encouraging dune growth and conservation by nourishing the dune grass, installing snow fencing to help hold the dune and protect the grass, providing dune conservation education through signage and community brochures, and other activities. Any General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore should, it seems to me, commend and encourage such community stewardship as has been ably demonstrated by the Cherry Grove Dunes Fund. In your subsequent plans and newsletters, I hope to see mention of this worthy organization and its initiatives and accomplishments on behalf of the dunes of Fire Island. Thank you for your consideration. Sara Widdicombe Cherry Grove, Fire Island

---

**Correspondence** 120    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410



**ID:**

**Name:** Feder, Jerome, and Erica Fried

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Jun,16,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Letter

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Re: Comments on Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan

We, Jerome Feder and Erica Fried have been summer residents at our home at [REDACTED] Fire Island for 32 years. Erica Fried has also been the Deputy Commissioner of the Fair Harbor Erosion Control District for the past 10 years. We appreciate the efforts of all involved to formulate the Preliminary Management Alternatives in the General Management Plan. We also appreciate the ongoing efforts to preserve and protect the Fire Island National Seashore and to formulate joint stewardship with the embedded communities. We offer the following comments on the Preliminary Management Alternatives, with special focus on the effects on the communities.

While there are common elements within alternatives, at this point, we believe that the most attractive alternative is Alternative 3 - "Recognizing the Relationship Between Human Use and Nature." This alternative explicitly allows limited beach replenishment, which we believe is critical to preserving and protecting Fire Island. Human intervention in the form of maintenance of inlets in the strip of coastline extending east to Montauk Point has created a non-natural sand deficit situation that renders any alternative that does not include provisions for limited beach replenishment (such as Alternative 2) a threat to the preservation of Fire Island. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would prohibit reconstruction following a major storm, thereby potentially leading to elimination of the communities, the usage style that has been characteristic of this unique place, and reducing the recreational value. We also question the feasibility of this alternative, since it is doubtful that sufficient funding would ever be forthcoming to compensate owners if reconstruction were prohibited.

In examining Alternative 4, Fire Island is already heavily developed and already suffering adverse effects of over-development. Significantly increased use, such as promoted by Alternative 4, could potentially be detrimental to the character of the island and might not be sustainable due to septic and water quality issues. The costs and tradeoffs of this alternative as well as the of the proposed move of some management and maintenance infrastructure off of Fire Island are unclear.

We would like to focus on several problem areas that largely transcend the alternatives offered that we believe should be considered in drafting the final Management Plan: Zoning and Building Portions of Fire Island, such as Fair Harbor, are already overbuilt and are very heavily populated during summer months. There are essentially no vacant lots remaining. Existing houses, however, continue to be expanded, in many cases in a manner noncompliant with existing zoning. The Zoning Board of Appeals has granted everincreasing variances, with each new application citing previous grants as precedents. This results in large houses, closely spaced, on very small lots, which crowds out vegetation, blocks light, and is unsightly. Since houses are often rented for short periods and large sums, the increased dwelling sizes and high prices result in increased occupancy and aggravate the problem of overcrowding. The Fire Island National Seashore (FINS) has attempted to participate and provide input to Zoning Board hearings, especially for the more extreme variance requests or when the CEHA zone is involved. This has been extremely valuable and is explicitly mentioned in Alternative 1. Pending some other more effective solution to the problem of zoning and building, this FINS participation should be continued in all alternatives. While the Zoning Boards don't always comply with FINS wishes, we believe that the FINS input does count, and has helped partially mitigate unfavorable

trends. We recognize that, due to the large number of applications and limited FINS resources, zoning participation is not easy, but it does help with a critical problem. We are pleased that FINS has met with officials in Islip and Brookhaven Townships, to promote positive zoning directions. These efforts are valuable and should be continued across alternatives.

At this point, both FINS and the communities are exploring additional directions that might help in controlling excessive and inappropriate building - incorporation of more villages, more uniform island wide zoning, and zoning "overlays" to preserve Fire Island values. We support these efforts, but feel that some may be difficult to achieve because of difficulties in obtaining village incorporation and difficulty in obtaining island wide consensus on zoning. In Fair Harbor, and possibly in other Islip communities, existing zoning districts and regulations are largely reasonable and consistent with historical FINS policies. Compliance with these existing zoning regulations would largely preserve park and local values. The problem has been the variances, and especially the precedents that have accumulated over time. As a simple, achievable, method that may help, we suggest that the Management Plan incorporate a formal statement of zoning policy that cites the problem of variance "creep" and explicitly states as a goal that, going forward from the date of issuance of the Management Plan, building be nominally compliant with federal and local zoning standards and that variances be very limited in scope, and issued only in cases of genuine hardship. A goal here would be to reset the variance standards and provide Zoning Boards with rationale to deny requests for large variances that simply cite previous precedents. We believe that there are variances that Zoning Boards would like to deny, but facing attorneys for the applicant and the threat of litigation, the Zoning Boards simply grant the variances as the "easy way out." Bicycle Path

Alternative 3 proposes a bicycle path connecting villages on the western end of Fire Island. (The rationale for including the bicycle path in Alternative 3 but omitting it from Alternatives 1 and 4 is unclear.) We believe that the suggested bicycle path would be detrimental to island usage styles as well as potentially dangerous.

1) Foot traffic on the major east west walkways in is extremely heavy during summer months, to the extent that bicycles must continually request that the slower moving foot traffic move out of the way or alternatively the bicycles must keep stopping. Traffic moving at different speeds is being intermixed on the narrow walkways. Simply going for a walk, a major Fire Island activity, is continually interrupted by requests to move out of the way. Increased east-west bicycle traffic, due to a bicycle path would aggravate this situation. One of the pleasures of Fire Island, the ability to let children play safely outdoors on the walks, is also jeopardized. Notably, the village of Ocean Beach has already prohibited bicycle traffic on certain thoroughfares during the summer months.

2) There are problems in many communities due to the heavy usage of golf carts on walkways. While this usage is supposed to be restricted to selected individuals with business needs, the rules are widely violated, and the heavy use of golf carts poses a danger to children. The existence of a long distance bicycle path would make golf carts attractive for traversing between communities, which is undesirable.

3) A level of difficulty in traversing between communities, such as now exists, promotes diversity in the communities on the island. A bicycle path would make it easier to travel between communities, effectively making the island smaller. For some of the same reasons that an east-west road is undesirable, a bicycle path would be detrimental to the character of Fire Island.

#### Motor Vehicle Traffic

The "Draft Park Goals" on Page 4, cites the preservation of the "roadless" character of the island and ensuring that water based transportation is the primary form of access to park resources whenever and wherever feasible. We support this goal and believe that use of water based

transportation and reduction of vehicular traffic should be goals for services to the embedded communities as well as park resources. All alternatives should aggressively seek to minimize this traffic, particularly in the summer and "shoulder" months. Motor vehicles travel at relatively high speeds on the beach, (speed limits notwithstanding) endanger other types of beach usage. Parents of children playing on the beach must remain constantly alert for the approach of motor vehicles. We do not see this usage of the beach as consistent with a park. As one especially onerous example, policemen commuting to their jobs in Ocean Beach, frequently do so in mid-day during July and August. It is unclear what regulations are used to justify this, but these police are clearly not performing an emergency service in the communities that they traverse, and are simply driving on the beach because it is convenient. The Village of Ocean Beach also uses trucks traversing the beach to carry trash during the summer months. Fair Harbor and other communities have managed to achieve workable water based transportation for trash removal. It is unclear why this is not feasible for Ocean Beach too.

Thank you again for your efforts in creating the draft Management Alternatives and for providing us with the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely, Jerome Feder and Erica Fried

---

**Correspondence ID:** 121    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Mahany, Al  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,17,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Thank you to Superintendent Chris Soller and the rest of the FINS officials who provided us with this opportunity tonight to attend your presentation and offer our comments, questions and concerns. It is a great feeling to see the level of concern that FINS officials have for public input into this ongoing process and the knowledge and expertise you all showed in addressing those concerns.

Sincerely, Al Mahany

Past President Long Island Travasuns Inc. Past Vice President Lighthouse Crew Inc. Past affiliate Friends of Lighthouse Beach Inc.

**Correspondence ID:** 122    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Lui, Wei  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jun,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am a homeowner in the Ocean Bay Park community on Fire Island and support Management Alternative #2 "Enhancing Natural Resource Values". I would like to see FINS/National Parks Service do as much as possible to preserve the natural state of Fire Island. I believe the island is already overdeveloped with people putting up more walls and fences and other structures every day - this needs to be controlled.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 123    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** VanSickle, Kenneth  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jul,17,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** This is addressed to the Fire Island Seashore General Management Plans, Primary Management, relative to the Wilderness alternatives. I spent a good deal of time on Fire Island in the 60's and early 70's, mostly in Davis Park and Whale House Point, even when they phased out the houses that were there and I could no longer stay over with friends, I was pleased to see it returned to it's natural state. I appreciate this wilderness area precisely because it is wilderness and is not like the rest of the Island, which has plenty of "amenities and improvements". We have a wonderful opportunity to do a good thing here and that is, to let the wilderness remain wilderness. Sincerely, Kenneth Van Sickle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 124    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** NA, NA  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Jul,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** After reviewing your "Preliminary Management Alternative Booklet for Fire Island there are several points I wish to express a view on: # 1 Reducing the Marina at Watch Hill is the opposite of what I would like to see happen. I actually believe we should be expanding the facility to accommodate more boats. Bottom line is there are too few facilities for people to use today and to reduce the few that we have doesn't make sense. Parks should be for people # 2 Closing Sailor Haven. We should be doing the opposite - Expand it I don't understand why we have the money to build parks in Iraq and no money for maintain the facilities we have here. Your management plan should include new bath rooms, hot water for the showers and an expanded marina, a play ground for kids, new picnic tables. More not less Think about people -

**Correspondence** 125 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Henig, Donald

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Please don't limit the # of boat slips. Those beaches are beautiful and we help keep them that way at no cost to the state or national government. When you talk about expanding the visitor base, I realize someone must be kidding if they think decreasing boat slips will help increase visitor experience. I hope your study is duplicated by people with local knowledge and with a lower level of hatred for people. Thank you, Don Henig

---

**Correspondence** 126 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Thayer, Gary E

**Outside** Wantagh Bay Yacht Club Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: I have just completed the reading of possible recommendations for the future of Watch Hill, To say the least, it is very disturbing to view the proposals put on the table for consideration!! I just returned to home port on my boat from staying at W.H. for five days. To be perfectly clear, in my opinion, the facility is being run better then it has been in years ! The facilities are clean and the workers are helpful and courteous! The W.H.facility enables many of us to have a destination which is affordable destination to stay for mini boating vacations. Reducing the size of this marina and the availability of dock space would not only be unfair to the boating community on Long Island but to those traveling from other states. Most of the other marinas on the South Shore have restrictions for those not residing in the Town where the facility is located. Consequently,many boaters use W.H. as an alternative. Reducing the dock space availability of W.H. could create a hardship for those planning to use the facility as a place to dock for the evening. With limited spaces boaters would be more apt to be turned away. The only appalling part of the Watch Hill Marina (one just about all boaters will agree ) is the lack of response by those in authority to communicate with boaters what is being done regarding mosquito control. This issue has caused many boaters to reject going to the boat basin. The CO 2 machines are not an effective deterrent there are too few, and alternative methods are never employed. Many people are concerned about West Nile virus issues. If those in positions of authority would attempt to use alternative methods (besides the Co 2 tanks provided by the Friends of Watch Hill) to alleviate this problem, the marina would probably be filled to capacity more often..Someone should exert some additional energy into eradicating this enormous problem. I am sure most boaters would gladly incur a per diem price increase to defray the cost to running the facility if the mosquito problem was minimized. Please continue to maintain the size and management of the Watch Hill Marina. However,consider adding to profitability by taking steps to minimize the mosquito infestation. There are many reasons which can be communicated to the Federal Government to validate spraying in order to protect people from potential diseases. Sincerely, Gary E. Thayer Board of Directors - Wantagh Bay Yacht Club

---

**Correspondence** 127 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Chin, Mimi  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Hi Fire Island,

How are you doing? I wanted to write and ask if it is possible for your planning committee to make Fire Island cigarette smoking free. I walked along the beach coast yesterday from Ocean beach towards Sunken Forrest and in those 3 miles, where everyone was on the beach, I continually smelled cigarette smoke. It really ruined my experience. There is absolutely no benefit whatsoever to anyone who is smoking or for the 2nd hand smoke recipient. Please make these changes happen for a healthier fire Island.

Thanks Mimi Chin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 128    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Damonshealth, NA  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Please keep the air clean on fire island. Smoking destroys the air like small tailpipes of a car. No cars or smoking=clean air....and less polution from cig butts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 129    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Tuthill, NA  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,11,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To who it may concern, I don't understand why you would put up a 4 million terminal and make major dock improvements and then decide to make Watchhill smaller. In the 70's we had squatters rights and used the land until the federal government took over, We got to use the land for another 7 yrs. Before the houses were burnt down. I believe there is a pretty good demand for slips in the marina now. A lot of the bigger boats are shut out, most weekends. These 2 locations also provide stops that aren't town run, for boaters heading out east. I have enjoyed this area for 38 yrs. I consider it a family marina, what happened to all the child programs you had? Your Rangers need to be present more, to teach the children about our beautiful resources, and how to enjoy the the gift of Fire Island. There is no place like it in the world. I can leave the mainland and 20 min's later be on the island it's a mini vacation every week for me and my family to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 130    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Hallock, Bryan and Karen  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,18,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please, please don't take the boating facilities away from Sailor's Haven and Watch Hill! They are the last beautiful places that we can take our children by boat in the Great South Bay ? nothing else is left. My son grew up going to both of these marinas and I believe that his sensitivity to the environment and our responsibility to it has been fostered by his experiences there. None of us living on Long Island have access to wild areas anymore ? please don't take our access away. Day visitors just can't get the immersion that is available to people who can visit by boat ? how the beach looks at night, how clear the stars are visible, how the wildlife comes out ? none of that can be seen by people who can only come by ferry.

Please allow us as boaters to continue to bring our children to these wonderful areas ? let us live in harmony with the purposes of the parks ? don't shut us out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 131    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** White, Bradlee  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,18,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** As a homeowner in the community of Kismet, I am definitely opposed to Alternative 2. Phrases like "emphasize the protection of natural resources over human use and development", "acquisition of high priority lands..." "no reconstruction would be allowed after a major storm even within the communities or in the Seashore district" and "physical connections between Seashore sites and the communities would continue to be limited or even diminished" sound like code phrases to phase out and/or make life increasingly difficult for community residents and visitors. While federal funding in the future might not offer any alternative but Alternative 1, I would prefer to move toward more action to establish a better relationship between the communities, visitors and the Park Service. I believe that any national park should be open and "user-friendly" to the greatest extent possible consistent with preservation of plant and animal life. Unless the public comes to understand, love and appreciate those areas preserving our natural heritage, they will not support them. Alternatives 3 and 4 sound promising though very similar, differing only in degree. Again, federal funding dictates may limit the extent of any change. I do like the sentence "It would acknowledge the strong connection between resource protection and human use and foster an appropriate relationship..." However, I'm not sure what "appropriate" means nor "moderate" in "moderate level of intervention in natural systems...including limited beach nourishment" means, except more of the status quo in which the Park Service has often been in opposition to scientific initiatives -- Immunocontraception in the beginning and the 4-Poster Tickicide Program -- to improve the health and welfare of both people and deer.  
Bradlee White [REDACTED]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 132    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Littlered, NA  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,20,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I stay in Sailor's Haven every weekend in the summer. My family loves it there. One thing I would like to state is that it would be nice if we had a few more things there. A hotel would be nice so we can have friends stay that won't fit on our boat. Also, a bar would be great. We have to walk 20 minutes to Cherry Grove to buy a drink and that would help. Maybe even a liquor store. Thanks for your time and consideration in reading this letter. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 133    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** LeVasseur, Peter  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,21,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am a member of Fire Island Pines Property Owner's Association who SUPPORTS the idea of the Parks Department confiscating beach-front property after a home is destroyed because of wind or water damage. I am concerned that the inappropriate building of homes on primary dunes creates wind erosion that destroys the dunes we are constantly replacing with pumped sand replenishment.projects.

Please consider my thoughts when implementing managment decisions for Fire Island National Seashore.

Peter LeVasseur 

---

**Correspondence ID:** 134    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410



**Name:** Joseph@weareone, NA  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**

**Correspondence:** WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH, AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 135    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Pasino, Bob  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am writing to ask you to please continue with the clothing optional uses of Fire Island Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 136    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Palmer, Richard and Mary  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**

**Correspondence:** WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY. Sincerely, Richard and Mary Palmer Greenwich, CT

---

**Correspondence ID:** 137    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Grayson, AIA, Glen  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** National Parks Service,

I am writing to express my support for maintaining the Clothing Optional areas at Lighthouse Beach and other portions of the Fire Island National Seashore. These areas are used extensively by a diverse resident and non-resident populations in the Tri-State area.

The most limiting factor in the use of these facilities at Lighthouse Beach is the limited amount of parking available on any given day, especially in seasons where Field 4 is closed, which puts a greater burden on Field 5 to support the parking of the traditional beach at the Pavilion at Field 5.

Sincerely, Glen Grayson, AIA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 138    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Geoghan, Michael  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:**

WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 139    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Buono, Vittorio  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Since about 1990, I have travelled, usually with a companion lady, to Long Island, as well as to other venues along the New England coast, at least ten times. The purpose has always been visting the clothing optional beaches. However for the occasion we had the opportunity to

enjoy interesting places and to patronize public and private facilities: stores, campgrounds, attractions. It must be noted that this implies 7+ hours driving one way, border crossings more and more tedious to negotiate, uncertain weather, traffic jams and lots of personal time. Competing clothing optional venues are numerous: in Florida, Cuba, Jamaica, French West Indies, Mexico, Brasil, Europe... Keeping current and additional clothing optional beaches available, I believe, is a great asset capable of enticing tourists. Thank you for your attention, Vittorio Buono [REDACTED]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 140    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Canner, Bruce  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have been going to Light House beach for the past 20 plus years. We totally enjoy the clothing optional and we hope that that options continues for the next 20 plus years. We have made many friends at the beach and our families now spend vacation time together as well as attending family weddings. In the years that we have been going to the beach we have seen the crowds grow.....obviously this beach has tremendous appeal. So, I ask you that you keep the clothing optional beach available to us so we can continue to enjoy our summers here on Long Island.

-- Regards,

Bruce Canner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 141    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Jacobs, Martin  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** We have enjoyed the clothing optional beach for many years, traveling from the New Haven, CT area most weekends during the Summer. We stay for the weekends (or long weekends) at local hotels, dine at local restaurants, and shop at local stores. Please consider that not only does that part of the beach draw many people, it is also good for the local economy. Please let Lighthouse Beach remain clothing optional.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 142    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Silverstrone, Nick

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I understand that the National Park Service is currently in the process of updating its General Management Plan (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore. This "master plan" represents a guide for the management and operation of the Seashore for the next 15-20 years. NPS is considering four management alternatives, and is soliciting comments from the public regarding those alternatives and the proposed uses for the Fire Island National. WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY. Thank you

Nick Silvestrone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 143    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** mardugan, NA

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Even though I am not a nudist myself, I respect the right of those who are to have some beaches saved for them. Lighthouse Beach on Fire Island should continue to be a clothing optional beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 144    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Opulente, Mary Ann

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am writing to support maintaining the traditional clothing optional designation of lighthouse beach. It is a much needed and appreciated on Long Island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 145    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Wallshein, Cliff

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** RE : Lighthouse Beach WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

Thank you for doing a great job. Would you look into rebuilding the ramp to the beach that was lost last year.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 146    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Penella, Robert  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Fire Island National Seashore:

I write to urge that, whichever of the four management alternatives currently being considered for Fire Island National Seashore is adopted, the clothing optional sections of the Seashore be retained. The nude beach at the Seashore is a wonderful resource, and it attracts a whole range of users, some of whom have been regulars for many, many years. I hope that you will see the clothing optional beach as a special resource, with many, many taxpayers who have an interest in it. If the nude beach has special management issues connected with it, so do virtually all public accommodations; and the overwhelming number of users are well behaved and respectful of this special place on Long Island's beautiful southern shore.

Best,

Robert J. Penella Chairman, Department of Classics Fordham University

---

**Correspondence ID:** 147    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Stancarone, Alissa and Pat  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have enjoyed coming to the clothing optional beach for years. We are in support of keeping the lighthouse beach and other areas clothing optional. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 148    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Bodden, Wayde

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

In regards to the current process of updating the General Management Plan (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore: WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 149    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Josephs, Ralph

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I wish to make known my support of the continued use of what is generally known as Lighthouse Beach as clothing optional, continuing the status quo. I say this in conjunction with a note that adequate signing advising of the presence of nude sunbathers, should also be a part of the overall picture. Signing is not positioned at the end of the boardwalk from the "Burma Rd" to the dunes. A couple of years ago there was such a sign advising of the tradition clothing optional use and possibility of seeing nude sunbathing. I appreciate your patrols and I can assure you that I am extra careful to take all of my refuse out with me. I also try to be respectful of others on such a public beach. But I do ask that the clothing optional use be continued. A Kiner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 150    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Posada, Jose P

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern at the NPS: WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

I will appreciate your support on this request.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 151    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Smith, Fred

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** We understand the current part of the National Seashore beach that is clothing optional may be closed to nude sunbathing. My wife & I have enjoyed this beach since 1994. We hope this option will continue. We have not observed any problems while attending the beach. We are careful to remove our trash. Most of the people who attend this beach regularly are friendly and courteous, careful not to offend others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 152    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Blanksi8, NA

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** For the past 10 years my family has enjoyed the clothing optional use of Light House Beach and Fire Island with many very nice and considerate people. The use of the beach as a clothing optional beach has been very convenient and enjoyable to us. We have heard that the use of these beaches may loose their clothing optional status. As you know there are an awful lot of people who use these beaches with the rules as they are now, and we have heard that some rules on the island may change. We are asking that if rules change, that you keep the use of the beaches as clothing optional. It is one of the things that we enjoy about living on long island. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 153    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Solorzano, Andy and Diane

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** We are Andy and Diane Solorzano of Temecula, CA. We are frequent vacationers to National Parks and the east coast. We are also members of the American Association of Nude Recreation (AANR) and The Naturist Society (TNS). We understand the the General Management Plan (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore is currently being discussed and input from those that use the National Parks is encouraged. We would like to submit our thoughts on your plan and would hope that you will consider our thoughts in the process of developing this GMP. As stated, we are members of AANR and TNS. Being lifelong naturists, we are always hopeful that the Parks Dept. ensure and protect our the use of certain areas that have been traditionally used by nudist and naturists. We would like to suggest that areas traditionally designated clothing optional, such as Lighthouse Beach, remain as such so that those of us that prefer this type of recreation can continue to enjoy those areas as we have for many, many years. We have visited Lighthouse Beach a few times and during our vacations to the area, we would like to continue to use this beach with it's current traditional clothing optional status. Please consider our suggestion and request during your discussions and GMP process. Thank you, Andy and Diane Solorzano Temecula, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 154    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Kukuk, Jon and Lisa  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I would like to voice my opinion on General Management Plan (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore. I believe in the interest of personal freedom and the continued clothing optional designation.

WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE BY THE DIVERSITY OF ITS RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT POPULATIONS, AS A PLANNING PRIORITY.

I would like to visit Fire Island, but your determination ruling toward the clothing optional status will determine that. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 155    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Alba, Ilise S



**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:**

Dear Sir or Madam, I have been advised by the organization Save Lighthouse Beach, of which I am a member that plans are under consideration with respect to the management of Fire Island National Seashore. I am writing to express my concerns about the continued clothing-optional use of certain areas located on Fire Island; in particular, the one that is East of Field 5 in Robert Moses State Park. My four-year-old son is a third generation user of that clothing-optional beach. I began going with my father thirty years ago, when I was a young teenager. Initially, I would have preferred to go to a more traditional, fully-clothed beach. My father is a life-long naturist, but I was not. Yet, if I wanted to go to the beach with my father that was the beach I had to go to (I opted to wear my bathing suit, then). Thirty years later, I still go to that beach, along with my son and his father (whom I met there). Now, we all opt against the suits. Why have I continued to do so? Why do I feel so comfortable bringing my child there, naked, despite the media reports of pedophiles surrounding us in our New York neighborhoods? It is because of the incredible people with whom we are surrounded. I recall my father's explanation of why he had become a naturist. The main reason he proffered was that, without clothing, there are no external boundaries to friendship. He could not judge anyone based upon which designer label he or she bore. There was no way to ascertain whether someone was a wealthy lawyer or a starving artist, until he spoke to him or her. Thus, he did speak to all those he met, and forged friendships with an eclectic group of trust-fund babies. lawyers, television camera-men, fishermen, house painters, photographers, black, white and Asian individuals, rich and poor, extraordinarily intelligent people, and those that were less than so. People he never would have spoken to in any other environment than the clothing optional beach on Fire Island. Those are the people who helped raise me, as members of my beach family. And, now, those are the people who are helping me to raise my son as part of his beach family. They protect him. They feed him. They play with him. They nurture his intelligence, his trust in the goodness of humankind. What is it about the clothing-optional users of Fire Island National Seashore that sets them apart from other users? Certainly, we all share our love of the incredible beauty nature has bestowed upon us, and our gratefulness for the opportunity to revel in it. Yet, there is some inexplicable fiber that we all share at the clothing-optional section that weaves us together in such a tight-knit microcosm of the world, despite the dearth of textile. It is not the lack of clothing that draws us to one another, but something that engenders that that shared interest does bind us together. There are those who seek to shut our section of the beach down. They equate nudity with sexuality. But they do not know us. They do not know that that is the last thing on my mind, on my son's mind. Ironically, I fear the day of having no choice but to go to "their" fully-clothed beach. The place I am afraid to leave my valuables, lest they be stolen. The place where I would not want my son to play with a stranger's child, because I am concerned about the motives of that person's interest in my child. Where, it seems to me, garbage is strewn without care. Where I would likely never speak to anyone I had not come with. Where we would be isolated from our fellow beach-goers just as we are in our urbane neighborhood. In all likelihood, we no longer would go to the beach at all. It seems that I too, have my prejudices. So, I wrote to ask that any plans that are made for Fire Island National Seashore include the continued, traditional use of the clothing-optional section. I ask that the plans permit my son to continue his education about the spirit of humanity that renders us one, despite our other differences. I ask that the plans enable me to witness the fourth generation of my family's attendance at the beach I so adore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 156    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Suchy, Glenn

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please add me to the list of citizens who wish to leave sections of the Lighthouse Beach open for clothing optional patrons.

Thank you,

Glenn Suchy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 157    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Siegal, Gail

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,23,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To: National Park Service I am writing in support of Alternative 1: to maintain the status quo for the Wilderness Area on Fire Island. There is not much wilderness to be found in this area any more: I would like the little that still exists to remain "unimproved." And, please, I urge you to maintain the trails so that we can enjoy what is there. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 158    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Kahana, Ellie

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I would like to see the clothing optional portion of the Lighthouse beach at Robert Moses and at other Fire Island Beaches continued.

I have enjoyed visiting this beach during the past several years and I feel it is important to continue having beaches on Long Island which are clothing optional.

Thank you for your attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 159    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Naughton, Brian R  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed Lighthouse Beach for many years. I grew up on LI and now live in MD. I make special trips to LI and stay weeks in order to enjoy this beach. I have never observed any of the illegal activities over which there is a concern. The clothing optional feature is rare on the East Coast for an ocean beach. I request that you retain this feature. I have also become affiliated with Travasuns, an organization on LI that shares this philosophy. If this policy changes, I will travel to LI, NY a lot less frequently, if at all. Please keep the current policy in force. Thank you for your kind consideration in this matter Sincerely, Brian R. Naughton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 160    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Benjamin, Christian  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** Hello, I strongly support the continued use of Fire Island and Lighthouse beach as clothing optional areas. I believe this criteria should be a planning priority. Having a place that allows one to express their natural freedom and commune with nature is of vital importance, especially given it's proximity to New York City. The city, the cement jungle, is all too foreboding regardless of economic conditions. I believe that the creativity that it takes to maintain this world cultural and economic center requires recharging in many forms. For some, for many, communing with nature while being nude is an excellent way to stay centered while restoring the vitality that NYC zaps over and over again. I have been a nudist/naturist my entire life. I have moved away from the area and have come back, in part, because of the proximity of such a joyous area. Please keep Fire Island and Lighthouse beach open for clothing optional.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 161    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Storozum, Paul  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Sep,15,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** Other  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I am a member of SPLASH (operationsplash.net) and fully support an initiative to "re-open" up the ocean inlets that were closed up years ago. The closure of these inlets undoubtedly has increased pollution in the bays and the much needed flushes of the bays are reduced.

If new ocean water would be able to flow again through these inlets, I am sure marine life would be able to thrive again like Long Island has

known it in the past.

Please consider this initiative to help Long Island become a thriving bay community again, Please!

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 162    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Famwy (Faminy?), Pignataro

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,13,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Other

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Support opening up new inlets, or some type of ocean water exchange to help flush out our bays that have been stagnating since 3 natural inlets were closed up by Robert Moses 70 years ago.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 163    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Walch, Margaret

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,13,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Other

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** As a long time owner -- since 1970 -- 2nd as an even longer resident -- since 1940 -- of Fire Island (mainly in the Seaview community) I have watched with dismay as a peaceful, sleepy, slightly old-fashions barrier island transformed into an overcrowded, noisy, and overgrown space. Too many people -- residents, day trippers, and meeting their "needs" have changed the character of the once relatively rustic resort near New York City. It is a pity! Any measure to lessen the impact of over population and overgrown landscapes would be welcome.

Sincerely,

Margaret Walch, Seaview

---

**Correspondence** 164    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Lindell, Marie  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,13,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Petition

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** September 3, 2010

Dear Mr. Soller,

I am writing in response to the Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan with several issues. First. I would like to request an extension of the Sept. 6th deadline for public comment on the proposed alternatives. I have regularly spent much of my summers at the Sailor's Haven Marina for the past 4 years. I just spent 6 days there with my family and, for the first time, heard about these proposed plans when I questioned a Ranger about who the "official looking people in suits" were walking around Sailor's Haven. I was directed by the Ranger to the visitor center to obtain a pamphlet explaining the alternatives. I went back to the beach with 10 copies of the pamphlet and found that none of the "Sailor's Haven regulars" were aware of any of these proposals or the apparent years of public meetings regarding this issue. Many were quite angry that these public meetings have not been advertised at Sailor's Haven, Watch Hill, the ferry terminals, etc. so that the people that regularly use the facilities would be informed and could have attended these meetings. There are bulletin boards and glass cases that could certainly have been used to advertise these public meetings and at the least notify the public of the Sept. 6th deadline for public comment. The Rangers were unable to tell us why there have been no postings even though they were aware of the ongoing study and previous meetings. Why is this? I am requesting that you extend the Sept.6th deadline and post information at locations throughout Fire Island. especially at the marinas and ferry locations so you can get appropriate input from the people who use the Fire Island marinas and beaches.

Once again, the people at Sailor's Haven the day of your visit were appalled to hear of these proposals and the lack of "public" posting of information. I am therefore enclosing a petition gathered on that day requesting that you maintain the current marina and beach facilities at Sailor's Haven. I apologize for the lack of professional quality of the petition but this was all we had available at the beach in order to meet the Sept.6th deadline.

I strongly urge that you refrain from developing Sailor's Haven and maintain the marina and beach as it is. It's pristine beauty and appeal is in its natural, undeveloped, serene nature. It is an oasis from the hustle and bustle and crowds of LI, Robert Moses and Smith Point. It would be a crime to develop it, taking away from its tranquility. It is a treasure on FI and one of very few, if not the only, such place for boaters and ferry passengers to "escape" to. Adding shops, recreational facilities, buildings, etc. would greatly detract from it. There are many, many other places to go on LI for those interested in development and recreational facilities. Please do not destroy this oasis by developing it further. I ask that you maintain the marina as it is. Large marinas like Watch Hill and Atlantique and noisy marinas like Davis Park with its Casino Restaurant lose the peaceful serenity of Sailor's Haven. It is truly a unique marina and it would be a travesty to eliminate or change it.

Thank you for your time. I trust that the petition put together in a few hours will be an indication of the public's opinion and the need for appropriately publicized postings. Please advise me as to whether the Sept. 6th deadline is extended and if you will be posting a new

deadline and future meetings at all the marinas and ferry terminals. My email is mariesangels@me.com and phone 631-849-3530.

Sincerely, Marie Lindell cc: Diane Abell

We are in favor of maintaining the current marina and beach facilities at Sailor's Haven/ Sunken Forest, Fire Island:

Petitioners: Georgi Sandgren, Sayville, NY Deirdre A. Nicolle, Washington, NY Marie Lindell, Shoreham, NY David Berkowitz, Hauppauge, NY Andrea Carvjo, Hauppauge, NY Jared Richberg, Woodside, NY Sirima Rehberg, Woodside, NY Gavin Shenahan, ??, NY Catherine Simek, Long Island City, NY Andrea Carley, Sayville, NY Jennifer Gass, New York, NY Jim Nichols, Bayport, NY Mike Eisner, Oceanside, NY Linda Rosen, Wantagh, NY Stephen Zalloughi, Brooklyn, NY Tara Wilson, West Islip, NY Beatrice Zalloughi, Brooklyn, NY Sue Laudman, Freeport, NY Richard Gallo, Farmingville, NY Sharon Minneci, Lindenhurst, NY Kathie Tinucci, Bellmore, NY Wayne Tinucci, Bellmore, NY Devia Gollin, Kissimmee, FL Ward Gollin, Baldwin, NY Barbara McAtin, Lindenhurst, NY Ashley Gollin, Baldwin, NY Kyle Gollin, Baldwin, NY Richard Laudman, Freeport, NY Ward Gollin, Baldwin, NY Steve Hennenemaker, Sayville, NY Craig Gallo, Farmingville, NY Natalie Zallought, Brooklyn, NY Philip ???, Oakdale, NY Ed and Cindy Light, Staten Island, NY Marge Baldi, Oakdale, NY Rachel Skotnick, Smithtown, NY Janet Kelvas, Centerreach, NY Tim Kelvas, Centerreach, NY Robert O'Connor, ?? Joann F. McIntyre, ??, NY Joseph Neugebauer, Sayville, NY Di Neugebauer, Sayville, NY Donna and Roger Williams, East Islip, NY Barbara and Jack Covello, Massapequa, NY Diana Sonzone, Massapequa. NY Fred Jacob, Farmingville, NY Tom Murphy, North Merrick, NY April Murphy, North Merrick, NY Deanna Murphy, North Merrick, NY #52 ??, Sayville, NY S. Lindell, Shoreham, NY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 165    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Gondesens, Margret  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Subject Clothing Optional Beaches

Hello Let's all work together to enjoy these beautiful beaches without any problems. Thank you Margret Gondesens

---

**Correspondence ID:** 166    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Coates, Norma  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** I was a Fire Islander back in the sixties. We stayed in a little settlement called Skunk Hollow. Very small, just about six houses I seem to remember, and we already respected it as wilderness. It was already a place to experience solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. But even then it was losing that character and retrospectively it is just as well that people like us, who went there for the solitude, had to lose our place because of the many others who added to the clutter. I haven4t been there for years, I don4t even live in the U.S. any longer, but

will always remember Fire Island's pristine nature even then. I am aware that that was recovered and that it is considered vitally important these many years later. Of the comments already made I would choose the status quo with the proviso that the path on the bay side be kept up and lengthened to its entirety. The proposal to develop more camping grounds is downright alarming and I would not be in favor of any measure along those lines. Individual campers here and there would not take away from the solitude and its possibilities of primitive and uncontained recreation, while letting them enjoy what it does offer. I certainly hope and pray that no new alternatives as suggested or may be suggested do not take away from Fire Island's wilderness. In particular a large structure for dispensing information about the amenities of the island, as proposed. Yours sincerely, Norma Coates Montevideo, Uruguay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 167    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** hajpat, NA  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Contrary to what many may think when they hear the phrase "clothen optional", it is not a bad thing. I have been going to the Fire Island beaches for almost 9 years and I find it to be a healthy, healing, friendly and, wholesome family beach. I try to spend every summer day there. It has become my favorite place in the world. Most of the friendliest people that I have meet can be found in the section that is clothen optional. It is a friendly and caring group with some of the highest standards for themselves and others. We trully love our clothen optional beach. Please keep it open.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 168    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Murray, Roger  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please don't close Lighthouse Beach and portions of the Fire Island National Seashore to the use of Naturist and clothing optional use. My wife and I travel extensively and use Clothing optional beaches. I know of their value and attraction as a tourist destination. I also have friends that use Lighthouse beach and would hate to loose it as a clothing optional beach. Clothing optional travel is also on the increase (trip adviser poll) and closing the beach would be a step in the wrong direction.

Thank you Roger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 169    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Salzman, Lorna

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Comments on proposed alternatives:

I urge the status quo.

There should be no new boardwalk, no new trails (clean and maintain existing ones), no signs, and no additional camping permits. Any of these would violate the wilderness legislation provisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 170    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Schloss, Morley  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,24,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you to include provision for a clothing-optional beach as part of the General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore. My family and I have enjoyed using beautiful Lighthouse Beach. The clothing-optional section is popular and heavily used. Lighthouse Beach has a long tradition of skinnydipping. No matter which alternative you choose, please include clothing-optional use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 171    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Lehrmann, Dr. Leonard J  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Soller and Ms. Carlson:

I have read with great interest the projected FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN and its four alternatives, and have been impressed with its conscientiousness, and with your request that the public send you comments. Here are mine.

While I appreciate the Parks Service's concern with protecting wildlife and nature, too often in other places this has been used as an excuse to shut out or hamper human enjoyment of recreational areas. I would thus very much favor your Alternative 3, or possibly Alternative 4, which



is very similar, but seems to include "providing more amenities and improvements" than Alternative 3.

Please allow me to suggest what some of these improvements might be.

Firstly, perhaps Parking Field 5 could be expanded, so it does not need to close so often. It would also be nice if hot water could be provided in the showers near Parking Field 5. It would be even nicer if showers could be provided in the area near the 1st Boardwalk, so folks did not have to leave the beach and don bathing suits to use said showers.

And it would be nice if the ramp that used to be at the 1st Boardwalk could be rebuilt, and the sign alerting folks of the beach's traditional clothing-optionality could be reinstated.

Lighthouse Beach, especially the clothing-optional portions of it, in many ways serves as a model for what a clothing-optional beach should be, and is, in many, many places in Europe, Canada, Australia, and the U.S., though more on the west coast and Florida than in the northeast. Thousands of people in the U.S., millions worldwide, enjoy the benefits of swimming and sunbathing without having to wear bathing suits, which has been shown to be much less healthy, causing skin rash irritations, etc., than not wearing them.

And a clear majority of folks, according to the latest polls, support people's right to clothing-optionality in designated areas, even if only a minority exercise that right.

In the New York area, there is no other place quite like Lighthouse Beach, except Gunnison Beach in Sandy Hook, NJ, which has a much longer, more arduous walk, along sand, than the delightful path on the boardwalk to Lighthouse Beach, where deer can frequently be seen, and flora and fauna enjoyed.

The only similar place in the east superior to Lighthouse would be Haulover Beach in North Miami Beach, Florida, where showers have actually been built on the beach, a project of organized local naturists and park service folks in friendly collaboration.

Local naturists in our area are also organizing, in groups like the Travasuns and SaveLighthouseBeach.org. In doing so, they are getting help and advice from national organizations like The Naturist Society, to which my wife & I have proudly belonged for over 20 years. In 1989 we formed the Opera/Musical Theatre Special Interest Group of TNS, and have performed at dozens of facilities across the U.S., Canada, France, and Australia. The Valley Stream Herald recently ran an article on our 500th concert together.

Whatever alternative you decide upon in your plan, please do not change the status quo in ways that could affect the continued enjoyment of Lighthouse Beach by members of the naturist community, who come from all over the metropolitan area to do so. Over the years we have been delighted to meet and mingle there with artists, jewelers, guitarists, teachers, opera singers, radio hosts, athletes, dancers, teachers, and many more delightful individuals. Please be cognizant of the reason so many free-spirited folks come there from so far so often, and don't do anything to discourage them.

**ID:**

**Name:** Morris, Richard D  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Not only do I support the continued use of Lighthouse Beach as clothing optional, I would like to see it expanded. More parking etc. I drive from CT just to use that beach. There are a lot more like minded people as we are that feel the same way. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 173    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Taylorroth, Steven

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please keep the clothing optional beach at Fire Island open as a clothing optional facility. Thank you. steven

---

**Correspondence ID:** 174    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Ohlsson, Andrea

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,25,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To NPS:

While none of the four management alternatives presented in the General Management Plan for the Fire Island National Seashore directly addresses clothing optional use on the beaches where it is currently accepted, it is critical that we insure that each of the alternatives under consideration includes keeping the traditional clothing optional use of these areas. It is vital that traditional clothing optional use be a priority for the future at Lighthouse Beach and other areas of the Fire Island National Seashore for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration,

Andrea Ohlsson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 175    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Miller, Bruce and Gisele  
**Outside**  
**Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,25,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence**  
**Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Hell to my friends at the National Park Service. I'd like to give you this quick email to voice my desire, as well as my wife's desire, to maintain the traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach as well as the other places on Fire Island where clothing is optional. My wife and I, in our early 60's, have been Naturists for the past 10 years. We have never seen any inappropriate behavior at Lighthouse Beach, but we have to assume it has gone on as there have been complaints that we have read about by the Save Lighthouse Beach movement (I must say, thought, that I really hope it is not a question of fictionalized accounts by people who just don't want a clothing optional beach to exists, horror to that!). Lewd behavior, drinking, boisterous behavior, have no place in a National Park, Beach, be it clothing optional or not. But I venture to say that if there were a drinking problem at Jones Beach, the Beach wouldn't be closed, rather the people drinking would be cited and thrown off the Beach. Making Lighthouse Beach a clothed beach is equivalent to closing the beach for Naturists. There are too few clothing optional beaches in the country to begin with. Losing Lighthouse Beach would be a tragedy for us, as well as to other people we know, who enjoy a clothing free lifestyle. It would be sad if we had to lose our beach because of a few people who "just don't get it" , yet another loss to those who wear the White Hat and a victory for the forces of darkness. We don't want that. Surely this problem can be taken care of by weeding out the bad elements, and leaving the people who know how to act with respect and consideration for others to continue enjoying their beach. Sincerely, Bruce & Gishle Miller.

---

**Correspondence** 176    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**ID:**

**Name:** NA, John  
**Outside**  
**Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence**  
**Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I want to tell you about wonderful experience at Assateague Island National Seashore Park about 15 years ago. My wife and I read about an isolated north portion of the beach that allowed nudity (unofficially). It was isolated enough that my wife and I would be able to discover and learn about our responsibility and freedom of being nude and enjoying it. We were able to relax and enjoy the scenery and beauty of this wonderful place. We introduce our two children to this place. We met people who enjoyed being nude and keeping the beach in the same condition as we found it. My family and I traveled from Chesapeake Virginia to relax here. We were sad when we were unable to return to the portion of the beach that we enjoyed the most. I am a member of Save Lighthouse Beach. We are planning a vacation at Lighthouse Beach in future. Now, my wife and I would like to voice our support in keeping a portion of Lighthouse Beach as a clothing optional beach. We are 55 and 54 years old and both retired professionals.

---

**Correspondence** 177    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**ID:**

**Name:** Gastrich, Bernard and Ann  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,26,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**

**Correspondence:** This letter is to support the continued clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach. We have enjoyed the use of the beach for over 35 years, and are committed to helping Friends of Lighthouse Beach to eliminate whatever behaviors might be objectionable to the National Park Service, or to other reasonable users. In past years we have participated together with the National Park Service in setting up barriers on the dunes. Bernard and Ann Gastrich

---

**Correspondence ID:** 178    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Conley, Charles  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am writing to encourage the inclusion of clothing-optional recreation as an important part of ANY plan for Fire Island National Seashore.

Sincerely ,

Charles Conley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 179    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Shopiro, Jonathan  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Greetings!

I am writing to ask that you include provision for clothing-optional recreation in the new General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore. Nude sunbathing and skinny-dipping are traditional and popular there now and this should be continued because there are few other public opportunities for nude recreation and many people value this choice. The General Management Plan should provide for designation of clothing optional areas with signage to prevent confusion and conflict between user groups.

I have visited the clothing-optional Gunnison Beach at Gateway National Recreation Area and Haulover Beach in Miami. I have found them

to be safe and attractive places which I enjoy. I would be likely to visit Lighthouse Beach at Fire Island if it continues to be available for clothing-optional recreation. The best way to preserve and strengthen the family-friendly, safe, and positive character of Lighthouse Beach is to manage and plan for it. Making clothing-optional recreation an explicit part of the General Management Plan will ensure that this continues to be done.

Thank you very much.

Jonathan Shopiro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 180    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Ross, Andrew S  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** ...at fire Island's Lighthouse Beach and elsewhere where naturists choose to sunbathe, beachcomb and swim without clothes on. This is a majority-approved pastime and adds to the diversity of National Park Service Lands. If you can do the same for Camuset State Park that would be appreciated too. Sincerely, Andrew S Ross Connecticut Resident And Naturist Beach Lover

---

**Correspondence ID:** 181    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Clifford, Mike  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I urge you to maintain the current nude use of beach areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 182    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Perez, Herman  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please keep the Fire Island beach the way it is and all can enjoy been nude or wearing cloth. Thankyou

---

**Correspondence ID:** 183    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Chism, Steven B  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** August 27, 2010 National Parks Service Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager Fire Island National Seashore GMP 15 State Street Boston, MA 02109 I am a 56 year old registered voter, tax payer and a proud American. I have recently become retired due to disability. I am a life long artist and photographer. I enjoy the outdoors and the beauty of our country. I am in the process of planning my travels around our great country in my 36 foot Fifth-wheel trailer. I am also a life long naturalist / nudist. I have dozens of friends that are naturist / nudist, both male and female many who have children of all ages. I have been to several of our national parks over the years. While camping it is not uncommon to come upon a group or individual who is bathing, swimming or sunning in the nude. In most cases the park rangers know this to be the norm and accepted, then just go about the business of the day. One issue I have with the National Parks Service is that beyond the tax's it receives it charges visitors usage fee to the people of this nation while still not designating clothing-optional areas within the parks of this nation. Ever citizen and visitor of this nation have a place to relax and enjoy nature in their own way. Americans of all nationalities, race, creed, color, sex and sexual orientation are allowed to enjoy our parks without so much as a second thought. I have seen nudist at a several decades old recognized and accepted clothing-optional beaches or wilderness areas forced by one person that came upon someone nude throw a fit, call for park rangers to force their moral dogma upon others. Husbands, wives and their children then forced to abide by another's views of what is moral in their eyes. Some ticketed some arrested, none's' civil rights protected by "The Constitution of The United States of America" that does protect them. Why not nudists? We need designated national park areas like the wilderness and beach's on the coasts of our nation to enjoy without moralist attacks. Skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are truly valid recreational choices. As you may not be aware in 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the Independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. 74% of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. In the same survey, a clear majority, 54% of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation. America sees this activity as a viable recreation for those who wish to do so. I could quote more statistics but this should make my point obvious. The traditional clothing-optional areas, like Lighthouse Beach within Fire Island National Seashore, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks. I am asking that you include in the GMP for Fire Island National Park a designated area for nudist to enjoy in the way they have for years at this location permanently. Please do this regardless of which management option is ultimately chosen. Citizens as well as international nudist will come to this area spending millions of taxable dollars every year. This could be a model program that pays for its self even with an extra ranger to observe the people as they enjoy the sun and surf. Skinny-dippers and nudist sunbathers simply wish to be included in the General Management Plan. Why not be an example and start seeing to the needs of this nation's entire citizenry. I am asking you to please read this letter into the minutes of your next GMP meeting and also on the day of the final GMP vote meetings minutes before the vote. I have attached a Word document for you to print this letter and share with the entire board. Cordially, Steven B. Chism

---

**Correspondence** 184    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Stark, Jim

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Please consider in you plans for the use of fire island an area for clothing-optional recreation be included in the General Management Plan, as that plan moves toward completion. History has demonstrated that naturist tend to take good care of their environment. For decades, clothing-optional recreation has been a popular choice among visitors to Fire Island National Seashore.

The independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sun bathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. This same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Stark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 185    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Colbert, Rob

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,27,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Hello, My name is Rob Colbert and I am a 44 yr old architect living in Waterbury Vermont. I was born and raised on Long Island and practically grew up on the beaches of the Fire Island National Seashore. Many outings included visits to the Lighthouse Beach area and specifically the clothing optional areas. It is with great concern that I recently learned that the new General Management Plan options being proposed for this area DO NOT include any considerations for the generations old nude-use areas. I have not lived on Long Island for 26 years, but I still make annual visits with my wife and two children to visit family in the area. Many of these visits still include time spent on Lighthouse beach enjoying the sun and surf in the nude.

I would urge you, and fully support any GMP that includes the continued clothing-optional use of these beautiful areas. Clothing-optional recreation is enjoyed by millions of people worldwide and Lighthouse beach is one of the premier east coast locations for enjoying this wholesome and family friendly lifestyle. I am sure that you are aware that a significant income stream is brought to this area each year by locals and visitors that wish to experience the beautiful beaches of the Fire Island National Seashore without the confines and constraints of soggy bathing suits. I for one would be greatly saddened if this ability was not considered, or worse.. eliminated. I urge you all to include provisions for continuing the tradition of clothing-optional use on the already established areas of Lighthouse Beach. Thank you for your attention and consideration, Warm Regards, Rob Colbert Waterbury, VT (Formerly of East Meadow, NY)

**Correspondence ID:** 186    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Koroskenyi, Tom and Lisa

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please support the continuing Clothing Optional area at Fire Island. We plan most of our travels around locations such as this. We would like to continue to enjoy Fire Island but only if this public accommodation continues. Sincerely yours, Tom & Lisa Koroskenyi & family  
Charlotte, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 187    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** R, Richard

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** As you evaluate your plans for the Fire Island Nations Seashore please keep in mind that people have enjoyed the the traditional clothing optional beach by the lighthouse for well over 20 years. This includes singles, couples, and even families. I have met some wonderful people there who have become my friends in more traditional settings. I have been going to Lighthouse beach for many years and before that to Robert Moses State Park. I find the clothing optional beach much quieter and more relaxing than fields 2,3, or 4. Please continue to allow this option to exist at the National Seashore. Thank you, Richard R.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 188    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Johnson, Daniel

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual



**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** My name is Daniel Johnson and I consider myself a prospective visitor to Fire Island National Seashore

I am writing you today to express my desire to have clothing-optional recreation to be included in plans for the Seashore, REGARDLESS OF WHICH MANAGEMENT OPTION IS CHOSEN.

Skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose.

In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

Traditional clothing-optional areas, like Lighthouse Beach within Fire Island National Seashore, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks.

I know how valuable skinny dipping and sunbathing areas are in Seattle and the next time I come to the Eastern shore I would definitely visit any local beach areas as I have done in the past in places like Florida.

Skinny-dippers and nude sunbathers simply wish to be included in the General Management Plan.

Thank you for your consideration,

Daniel Johnson

---

**Correspondence** 189    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Gold, Leslie

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Please set aside a section of the beach for clothing optional bathers. Even if isn't something you do, it's something others enjoy. Please give them the opportunity to show that they can enjoy their freedom while behaving appropriately at all times, i.e., staying within the designated area, refraining from any lewd behavior, and ensuring that others do the same. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 190 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Horowitz, Mitchell

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,28,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

I would like LightHouse Beach, at FINS to remain a clothing optional beach.

Mitchell Horowitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 191 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Sabl, Ph.D., Joy F

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Considering the recent buzz about the increased popularity of the "nakation" (i.e. clothing optional vacation or vacation with clothing optional recreation) I find it unfortunate that there are no "clothing optional" areas specified in any of your Fire Island management plans. Given the history and the culture(s) of Fire Island both for residents and as a resort destination, I suggest that you include clothing optional areas in all four versions of your plan.

You might want to bring up for discussion (i.e. alternate plans) having both "singles" and "family" clothing optional areas, or male vs. female clothing optional areas--as there is a long history of de facto segregated use--or set up small sections where the mode of dress can be defined by the users, e.g. by use of a flip sign that can easily be set up to warn of "nakationers" in that section. One side benefit would be to draw more nakationers away from ecologically sensitive dune areas. Another would be to assure everyone that they are valued visitors to "the island." I know that having an official clothing optional beach area would be a draw for me, especially if it were also ecologically aware. It wouldn't hurt if it were set up to accommodate both "guys wanting to hang out with and watch guys" and "random middle aged female nakationers" such as myself, without either group distressing or distracting the other, but that's not really the crucial element for me. I just

think that sun, sand, and nakedness go great together, and I'd hate to see that be lost.

Joy F. Sabl, Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 192    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Davis, George  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Sirs:

I visit NYC on business occasionally.

When the weather warrants it, I love to go to clothing optional beaches.

Please continue the clothing optional status of the Fire Island beach.

Naturally, George Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 193    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Gindi, Roger  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:**

Ladies and Gentlemen: It has come to my attention that none of the present proposals for management plans for Fire Island currently provide for the continuing use of part of the Fire Island National Seashore for clothing optional naturist activity. Regardless of which management option is finally chosen, it is important that such use be allowed to continue, preferably at its current location at Lighthouse Beach/Robert Moses. Skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation. Traditional clothing-optional areas, like Lighthouse Beach within Fire Island National Seashore, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks. Each summer, thousands of people come to Lighthouse Beach and take advantage of the the clothing optional beach currently available to them. It would be a terrible thing if such use is denied them in the future, either by design or by accidental oversight. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

---

**Correspondence** 194    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Eisner, Linda and Mike

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Attn. Ellen Carlson, Project Manager My husband and I are long time boaters at Sailors Haven, the Sunken Forest. Yesterday we had the honor and pleasure of meeting and speaking with Senator Kirsten Gillibrand. She took a tour of Sailors Haven, the Sunken Forest and took sometime to speak with us. We are very pleased by her comment that she would do everything she could to preserve Sailors Haven. I wrote the following on her facebook page. It was a pleasure and an honor to meet you yesterday. We thank you for taking the time to visit our paradise. We take very seriously your words that you will do everything you can to preserve not only the seashore but Sailors Haven also. We continuously meet people from all over the world that come to experience the Sunken Forest, as you did. Its too bad we didn't have more time to chat about what important to us and how Sailors Haven can be developed and grown. We boaters, spend our summers here and have for many years. Sailors haven is much more than a marina; it is our home away from home. It is a safe place where we and our children have grown up and thrived for many years. The boaters have wonderful cost effective ways for Sailors Haven to be built up as well as preserved. The distant companies chosen to do the work here don't. There is no accountability after the job is completed when their work falls apart. There were so many projects done incorrectly and are a danger to all of us. Then more money is spent to fix the shotty work. It truly amazes me how frivolously money is spent. Again we appreciate you taking an interest and hope Sailors Haven and the marina will continue to remain open. My husband and I have great ideas and hopes that Sailors Haven would be expanded and built up. Every person that we invite to come to the marina, has a wonderful time and makes plans to return. All the new invites have become a mixed blessing because often there is not enough slips for all the boaters that want to get in. We love it here so much we want others to experience it but then selfishly run the risk of not getting in ourselves. We travel over 2 hours each way every weekend to spend time with our summer friends at Sailors Haven. We are also looking to purchase a home farther east on Long Island. One of the major criteria in doing so is to be closer to Sailors Haven, that's how much we love it here. Please don't close the marina. We would love to see a hotel, a restaurant and hot water showers. There is so much debris, glass and contractor remains like nails and screws in the sand; it should be screened. The barbeques need to be moved out of the center so children and adults can play without risk of running into them. Also flying coals are a danger to the boats where they currently placed. The barbeques should be installed on the outer ridge of the bulk head where day trippers can utilize and enjoy them. The boaters usually bring their own barbeques so the stands that were installed are very helpful but are not currently at every slip. Pole holders should be installed for umbrellas. More care should be taken in the contractors chosen to do repair and updating work here. They need to be accountable after the job is done, guarantee their work and come back and fix the problems. The newly replaced bulk head needed to be completely redone because it completely fell apart. The trex decking is buckling in many places because it was not installed properly. It has become a tripping hazard and the nails are popping out. Ladders were never re-installed behind each boat for safely if someone fell into the marina water. Tractors destroyed the edge of the forest on the west side. This land was part of the preserve and was never supposed to be touched. They took shortcuts and used this land as backfill for the bulk head. Now tick filled grass is growing in the middle of the beach where it shouldn't be. The contractors obtain the bids and then cut corners to lower the cost and nobody is watching. The boaters see all of this but have no recourse. We care and want Sailors Haven to remain open, prosper and grow. Linda & Mike Eisner

---

**Correspondence** 195    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Panganiban, Anita

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Reader, Hello! I understand that you are now forming management plans for the Fire Island National Seashore. I sure would like to see the clothing optional areas considered in those plans. Regardless of what you decide for your overall plan, the tradition of clothing optional recreation is enjoyed by many in our nation, and contributes to the diversity of, and participation in our National Parks. Skinny Dipping and Nude Sunbathing are not only fun and healthy activities, but are valid and popular recreational choices. I have been a nudist for many years, and have seen the value and long term benefits in others. I have received enrichment personally from these activities, areas, and friends over the years. Thank you for your consideration, Anita

---

**Correspondence ID:** 196    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Walsh, Robert J  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern: I, Robert J. Walsh, reside at 215 Adams Street #14A, Brooklyn, NY. I am a registered voter, a tax paying citizen and a naturist. I have been a visitor to Fire Island for many years and as such have always enjoyed the ability to do naked sunbathing in appropriate areas. I am writing to urge you to include accessible and appropriate clothing-optional recreation in plans for the Seashore - no matter which management option is chosen. Over the past few decades, in this country and abroad, nude sunbathing has become a growing and valid recreational option for citizens. This is a right that has been gaining growing popular approval for those who choose to exercise it. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent (74%) of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

The national park system is a wonderful resource that is owned by ALL Americans and it should provide natural means of recreation for all Americans. Maintaining traditional clothing-optional areas, like Lighthouse Beach within Fire Island National Seashore, contributes to the diversity of our National Parks and provides an appropriate source of recreational fun for naturists who enjoy sunbathing in the nude.

People like me want nothing more and nothing less than to have our legitimate concerns and rights included in the General Management Plan. We urge you to accommodate us as you create a balanced and fair plan. Thank you for your work on behalf of all the people who use these wonderful resources. Sincerely, Robert J. Walsh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 197    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Conklin, Ted  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs:

Regarding the revision of the General Management Plan for the usage of Fire Island, I would respectfully request that an area be designated as authorized for clothing optional use. There are areas herein which have been traditionally accepted as clothing optional and I humbly ask that provision be made to continue that tradition.

Thank you.

Ted Conklin

---

**Correspondence** 198    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**ID:**

**Name:** Mahany, Al  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs; My name is Al Mahany, and I have the privilege of serving as an ambassador with the Lighthouse Beach Ambassador Program. As a lifelong naturist and a user of Lighthouse Beach for the past ten years, I was excited by this opportunity to serve the Lighthouse Beach community and help maintain its integration with the larger Fire Island community. Because of my interest in Lighthouse Beach, I have been equally interested in the Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan. I have been following the plan since its inception, attending meetings and presentations and speaking with both past Superintendent Mike Reynolds and present Superintendent Chris Soller about the plan and the four proposals. I did, however, notice that none of the four proposals made any mention of clothing optional recreation and was wondering if whatever plan is ultimately adopted could include clothing optional recreation in its final form. While I am not unmindful of the fact that some people do not consider clothing optional recreation to be a legitimate form of recreation, the majority of Americans disagree. In fact, a Roper poll conducted in 2006 indicated that 74% of Americans believe that clothing optional recreation should be permitted on land set aside for that purpose, and 54% believe that the government should set aside public land for that purpose. Additionally, clothing optional recreation contributes to the diversity of the Fire Island community,. Thank you for your effort on behalf of the Fire Island community in developing this plan and especially for your careful consideration of the input from the Fire Island community that I have observed at these meetings. Yours truly, Al Mahany

---

**Correspondence** 199    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**ID:**

**Name:** Frandsen, Dr. Marvin

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Dear Fire Island National Seashore,

I strongly urge you to include managing FOR clothing optional recreation as part of your updated General Management Plan.

The National Park Service should be proactively working to manage this important portion of national park visitors. To do less is to arbitrarily favor some citizens, families, and and taxpayers over others. Managing for clothing optional recreation is necessary to carry out the spirit and letter of Policy 91-3 to prevent user conflict and provide an enjoyable, natural experience for all visitors to the Seashore. And, of course, naturist/clothing optional recreation provides an important diversity to the national seashore.

As you know, a super majority of Americans support clothing optional recreation within defined areas.

I would very much like to visit Fire Island National Seashore the next time I am in New York. The presence of a clothing optional area is very important to me.

Thank you,

Dr. Marvin Frandsen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 200    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Auerbach, Richard M  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Aug,29,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Fire Island National Seashore GMP 15 State Street, Boston, MA 02109 attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager Re: General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore Gentlemen: I understand that the General Management Plan for the Fire Island National Seashore (FINS) is currently up for review. I grew up on Long Island and the FINS has always been an integral part of my life. Over the past few decades, use of the clothing-optional sections of the FINS (such as the Lighthouse Beach) has been of great benefit to my physical and mental well-being as I have confronted challenges from several life-threatening illnesses. Above and beyond the many benefits I have obtained personally from clothing-optional use of the FINS, I have observed absolutely no negative effects upon any of the users of the FINS from the clothing-optional status of certain well-demarcated portions. On the contrary, the public signage has allowed for appropriate use of the entire beach by those who wish, or do not wish, a clothing-optional experience. I urge that whatever management option is ultimately chosen for the FINS the current situation allowing for appropriate clothing-optional use be maintained.

Very truly yours, Richard M. Auerbach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 201    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Serino, D  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** After reviewing the 4 proposals suggested for Fire Island, I would like to voice my opinion as a member of the public. My family and I enjoy the many resources available at Sailor's Haven throughout the summer as we have our own small boat. I feel strongly that proposal #3 best suits the needs of both people and nature. I support the continued use of the marina, improving the effects on erosion. I appreciate that it still emphasizes preserving the natural surroundings, but allows for rebuilding and updating as needed for our creature comfort. I urge you to please take into serious account the voice of the public. We use these beautiful areas and want to see them stay this way. Thank you for your consideration!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 202    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Frey, Steve  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Aug,30,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, I am writing to express my concern about the possibility that the clothing-optional beach currently on the Fire Island accessed from Field 5 of the Robert Moses park may be removed. I have been going to that beach for about 12 years and always have a good time. Clothing-optional areas, like the Lighthouse Beach, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks. I think that clothing-optional recreation should be included in plans for the Seashore, REGARDLESS OF WHICH MANAGEMENT OPTION IS ULTIMATELY CHOSEN. Skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation. I think the numbers suggest that the existence of a clothing optional beach is still warranted and should be retained. Thank You.  
Steve Frey Rockville Centre, NY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 203    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Spencer, Bob  
**Outside Organization:** FIA/ Davis Park Association Unaffiliated Individual



**Received:** Aug,31,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** Letter

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** GMP-- Bob Spencer Personal Statement to National Park Service for New Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan (GMP)  
Aug. 31, 2010

Regarding "Preliminary Management Alternatives" published April, 2010 (With particular reference to FINS Seashore Comments on Climate Change & Sea Level Rise", along with Comments on "Community Resources")

As a resident-owner within the FINS Dune District and the New York State "Coastal Erosion Hazard Area" (CEHA), I make the following comments in support of others owning more than 500 homes ? within 17 communities on only 20% of Fire Island -- in a similar ocean-facing barrier-beach position. I dare say that the majority of these resident-owners were in the vanguard as stewards to preserve and protect Fire Island way back, starting in 1962 to forego continued heavy development ? including denying a paved four-lane highway, and which was then considered a sand-dike for hurricane protection on Fire Island and for north of the bays that are adjacent.. We worked to create a National Seashore, and are ready to really "partner up."

The US Congress authorized a "Hurricane Protection Plan" be created in 1960, but we see planning now as focusing on retreat and that of nature taking its course instead.

Basically, I ? along with most other resident-owners -- I would think-- would like to engage in new levels of "cooperative stewardship" between the National Park Service, their 17 Fire Island communities and their residents, and all other entities on page 7 in this publication of your April newsletter. This would be better than with the first GMP issued in 1977 where "? community developments were characterized to function as "semi-autonomous units within the national seashore", also "Park visitors are not encouraged to spend time in the communities." (Excerpt 1977 GMP, page 11.)

On the other hand, the original GMP had extensive language in it regarding the National Park Service cooperatively working with the Corps of Engineers to "determine the feasibility of sand nourishment" except in the Wilderness area east of Watch Hill. ('77 GMP page 33.) On this same page, it also discusses that "Ocean-facing dunes will be repaired or restored as needed ... throughout the seashore?In the development district, dune blowouts that endanger homes during extreme high tides or moderate intensity storms may be filled and replanted? by affected communities." ('77 GMP page 33).

Now, there no mention at all of the major sand nourishment planning, via a major, 50-year effort by the Corps of Engineers, in the new "Preliminary Management Alternatives" draft of this April newsletter. The Corps planning has been turned away once already in 2000 from that of hurricane protection. Instead, after another ten years of planning, we have a new position being taken on page 7 that "The Seashore would implement sustainable strategies for adapting human activities to dynamic coastal processes and climate change and sea-level rise." In another 2010 document from NPS, the seemingly new policy is expressed in this fashion ? "NPS policy directs that the natural processes of the barrier island (breaches, over-washes, northern migration toward the mainland, storms, erosions cycles as well as natural re-nourishment cycles) be allowed to occur without interference? (also) NPS is very concerned that alteration of offshore sand resources may exacerbate storm damage within the national seashore." In other words we are being directed to "let nature take its natural course to do what it wants.

No more hurricane protection plan will be supported."

It does clearly seem that the NPS position of pulling away from supporting the repair of "ocean-facing dunes" as stated in the 1977 GMP "throughout the seashore" has been replaced with a strong stand now of "let nature take its course." We also notice that New York State is now taking much the same position. I must agree with Mr. Stoddard's opinion (Aug. 19, page 3) that the NPS staff is stating a view that "how science should be settled" and thus setting up an "us against them" position where those nearer the ocean see themselves not possibly being part of any "cooperative stewardship" sought now by NPS. All who live along the ocean well know that sea level might rise ? even fall -- as it has before, and will again. But that sea-level-rise science is in initial developmental stages and has not given NPS good reason to change direction, and take such a hard position now. This is not a form of cooperativeness.

We have also seen this new NPS position -- as stated in the June 2010 document ? "Continuing to build, rebuild, or expand development in the CEHA is not sustainable. Beach nourishment in perpetuity -- given sea level rise and climate change issues would be required to protect the extensive development in the CEHA. A program to control development in the CHEA, with acquisition of CEHA properties, over time, focusing first on the most at risk should be part of any long-term program with the acquisition of CEHA properties over time ? focusing first on the most at risk ? should be a part of any long-term program that is undertaken to protect coastal development from storms and changing sea levels. The status quo of continuing to build, rebuild, or expand in high risk coastal areas is unsustainable and prohibitively expensive."

Therefore, oceanfront resident-owners, and probably those along the bay, soon thereafter, would feel the focus of attention first, and would not be able to join in being cooperative stewards. We see new things to try and divide us instead.

One comment on the "DRAFT PARK GOALS" on page 4

While it states on page 4 that one of the "RESOURCE MANAGEMENT" goals is to "1. Partner with the public, island communities, and others in the stewardship and preservation of Fire Island's natural and cultural resources and its distinct character" we don't specifically see this stating that the 17 communities, entitled to remain within the Seashore, should be preserved or protected on the 20% of Fire Island where they were declared "exempt" in 1964 when the Act was signed into law. Witness the statement related to "LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT" support goal related to the above. It merely says "Partner with others to ensure that land and development practices undertaken? promote ecological health, environmental quality in this dynamic environment. This should not refer to partnering "with others" but rather point out that the communities that are there now should "remain in character" and "protected as communities."

Comments regarding each "COMMUNITY RESOURCES" section of the GMP Newsletter 2, April 2010

Alternative 1 ? "Status Quo" --This calls for the Seashore to "continue to rely on NYS Coastal Erosion Hazard Area (CEHA) law as implemented by state and local authorities. Within the communities, properties damaged or destroyed by over-wash and storm surges would continue to be allowed to be repaired or rebuilt, consistent with existing zoning standards." (I believe that rules now state that if a home is storm damaged in excess of 50% of fair market value that it may be acquired after a storm. We would have great concerns that this regulation would be strengthened against a homeowner.)

The problem here is that NPS sees that there has been little enforcement of existing land use regulations and per NPS's position in June 2010 ? "will be mandatory as part of any beach nourishment/storm protection project that is undertaken in the future whether it be FIMP or

through a community project?" I can see long discussions with local regulators, and property owners. I can see that things can be worked out for new land use regulations in return for some stability in being allowed some sand-nourishment rights, especially within a realistic FIMP program.

However, no attempts have ever been made in the more than 40 years of the Seashore's existence to work out those problems. Pure "status quo" would not be desirable.

Alternative 2 ? "Enhance Natural Resources" -- In this alternative it calls for "emphasis of protection of natural resources over human use and development. NPS would work with others to undertake a comprehensive land management program that may include acquisition of high priority lands (e.g. dune line) that would foster land protection. The Seashore would work with state and local authorities to enforce CEHA. No reconstruction would be allowed after a major storm event within communities or in the Seashore district? NPS would work with others to arrange at a meaningful strategy for compensating affected property owners."

This seems anti-community in various respects. In recent time, NPS has allowed 11 communities (of the 17 within the Seashore boundaries) to complete emergency sand nourishment projects, at modest sand levels, via specially written Environmental Assessment (EA) reviews. The new NPS position is that all future community projects would require a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Also required would be a "preamble" Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that might cover 20-30 year span that would also need project-specific EAs. Communities would be required to expend a large sum of funds to do this "preamble work" which would have to be completed prior to any GMP being approved, just to be able to consider future nourishment projects.

All communities thus should seek a better understanding than with alternative 2.

Alternative 3 ? "Recognizing the Relationship between Human Use and Nature"

This alternative seems written to appeal most to the communities. We can accept the idea that "NPS would work to strengthen partnerships on the island towards creating a more integrated park/community experience." It does positively state that "A moderate level of intervention in the natural system would be permitted including limited beach nourishment." While this would be limited to the communities covering 20% of Fire Island, should the communities undertake a major PEIS development, it does not take into account the possibility of a more protective FIMP nourishment plan, which importantly also calls for the much better protection of the mainland north of Great South Bay which would be provided. The NPS position stated here would include development of "Land management strategies would provide a transition to a more natural (landward) dune alignment. This active effort to migrate the dune-line towards the mainland seems something that communities should argue against. I support Gerard Stoddard's statement in his Aug. 19th review that "to many, these are fighting words."

I do agree that we should negotiate better ? and enforceable -- Dune District, CEHA regulations so that totally new & expanded development, unrelated to reasonable replacement of damage or loss by fire or wind does not occur.

Alternative 4 ? "Exploring New Opportunities Public Use"

This section on "community resources" is much like Alternative 3, but seemingly more restrictive in content in terms of the following ? "The

Seashore would work closely with island communities using a variety of means (e.g. community design initiatives, town regulations, community infrastructure, selective land acquisition or transfers) to help communities attain protection of natural resources and community character." It does add a new recommendation ? "NPS would work with others to arrive at a meaningful strategy for compensating affected property owners" for such acquisitions and loss of property rights. I support Gerard Stoddard's personal opinion document of August 19th that "Compensating affected property owners is not a substitute for a rational program of coastal management."

Some conclusions

The new lack of any meaningful recognition of going forward on a "hurricane protection plan" as approved by Congress in 1960, and still being developed by the Army Corps of Engineers over a 50 year span for more than \$25 million planning dollars is not recognized by US Interior as an option for the National Park System. It seems to tie in with the same "retreat position" being developed by New York State at the Department of State and their affiliated Department of Environmental Conservation. It seems that cooperative negotiations do not seem possible as every alternative seems to feature that NPS favors retreat over conservation of the 17 communities ? located on less than 20% of Fire Island, and a "lodging resource" for Island visitors and resident-owners -- that once strongly supported the formation of the Seashore in lieu of mega-development with a four-lane highway down Fire Island.

NPS has brought up the notion that we must be limited on beach nourishment, and NPS won't allow any sand placed on their directly owned properties. It seems possible now to negotiate a community plan at developing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), but we can see that it would take major financial support of all communities to do this, with no real promise of the communities being successful.

We have also been told by NPS, regarding small future nourishment projects by the communities that "a project that is not comprehensive (all communities on Fire Island) will make it less likely for approval from DOI (Department of US Interior) and New York State. A realistic comprehensive approach is needed. The project should also address bayside issues because erosion and property losses are real on the bayside?"

If NPS believes in developing a "Cooperative Stewardship" with the 17 communities and other entities, it seems that the discussion potential for negotiation has been severely limited so far.

I join in the "applause" by the Fire Island Pines Property Owner's Association in their statement of this same April NPS document ? regarding "the Park Service's recognition of the unique character of Fire Island National Seashore with the 17 communities ? a fundamental element to be valued and protected? and overlying management objectives to foster a balanced relationship between people, including community residents and visitors, and the natural environment." The Pines has more than 80 homes to be affected by any revisions in regulations for properties in the Dune District and CEHA. Davis Park has nearly 40. They will be very interested in what transpires in the period ahead, and will the nearly 400 other owners with homes located there. I don't feel they are being listened to at this time. The bayside resident-owners, I can see, will have their related issues.

Also, NPS in ignoring the value of major action to build up the Fire Island Barrier beach via sand nourishment on all federal lands seems to go against the wishes of US Congress back in 1960 to work to protect the large developments north of Fire Island across the Great South

Bay. The 17 communities were left here for a reason.

Personal comments by Spencer on preliminary management alternatives for the revised FINS GMP 2010-2011

Bob Spencer Member Fire Island Association and Davis Park Association

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	204	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	NA, NA		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,30,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	WHICHEVER OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES IS CHOSEN, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MAINTAINS THE TRADITIONAL CLOTHING OPTIONAL USE OF LIGHTHOUSE BEACH AND OTHER CURRENTLY CLOTHING OPTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	205	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Feinberg, David A		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,30,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of including a clothing-optional beach area, specifically Lighthouse Beach, as part of any new usage plan for Fire Island Seashore. The availability of places for nude recreation is very important to me. It's an important factor when I make my travel decisions, and I know it is a factor for more and more people who may be visiting Long Island or the general NYC area. As the president of 200-member naturist social club in the area, I can also testify that naturism fosters a sense of community as well as better self-image for the individual. Finally, I suspect your own rangers will testify that nudists appreciates the beaches they have and take better care of them. Thank you for considering my opinion. David A. Feinberg New York, NY		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	206	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Lawrence, Buck		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		

**Received:** Aug,31,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Thank you for soliciting the public's comments. I am writing to express my support for the continued historic use of some areas of the park for clothing optional use. It is important for me and many of my friends, and especially Lighthouse Beach as a favored destination. We request your assurance that this traditional use will continue for ourselves, our friends, and our families. Others may choose not to join us there, but diversity requires that a place be made for this type of use. Thank you again for listening to our concerns. Buck Lawrence

---

**Correspondence ID:** 207    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Silverstein, Mark

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,31,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a retired Federal Employee and have been enjoying our nation's clothing optional beaches over the last dozen years. I am writing today because I am aware you are considering a number of general management plans for Fire Island National Seashore. I am also aware that the Seashore includes an area that has been traditionally, clothing optional for many years. I don't particularly care which plan is chosen, but I do urge you to include clothing optional recreation in whatever plan is chosen.

As a Federal retiree, I understand that our government agencies serve the needs of ALL Americans. I would hope that the needs of those of us who enjoy clothing optional use of the beach will be included in the plan, serving our needs, as well as the needs of those who choose to enjoy the beach in bathing suits.

You may have seen the Roper poll that was taken in 2006 that showed 74% of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sun bathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. Moreover, the Roper poll also showed that the majority of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing optional recreation. I hope that the new General Management Plan will support the beliefs as reflected in the poll.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Mark Silverstein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 208    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Lewis, Dave and Brenda

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,31,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Please reserve some space for clothing optional use. You will find that naturists are extremely good users of public lands. We clean up after ourselves and even after others before us so that our natural resources stay pleasing to everyone. Thank you. David and Brenda Lewis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 209    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Sachs, Marjorie

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,31,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my appreciation for all the mindfulness and hard work that has gone into the wilderness on Fire Island. My name is Marjorie Sachs and I have been visiting Fire Island for over 25 years.

I want to let you know I am very much in favor of Alternative 1 and that the historic lateral trail be adequately maintained in it's entire length.

I have questions about Alternative 3.

I think that Alternative 4 would be detrimental to the Wilderness.

Please continue in your positive venture of protecting the wilderness for all now and all the future generations.

Sincerely, Marjorie Sachs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 210    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Verrastro, Robert and Barbara

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,01,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** My wife and I are Connecticut residents who drive approximately 90 miles each way in order to enjoy the clothing optional use of beautiful Lighthouse Beach. We do this several times a year and have been doing this for the past 3 seasons. Nowhere in CT are there clothing optional beaches where we can practice naturism.

We urge the National Park Service to continue the clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach, as well as other portions of the Fire Island National Seashore.

Sincerely,

Robert & Barbara Verrastro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 211    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Bill Pennington, Camilla Van Sickle and  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Aug,31,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Dear Fire Island National Seashore,

We are writing to request that, no matter which management plan you ultimately choose, that the traditional clothing optional beaches of Fire Island National Seashore remain intact.

The need is obviously there: people have been using those beaches for clothing optional recreation for at least fifty years, and probably longer. Further, skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. The same survey showed that a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

Traditional clothing-optional areas, like Lighthouse Beach within Fire Island National Seashore, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks. As we understand it, part of the mission of the National Park Service is to serve as many interests of the general public as possible, so again we ask that whatever management plan is chosen, that the traditional clothing optional sections be preserved or expanded. It might also make sense to add one or more additional clothing optional areas to better serve the public.



One of our biggest reasons for going to New York is to visit the traditional clothing optional beaches. We would not consider visiting a beach if clothing were required; we do not own bathing costumes. We believe that New York needs more clothing optional venues, because they bring untold amounts of tourist dollars into the state.

For our part, we rent a car when we fly in, stay in a hotel, dine at fine restaurants, and spend our money in a variety of other ways, such as on concert tickets, game tickets, clothing and objects of art. We can tell you with certainty, that if there are fewer clothing optional opportunities in New York that we'll visit far less often, politely taking the several thousand dollars we spend on each trip to New York elsewhere.

For anyone who is offended by the sight of a human body, we have this to say: We're all just human bodies who came from a human body, God's most beautiful creation. We were created by God unto His own image, and He was pleased with what He saw. Therefore, the human body cannot possibly be offensive or indecent. Anyone who has a problem with the human body must not think much of the work of our Divine Creator or of their own body, for that matter.

Please keep the clothing optional beaches in Fire Island National Seashore; seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose.

We thank you in advance for a timely response.

Sincerely We Remain, Camilla Van Sickle & Bill Pennington

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	212	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	Chorba, Thomas				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

**Received:** Sep,01,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** To: Chris Soller, FINS Superintendent

In re: Preliminary Management Alternatives

Supt. Soller,

Under choices for "Community Resources" you have presented four choices all of which include land acquisition and/or condemnation. I agree with none of these choices as they are all the same with slight degrees of difference.

Removing private property will not affect the structure of the beach one iota. The opposite will occur. If NPS uses funds to purchase these private properties, you have already stated that no dune restoration will be done on federal lands which will gut the ability of the 17 communities to do beach re-nourishment.

Removing private property will decrease tax revenue for the Federal, State and Local governments and will underminethe financial health of the Ferry system which keeps Fire Island uniquely 'traffic free".

I have just finished watching Channel 12, New Jersey news where the Army Corps has completed a 25 million dollar dune and beach project on the New Jersey shoreline. This is the same organization that has been thwarted from performing its duties by the NPS, the NYS DEC and so called environmental groups i.e. The Nature Conservatory, TNC.

Why is FINS and the NPS not actively pursuing the New Jersey option of renourishment?

Why is this alternative correct 90 miles to west of FINS and anathema in the FINS area.

Perhaps FINS de facto judgement on the science of climate change is wrong and New Jersey's judgement and The Army Corps of Engineers judgement on the same data is correct.

Sand is infinite and proximate.

Not using this natural resources to nourish the FINS area is the same as refusing to plant trees in the National forests

+++ A view of TNC.

TNC is a land acquisition organization that uses its position as an NGO to amass holdings of property which in some instances have been re-sold to board members at below rate prices for their own private use and allowed questionable land uses in these acquired lands. Be aware

the TNC agenda.

? Too close to business. Some environmentalists consider the industrial development to be antagonistic to environmentalism, and disapprove of The Nature Conservancy's policy of permitting oil drilling, timbering, mining, and natural gas drilling on land donated to the Conservancy[27]. The Conservancy argues that since corporations have such a significant impact on the environment, they must be engaged in finding ways to do business that do not harm the environment. Moreover, they provide significant resources. In the most egregious incident, Nature Conservancy protected-land became the site of a severe oil spill caused by an on-site drilling company. The Conservancy, however, apologized for the incident and instituted a broad policy review in the wake of the incident ? Questionable resale. There have been allegations of The Nature Conservancy obtaining land and reselling it at a profit, sometimes to supporters,[28] who have then made use of it in ways not perceived by many as being sufficiently environmentally-friendly. +++++

The Preliminary Management Document presents much language about letting natural forces "have their way" with Fire Island.

If you believe this doctrine, you must put all of the FINS resources economic and political behind a simple solution to nourishment of the park; the immediate removal of all the groins to the west of the FINS which are responsible for stopping the natural forces which would replenish and nourish the park with sand as it has for untold centuries.

Removing the Westhampton groins by NPS purchase will permit the trapped sand to flow "naturally" to the west and onto the the Fire Island National Seashore. These groins are the enemy of NPS not the land owners in the seventeen communities who banded together to bring the NPS to Fire Island in the first place.

This document ignores the elephant in the room, the destructive Westhampton groin fields.

Remove the groins, renew Fire Island and FINS the 'natural way'.

Thomas Chorba, Atlantique

---

**Correspondence ID:** 213    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** DeLuca, Robert S  
**Outside Organization:** Group for the East End Conservation/Preservation

**Received:** Sep,01,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** Letter  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** September 1, 2010

VIA E-mail: fire\_island\_gmp@nps.gov

Re: Fire Island Wilderness Management

I am writing on behalf of Group for the East End to submit our comments on the "Preliminary Management Alternatives" for the Fire Island National Seashore. Our comments are directed primarily at the proposals for the Otis Pike Wilderness.

For the record, Group for the East End protects and restores eastern Long Island's environment through education, citizen action and professional advocacy. The organization was formed in 1972. More information can be found at [www.eastendenvironment.org](http://www.eastendenvironment.org).

While there are a few positive proposals within the four alternatives presented, we would most strongly support alternative # 1, retention of the Status Quo. None of the other options presented are viable as a whole, as they will change the character of the wilderness area to a greater or lesser degree.

As you proceed to develop a "preferred alternative" to be presented in the formal draft plan, we ask you to consider the following: ?  
Wilderness Character: The best way to preserve the "wilderness character" of the area, which is a key requirement of the Wilderness Act, is to continue the management practices that have been in effect since the designation of the area in 1980.

? Camping: We would oppose increasing the number of camping permits (as proposed in alternative #4) because this will reduce the possibility of campers experiencing solitude in the area, and negatively affect their wilderness experience. Additionally, we ask that you avoid creating "fixed" campsites that would reduce the possibility for primitive recreation in the area. These comments also relate to the proposed "amenities," which we feel would lessen the wilderness experience as well.

Trail Maintenance: Regular maintenance operations are essential to maintaining the safety of trails for hikers. The main lateral trail, as well as some of the spur trails leading to areas of special interest, should be kept clear to help those using the recreational area avoid the risk of contracting Lyme disease. The Wilderness Act indicates that, "such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fife, insects, and diseases."

? Visitor Center: We support the recommendation of alternative #3 to remodel the Visitor Center to comply with LEED standards, but would suggest the size of the facility not be increased.

As the only Federal wilderness area in New York State, Fire Island is a unique and important resource for both residents and visitors. The Wilderness Act of 1964 defines wilderness as, "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." While the many additions proposed in the alternatives presented would be appropriate for a park,

please realize that the Otis Pike Wilderness should be treated differently according to the Act.

Thank you for your attention to our comments.

Robert S. DeLuca President

---

**Correspondence ID:** 214    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Brown, Jim  
**Outside Organization:** South Shore Audubon Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** September 2, 2010 P.O. Box 31 Freeport, NY 11520-0031 National Park Service: Regarding the creation of a new "Wilderness Management Plan" (WMP) for the Wilderness Area of Fire Island, we urge your agency to thoughtfully consider the comments below of the South Shore Audubon Society. Our organization is a local chapter of the National Audubon Society that represents approximately 1,500 families from the south shore of Long Island. The Wilderness Area of Fire Island is extremely important to the South Shore Audubon Society and its members. The seven mile stretch of Fire Island from Smith Point to Watch Hill was designated a federal wilderness area by Congress in 1980 and is the first and only federal wilderness in New York State. This wild section of Fire Island has been enjoyed by our members and many others over the years. The land provides important habitat for birds and other wildlife as well as offering the possibility of a true "wilderness experience" to those who love nature. Several different alternatives are being considered for the future management of the Fire Island Wilderness Area. Actions contemplated now will determine how the Wilderness will be managed during the next 20-30 years. The final "Wilderness Management Plan" that is adopted should be in conformity with the provisions of the 1964 Wilderness Act, an act designed to preserve the "wilderness character" of our nation's wild places, while providing "outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation." The South Shore Audubon Society hopes the new WMP to be adopted will choose an alternative among those being suggested that will accomplish the cherished goals of the 1964 landmark legislation. We feel that over the past thirty years the Wilderness Area has been basically well managed. Among the alternatives being suggested for the area at the present time our Society supports Alternative #1: "Status Quo/Current Management." We do feel, however, that the Old Burma Road, which provides basic access to the interior of the wilderness, should be better maintained along its entire length. This historic pathway through the swale is currently overgrown and is exceedingly difficult to even locate in places. Maintaining in a minimally intrusive way this simple footpath is necessary to help visitors better enjoy their experience in the wild. We strongly object to ideas contained in Alternative 4: "Exploring New Opportunities for Public Use." We oppose the use of increased signage and trail markers, the increase in the number of camping permits, establishing a system of designated campsites and restoring the bay side boardwalk. All of these changes would diminish, severely, the wilderness experience. We oppose this 4th alternative as being inimical to the letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act. Thank you for considering and weighing our input into this important process of developing a new Wilderness Management Plan for Fire Island. We fervently hope that the Wilderness will be maintained for perpetuity, for all future generations to enjoy as a truly wild place on Long Island. Please keep us informed as this process of formulating the new WMP continues. Sincerely, Jim Brown Conservation Chair South Shore Audubon Society P.S. The above comments of the South Shore Audubon Society are also attached as a Word File to this email message.

---

**Correspondence** 215    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Williams, Dan  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** PO Box 7897 Newark, DE 19715-7897 Dear People, I am a programmer from just outside of Newark, Delaware, and I visit the greater New York City area several times a year, sometimes enjoying clothing-optional beaches. I am writing to request that you please include CLOTHING-OPTIONAL RECREATION in whichever of the four management options is chosen for Fire Island National Seashore's GMP. You should know that a 2006 Roper Poll shows that 54% of Americans agree that the government should set aside public land for clothing-optional recreation. I'm not claiming that 54% of beaches should be clothing-optional, but I'm pointing out that such designation of a few such places is mandated by the public. Think of it as an opportunity to provide a diversity of recreation possibilities for a diversity of Americans. This is especially appropriate for places with a history of clothing-optional use, such as Lighthouse Beach. (And note that, regarding the clothing-optional places that have been established to date, 74% of Americans agree that interested people should be able to use them, according to the same Roper poll.) Thank for taking comments from the public! Sincerely, Dan Williams

---

**Correspondence** 216    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Merryman, Lawrence A  
**Outside** Great South Bay Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern: The Great South Bay Audubon Society, with a Suffolk County membership of approximately 1,000 persons, has a long history of advocacy concerning the Otis Pike Fire Island High Dune Wilderness stretching all the way back to 1980. Our organization was partially instrumental in gaining Congressional approval for the Wilderness area. This beautiful area, in close proximity to large urban populations, allows for a true wilderness experience and should be allowed to remain in its natural state by promoting the values of solitude and isolation. Therefore, as a primary stakeholder in the Fire Island National Seashore, the Great South Bay Audubon Society casts its vote for Alternative 1 - "Status Quo / Current Management." However, we would appeal to the Fire Island National Seashore to review its policies re the Burma Road trail in the Wilderness area, and reopen it as a footpath. At present this path it is not navigable by foot for more than 1/4 mile or so on either end because of extreme overgrowth of vegetation. If hikers and walkers cannot get into the Wilderness area it negates the wild experience. The Great South Bay Audubon Society also questions the appropriateness of allowing camping in, or contiguous to the Wilderness area without some sort of environmental review because of sanitation issues. Since there are no toilet facilities available nearby, campers will undoubtedly use the dune areas to relieve themselves and the impact of these acts has not been fully examined. In addition, our organization requests that the new General Management Plan will fully address all of the critical elements of the Wilderness area. We encourage you to develop a new Wilderness Management Plan as a separate chapter or other distinct component of General Management Plan. The current Wilderness Management Plan encompasses about 20 fully detailed pages of actions to be taken, and we would like to see the new plan presented in a similar format. Thank you for considering our views in the above matters. Lawrence A. Merryman Conservation Chair Great South Bay Audubon Society Email address: hawkauk7@optonline.net or greatsouthbayaudubon@verizon.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 217    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Gass, Jennifer  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** About 5 times over the course of a winter an email goes out to at least 40 people. It's an invitation to meet for dinner at a restaurant. The email is circulated amongst friends we have met at Sailors Haven. I have been staying in the Sailors Haven marina every weekend for the past 5 years with my family. On any given weekend I know at least a quarter of the people there. Sailors Haven marina allows for a close knit neighborhood where families grow up together. One of the major benefits of Sailors Haven marina is the intimate size. Given that, I bet you would be hard pressed to find a boater there that is not concerned with protecting it. I am concerned with the thought of limiting access to maintain the natural beauty, who are you protecting it for if no one can enjoy it? I also think you are misdirected to spend so much time and money on providing educational programs for Fire Island; it's a BEACH, it's the one place that New Yorker's go to relax, I doubt the majority of people are looking for educational programs when they have the opportunity to walk on the beach and enjoy the search for the most beautiful seashell? It's disheartening that no one thought to ask the people who use the marina every weekend what could be done to solve the problems there. It's also disheartening to see the poor engineering and work done on recent projects there costing a pretty penny, for example the bulkhead and deck repairs. I've suffered through your reports; me, and everyone else on the winter dinner invite email would be interested to know what the specific problems you have at Sailors Haven marina are and be offered the opportunity to provide solutions from an insider point of view.

As an architect, I am familiar with LEED; I hope someone has crunched the numbers to verify that striving for accreditation is worth the tax write off because I know the lawyers and specialists needed to achieve it are not cheap and a protected environment could be achieved in other ways. Sincerely yours, Jennifer Gass

---

**Correspondence ID:** 218    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Springer, Meredith and Eleanor  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** General Management Plan Fire Island National Seashore fire\_island\_gmp@nps.gov Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager

Dear Ms. Carlson:

We (husband and wife) have been longtime visitors to Fire Island National Seashore, having camped often at the Watch Hill Campground from the late 1970's onward. We have also enjoyed many day visits to the various clothing-optional beaches that have been part of the National Seashore for most of its existence. Beaches we have enjoyed are Lighthouse Beach, the beach immediately west of Davis Park, the generally little used area east of the Watch Hill campground, and the section of the National Seashore immediately west of Smith Point County Park.

We strongly urge that in developing the General Management plan you make explicit provision for clothing-optional use of areas where it has traditionally been allowed, such as those listed above. If explicit provision for clothing-optional use is not feasible, we request that the General Management Plan not include any words that would compromise clothing-optional use of areas where it has traditionally been tolerated.

A number of national polls have revealed that a comfortable majority of Americans support setting aside parts of public land for clothing-optional recreation. Fire Island National Seashore is a beautiful and irreplaceable resource for a wide variety of users. We strongly believe that we and our fellow skinny-dippers should be shown the consideration that is given to other groups. Sincerely yours, Meredith N. Springer  
Elinor M. Springer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 219    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Dolecal, Russell  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I've been a visitor of the Fire Island Lighthouse beach area for 10 years. As a relative newcomer to this area, I thoroughly enjoy the freedom afforded to me and truly wish to continue enjoying this. For those few whose behavior detracts from my enjoyment and freedom, I suggest that the NPS remove their freedom by policing the area, ticketing the offenders, removing them from the beach and ensuring good people that they will not be penalized because of the bad behavior of others. The "Save the Lighthouse Beach" organization's Ambassador Program is our way of telling NPS that we will not tolerate misbehavior.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 220    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Corn, Elizabeth



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** I've been a visitor of the Fire Island Lighthouse beach area for more than 20 years. I feel it is vital that traditional clothing optional use be a priority in the plans of one of the NPS's most beautiful beach areas. Clothing optional federal beaches should be a right for everyone. Please don't let the misbehavior of a few ruin the freedoms of so many people like me who are there to enjoy the sun and surf. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 221    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Stein, Joshua  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,02,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** To the National Park Service: I write to encourage you to include in the general management plan for Fire Island National Seashore a variety of beach use options? including "clothing optional" for some reasonable portion of the beach. The size of the National Seashore makes it possible to accommodate a whole variety of tastes, simply by designating suitable areas for different tastes. So it is easy enough, and really quite important and desirable, to include a reasonable "clothing optional" area or areas in the Seashore. I am a regular visitor to many of the beaches in the NY area, both clothed and clothing optional, and enjoy both types of beach at different times. This country is all about tolerance and accommodation of diversity. The accommodation of "clothing optional" bathers is very easy to do and in fact accommodates far more than just a small minority of the population. In my experience in the NYC area, the clothing optional beaches are consistently very crowded, so obviously there are a lot of people who enjoy them. It's easy enough to accommodate those people, so let's do it. In my experience at clothing optional beaches, I have never seen any misbehavior or even rudeness. People enjoy clothing optional bathing; behave when they're doing it; and have a great recreational experience. Our national parks should continue to accommodate that option. I think larger America favors this type of accommodation, whether or not particular individuals themselves want to enjoy "clothing optional" beaches. So I encourage you, regardless of which alternative(s) and option(s) you adopt in the GMP for the Fire Island National Seashore, you should please make sure that clothing optional bathing remains an option. Thanks very much for reading my note.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 222    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Austin, Howard  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am a boater on the south shore of Long Island and enjoy visiting Watch Hill and Sailors Haven as many weekends as possible. I realize there are many possibilities for future planning and would like to include my input for consideration.

Moving forward I believe a "status quo" (same name as my boat) approach makes the most sense. The marina at Watch Hill accommodates a fair number of boats while the ferry service allows non-boaters to visit with ease. Facilities at the park accommodate all visitors with no overcrowding that I have observed.

Most importantly, the natural beauty has been maintained and arguably enhanced. Friends of Watch Hill, a non-profit organization which I contribute to annually, has provided supplemental funding to improve the marina as well as help to control the mosquito population by purchasing mosquito magnets.

The possibility of a reduction in size of the marina will have a net negative effect on the area. It will reduce income thru the marina, reduce contributions to Friends of Watch Hill and create more anchoring offshore which could effect shellfish beds and other marine life.

In closing, it has been my observation that all visitors have the utmost respect for this treasured site and do not abuse the privilege to visit. Please do not reduce the size of these marinas. Under the current management program the marina and park have only gotten better, wildlife (Piping Plover) are flourishing and visitors have the ability to enjoy a rare jewel of natural beauty.

Sincerely, Howard Austin

---

**Correspondence** 223    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**ID:**  
**Name:** Meyer, Ph.D., Peter B  
**Outside** Trust C UWO Fred A. Meyer Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Sep,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** THE E. P. SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. P. O. Box 15124 Covington, KY 41015-1024

Comment on Preliminary Management Alternatives Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan 3 September, 2010

1. My interest and credentials 2. Comment on Goals, Status and Common Elements 3. Observations on the Alternatives 4. A missing element ? and an offer

Interest and Qualifications to Comment

Interest

Notwithstanding the address above, I have a property owner's interest, being the trustee of a trust owning the Ocean Beach home in which my 97-year-old mother is at present planning to ride out Hurricane Earl.

I also have a personal interest, having spent at least some time in Ocean Beach every summer since 1952. That means I witnessed the loss of a substantial number of homes to storm surges and extensive past beach erosion. The extension of access to the island and increased volume of day visitors, both within areas controlled by the NPS and the separate communities, has transformed the beach experience for homeowners over that time.

My comments are focused on what I know ? the barrier island itself, not the rest of the Seashore.

Qualifications

I am an economic and environmental planner with over 40 years' professional experience. My firm is currently engaged with the US Department of Energy in work to apply ARRA funds to energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. We previously were engaged with the British Government in work on the economics of climate change, which involved us in questions of the economic impacts of sea level rise, storm losses, and mitigation efforts.

Comment on Goals, Status and Common Elements

Goals

Under Land Use and Development, the Plan's goal ignores social and economic issues. These need to be explicitly included in the goal if the partnering process is to include any effort at influencing the four different jurisdictions that have zoning and land use control policies that affect their island communities and thus the island as a whole.

I would prefer language expressing an intent to influence the partners in order to attain the objectives of the plan.

#### Status

I was not previously aware of the various workshops and workshop reports referenced. As far as I can recall, there was no notice of these events and process products given in a form readily accessible by those property owners who were not already actively involved on the beach. We maintain membership in both the Fire Island and Ocean Beach Associations and there may have been notice there, but the NPS could have used county or town tax rolls to inform all property owners. That would have been fuller public involvement.

#### Common Elements

Praise here ? These are all elements I wanted to find, and they are all there. Two comments, however: ? I was afraid before reading the document that the threats from climate change and sea level rise would not be addressed, and was pleased to find them front and center (literally, on p.2). You do, however, have a bully pulpit available that this statement on anticipated programs ignores. I shall return to this point after addressing the alternatives. ? There is an ambiguity that hit me here ? and it pervades the document ? about who or what constitutes a "visitor" to the park. Are the residents (renters, owners) and businesses in the island communities included in the concept of visitor or not? I would argue that they should be, since any walk laterally out of a community may end up being "park visit" even if not recorded as such at the formal entry points. ? In the ideal, allowing for an estimate of the count of such visitors from the communities would increase the total park visitor count ? and perhaps help the park's budget allocation. ? Note also that educational programs for visitors, if extended to communities and their residents, can permit some effort to influence zoning, land use and business regulations to the benefit of the park as a whole, even in the incorporated villages.

#### Observations on the Alternatives

##### 1. Status Quo

This alternative needs to be presented, I understand. It is, however, untenable, given the growth in populations of residents and visitors. The NHS and the Seashore administration know this ? why else would you update a management plan that dates to the park's (rushed, unplanned) creation?

##### 2. Enhancing Natural Resource Values

Natural resource protection is central to the maintenance of the Seashore. Without it, the island itself may cease to exist. That said, the Seashore is a major NPS resource in an otherwise very densely developed part of the country. Limiting access and use may not be appropriate if the goal of serving populations regardless of income is to be met.

The "no replacement" for storm damaged non-Seashore premises has significant appeal. The devil is in the details, of course ? would beach and dune replenishment be precluded by this approach? If so, then the island itself would be sacrificed over time to natural processes such as erosion and rising seas.

A purer "wilderness" experience such as is envisioned here would really add to the mix of environments for outdoor experiences available in this part of the country and may be an element that should be pursued. Eliminating structures at Old Inlet makes sense, but the complete eradication of the Burma Road may be a serious problem for the year-round residents of the island since vehicular access could become impossible for school busses as well as residents when beaches experience winter storm surges. The Seashore itself may have to assure water access to the communities with year-round residents if all possibilities for mid-island lateral vehicular traffic were to be eliminated.

### 3. ? Human Use and Nature

The restrictions on new development here are very appealing, although potentially costly in terms of needed compensation. I am still convinced the purest wilderness area is the best prospect, but assuring ADA compliance and LEED certification for all Seashore structures makes sense if the Center is retained.

The development prospects for Sailor's haven or Talisman and the hike-bike trail are excellent ideas, expanding access ? and utilization ? while not intruding excessively on the natural environment. (Some provision for bike rental at the west entrance ? a concession? ? might also be an appropriate addition here.)

### 4. ? New Opportunities for Public Use

A greater emphasis on new public uses does not seem desirable from my perspective. On-island activity and day visitor volume has risen massively since the Seashore was authorized, the volume seems to lead to overload on limited beach space near swimming areas now, so adding to it may place a burden on island communities' capacity to provide public facilities and life guard services.

While much of the "community resources" section here replicates the intent and language of Alternative 3, there is more emphasis on collaborative planning with island communities in this narrative, and I think that is extremely valuable. ? but that collaboration has to extend well beyond work with elected and appointed officials of the communities. In Ocean Beach, in particular, the government is dominated by business interests and there exist real conflicts between their profit motives and the vacation and recreation objectives of the owner-occupants and long-stay summer renters of the community.

(Those renters, in all the island communities, may be the most underrepresented interested parties in this entire planning process ? was any effort at all made to reach renters taking a lease of a month or more to establish their interests?)

### Summarizing

The status quo is untenable, sacrificing the human interests to nature preservation no longer possible, and major new development is not desirable. Given that, there are interesting and useful elements throughout Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 that do not necessarily preclude each other.

A missing element ? and an offer

The missing element is the lead role the NPS could play in transforming the whole island, not merely the Seashore territories, into a more

sustainable built environment. The sustainable and green features of the Patchogue facilities are invisible to the many island visitors who go directly to the communities as well as the community residents. The "demonstration role" that could be played by Seashore facilities and initiatives requires that there be visible evidence of the sustainability measures in the communities and on the island itself.

With the vast majority of the annual energy demand on the island occurring at precisely the season that is most likely to generate significant solar power for photovoltaics, why is there no consideration of an effort to take the whole island off the grid? ? Developed Seashore facilities could mount PV cells on roofs, on some vacant scrub land and the like. Wind installations may also be possible ? Permits for rebuilding where they are controlled by the Seashore could provide incentives for rooftop solar, perhaps as a requirement for certain forms of rebuilding; meeting energy efficiency standards could also be required ? The Seashore could work with the relevant zoning/land use authorities to add requirements for LEED certification and/or on-site power generation as conditions for new construction. (Note that Babylon has in place LEED requirements for effectively all new commercial buildings, so there is local precedent.) ? One key role the Seashore can play, consistent with its educational and preservation objectives, is explaining both the economic and environmental benefits of distributed electricity generation for a largely seasonal population, while demonstrating the possibilities at its own facilities and documenting its cost savings. ? The high costs of electrical power on Long Island make this strategy more viable ? with more readily available economic returns ? than would be the case in many other settings across the country. Thus the Seashore effort, which is likely to have an economic payoff quickly, may be a demonstration to the rest of the NPS of the unit power consumption reductions and generation potentials in settings in which such conversions are not yet economically efficient given low electricity costs.

My offer is to work with you on this missing element. I am currently providing financial management technical assistance to the DOE Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) recipients, especially in the areas of leveraging the DOE funds with private dollars and with respect to use of the new Qualified Environmental Conservation Bonds (QECBs).

I know there are DOE initiatives with respect to federal facilities as well. Perhaps we can work together on this element of the plan for the Seashore. Consider this an offer to serve as a volunteer for the moment and call on me as appropriate.

/ss/

Peter B. Meyer, PhD President and Chief Economist

Trustee of Trust C UWO Fred A Meyer, [REDACTED]

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	224	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Munkittrick, Mark		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,03,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	National Park Service To whom it may concern,		

In reviewing your proposed future plans for the Wilderness Area, at Fire Island: "Preliminary Management Alternatives" for your "General Management Plan" (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore, I was concerned that the very nature of the area seems to be changing in a very subtle but nonetheless detrimental way.

I and my family have been visiting Fire Island for over forty years now. What impressed me the most, back then as now, is and was the very pristine character of the area and the ability for one to get as near to this natural beauty without modern day interference or the usual touristic, "planned vacation" character that seems to be creeping into all areas of our recreational pastimes.

Special areas set aside for camping and the reestablishment of public ways (the bay side boardwalk configuration for example) do little to preserve this character and I had assumed, this was the main reasons these things are by law, prohibited. This new proposal would violate this law and change the status quo in which one is able to "commune" with nature in such a personal and solitary way.

I also feel that the installation of signs and markers in the area goes even further in adding to the transformation where the promise of maintaining a "Wilderness Area" by it's very definition seems to be lost altogether.

I urge you to seriously consider and amend these and all plans that diminish the quality of this experience for campers and other visitors to the Wilderness Area of the Fire Island National Seashore.

Sincerely,

Ks Mark Munkittrick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 225    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Zalloughi, Stephen and Beatrice  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, It came to our attention that there is a plan afoot that possibly could close boating at the Sailors Haven Port on Fire

Island. My family and I (4th generation) and many many friends have been visiting the Haven for almost 50 years. We live about 52 miles from S. H. in Brooklyn and have very few boating parks that are environmentally correct and safe for our families. Since finding S. H. in 1960 we have routinely spent at least 30 days a year enjoying the Sunken Forest, the beach and the Bay and all the other facilities. Our children, grand and great grandchildren have grown up in this wonderful place. We have made several hundred acquaintances and friends over the years and have watched all of our children love and play at S. H. and grow into very fine adults that have also returned with their own watercrafts and children to S. H. We remember the Rose family who managed the Haven for many many years and now the very fine job the Stein family is doing with the snack restaurant and the on time and very safe ferry service. We marvel at the professionalism and dedication of the Park's employees from Jay who we knew as a fine law enforcement agent and all of the agents that followed him as he moved up the ladder of success. Also, the super job the lifeguards do as well as the maintenance personnel. In summary instead of thinking about planning to close the Haven to boaters we ask you to consider continuing to improve Sailors for the boating community. After all there are very few federal parks in the east and it seems that all of our federal dollars are sent to the west's parks like the Grand Canyon. We recently saw and spoke to our Senator Jill Hildebrand at Sailors and made our feelings known to her that we wanted Sailors to continue for the next hundred years. Thanks in advance for your attention to our request for keeping the Haven open and its continued improvement. Sincerely, Stephen and Beatrice Zalloughi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 226    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Heimer, Andy  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,03,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** National Park Service To whom it may concern,

Your proposed future plans for the Wilderness Area, at Fire Island: "Preliminary Management Alternatives" for your "General Management Plan" (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore, has come to my attention and I am concerned that each of the alternatives, to a greater or lesser extent will do little to nothing to enhance the Fire Island Wilderness, and, for the most part will greatly diminish the treasure that this national site is.

Special areas set aside for camping and the reestablishment of public ways (the bay side boardwalk configuration for example) do little to preserve this character and I had assumed, this was the main reasons these things are by law, prohibited. This new proposal would violate this law and change the status quo in which one is able to "commune" with nature in such a personal and solitary way.

I also feel that the installation of signs and markers in the area goes even further in adding to the transformation where the promise of maintaining a "Wilderness Area" by it's very definition seems to be lost altogether.

I urge you to seriously consider and amend these and all plans that diminish the quality of this experience for campers and other visitors to the Wilderness Area of the Fire Island National Seashore.



Sincerely, Andy Heimer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	227	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Stulz, Jr., Arthur A		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,03,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is of most importance that the National Park Service maintains the traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach and other currently clothing optional portions of the Fire Island National Seashore as a planning priority. Arthur A. Stulz, Jr.		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	228	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Wilson, Tara and Marty		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,03,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Attn Ellen Carlson; I am prompted to write this email, having recently found out about the proposal to close the Sailor's Haven Marina. This concerns me both on a personal and a general level. First, as an avid boater, my husband and I have been coming to Sailor's Haven for the past 15 years, both for single day and multiple day excursions. There is nothing like it on the South Shore. We are raising three children and Sailor's Haven offers a unique experience. The serene atmosphere coupled with the lack of housing for almost a mile on both sides, provides a safe enviroment for our children. The intimate and small construction of the marina means that our stay will be quiet and enjoyable. There my family can experience nature at its best. There is nowhere else we can enjoy the beach, the Sunken Forest and the plant and animal life. Some of our fondest memories are seeing deer, frogs, hermit crabs as well as constructing crafts at the visitor center. Closing this would deprive our children and others of what we consider one of the best natural parks. Secondly, the amount of boaters that come to Sailor's Haven/Sunken Forest is tremendous. I urge you to look at the waters surrounding Sailor's Haven on any summer weekend to see how many taxpaying voters would be affected. Not only is the marina full, but hundreds of boats are anchored off the coast having been unable to secure a slip in the marina. To close this would deny many the right of enjoying such a fabulous place. It would not be fair to expect that amount of people to only use a mandated ferry service since they would be unable to use a closed marina. Third, the marina recently went through a four million dollar renovation. To close it would be a travesty and a tremendous waste of taxpayers hard earned money. I, and my husband urge you to reconsider. Sincerely, Tara Wilson Marty Wilson		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	229	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Seymour, James D		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		

**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence**  
**Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir/Ms:

I write to weigh in on the proposed Wilderness Management Plan (WMP) section of the proposed General Management Plan.

First, I would like to thank the Park Service for doing a satisfactory job of maintaining the Wilderness Area in the past 30 years. I say "satisfactory" (rather than "excellent") because of the condition of the Burma Road, but basically the Wilderness has been maintained as one should be.

I would oppose Alternative 2 of the proposed WMP, "Enhancing Natural Resource Values," as I do not think, in this small part of FINS, there is any need for such civilizing. There is plenty of park left for such enhancements; the whole idea of the Wilderness is that it should be left alone so people can see it in an unadulterated condition.

I would oppose Alternative 3 for the same reasons; one does not (or should not) visit a Wilderness Area to enjoy "new or updated amenities."

I would oppose Alternative 4, which would tend to blur the distinction between the Wilderness and the remaining park.

Thus, I would support Alternative 1 of the proposed WMP. It will suffice simply to maintain the historic "Burma Road." There is no need for boardwalks, which I believe would be against the law. With minor exceptions, no signs are necessary; a visitor always knows where the ocean and bay are, and thus also which way is east and west. Exceptions might be "no go" warnings (e.g. to protect dune grass) and perhaps small signs with numbers, to go along with a brochure identifying flora, etc.

This is the smallest Wilderness in the National Park System. If it were larger perhaps its character would not be substantially affected by some additional amenities and signs of civilization, but given that it barely has sufficient critical mass to comprise a Wilderness, no measures should be taken to impact its "wildernessness" and opportunities for solitude.

James D. Seymour Senior Research Scholar Weatherhead East Asian Institute

---

**Correspondence** 230    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**ID:**  
**Name:** Nicolle, Deirdre A  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Organization:**  
**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence** E-mail  
**Type:**  
**Correspondence:** Dear Planning Team:

I have reviewed the four preliminary management alternatives for a new general management plan (GMP) for the Fire Island National Seashore contained in the Fire Island National Seashore GMP April 2, 2010 Newsletter.

I am a native of Long Island and a regular visitor to the Fire Island National Seashore. The Fire Island National Seashore is a national treasure. The beaches are among the best in the world. I say this having been to beaches in the Bahamas and Caribbean (Paradise Island, Nassau, Barbados, St. Martin, Puerto Rico, Cayman Islands) and in Europe ( Spain, France, Italy). The highest priority must be to maintain the beaches of the Fire Island National Seashore while at the same time making them accessible to the public. If it has to be an all or nothing approach, i.e., choosing only one alternative for the many varied situations in the various communities within the Fire Island National Seashore then of your four alternatives only alternative one, maintaining the status quo accomplishes maintaining the beaches and making them accessible to the public. Alternative 2 Enhancing Natural Resource Values which translated is "let it fall into the Atlantic Ocean and Great South Bay" is unacceptable. It provides for no reconstruction after storms. How foolish it would be to allow our beautiful beaches to be wiped away by a hurricane and not replenish them. How ridiculous to tell the private communities there is to be no reconstruction after a major storm. Equally, foolhardy is the idea in Alternative 2 of reducing the number of park facilities and removing the marina at Sailor's Haven. A reduction in the number of park facilities means less people will visit the Fire Island National Seashore. The Sailor's Haven marina brings vacation opportunities to those who live on Long Island and elsewhere. While I do not have a boat, I do know several people who use the Sailor's Haven and Watch Hill marina facilities. While at Sailor's Haven I have met people from other parts of the country and yes, even the world, who come to Sailor's Haven and use the marina. It is not unusual to meet people from New Jersey or Massachusetts who sail or motor boat to the Sailor's Haven marina. And, yes every other week, if you stroll down the dock at the marina you will bump into Jacques and Bridget who are from France and spend their summer sailing in the waters surrounding Long Island. The marinas at Sailor's Haven and Watch Hill provide a unique and important recreational opportunity for use by the boating community and should not be eliminated or reduced in size.

Alternative 4 and 3 have in common the idea of developing a science camp and lodge at Barrett Beach. Further development should be limited especially at the beaches. Do you really think the public wants a science camp? I live on Long Island because of the beaches. Most of the visitors to the Fire Island National Seashore want to be at the SEASHORE enjoying the BEACH and OCEAN. With respect to a lodge, I am opposed to this. I am also opposed to allowing any private catering halls, such as the one Trump plans to build at Jones Beach.

Regardless of which alternative is ultimately chosen, the Fire Island National Seashore should remain a place that is roadless.

While in certain of the communities there may be certain situations where further development would be warranted, your "pick an alternative" approach does not allow for examining the facts pertinent to each particular situation. In my opinion, this is a mistake.

Given the alternatives, Alternative 1 should be used for the GMP.

I am interested in receiving the draft GMP/EIS. Please let me know how I may obtain a copy of it.

Sincerely,

Deirdre A. Nicolle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 231    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Van Lith, Martin  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

As a former board member of the Friends of Fire Island National Seashore, I take great interest in both the present and the future stewardship of FINS. I find the draft of the plan General Management Plan to be very well done and I commend the staff for their fine work.

My main area of interest is that of the 8-mile Otis Pike Wilderness area. For the Wilderness area I support alternative 1, maintaining the status quo. For me, my family and many of my friends, the Fire Island Wilderness area is the greatest asset that we have living here on Long Island.

Thank you again for all of your hard work on this project.

Martin Van Lith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 232    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Bullard, David  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I'm a huge fan of the lands managed by the National Park Service along the New York and New Jersey seashore, but I would say that the Fire Island National Seashore is amongst the best parts.

I've been a fan of Lighthouse Beach for several years, finding it to be not only a beautiful spot, but the people whom attend it to be responsible and friendly, and have set up a very nice community there. As such, I urge you to continue to keep the naturist areas of Lighthouse and Kismet beaches in their current clothing optional state. This not only will give myself and others who enjoy naturist activities a place to recreate, it will also keep a community of people together who enjoy giving back to the beaches they attend.

I understand that the current plans do not address the status of this area in one way or another, but I urge you to continue to continue these clothing-optional areas, regardless of which plan is chosen. We all look forward to supporting you, as you continue to support us and our park.

Thank you,

David Bullard, Brooklyn, NY

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	233	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	White, Eugene		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,05,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Fire Island National Seashore GMP		

I am writing to you to ask for the INCLUSION of CLOTHING OPTIONAL beaches in all of the four master plans for Fire Island.

I am a long-time summer resident of the Fire Island Pines, renting several weeks every summer. I join many others in using the clothing optional areas between Cherry Grove and the Pines and to the the East of the Pines. These contribute to the diversity of the communities. Nude sunbathing is accepted by the vast majority of the members of both towns.

In most surveys a majority of Americans are in favor of setting aside areas for nude sun bathing and skinny dipping.

These areas have been clothing optional traditionally for decades and they should be taken into consideration in all the master plans.

Sincerely yours, Eugene White

---

<b>Correspondence</b>	234	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
-----------------------	-----	-----------------------	------------------------

**ID:**

**Name:** Hechler, Charlotte  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** We have been going to Sailors Haven for over 30 years. It is our home away from home every summer. My children were brought up here and now my grandchildren are. It is a very special place and we have very fond memories here, and hope to continue forming memories here., There isn't another place as wonderful as here. We would love to see Sailors Haven remain as a overnight marina, and continue to be upgraded as necessary. Sincerely, Charlotte Hechler, our boat is the Sheryl Lynn

---

**Correspondence** 235    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Brooks, Bryan  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,05,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I am writing to ask for clothing-optional recreation to be included in the General Management Plan for the Fire Island National Seashore, regardless of which plan is chosen. Nude sunbathing is a valid recreational choice. Bryan Brooks Brooklyn, NY

---

**Correspondence** 236    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Polly, Ron  
**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Good Morning Clothing optional should be included in the Fire Island General Management Plan for the following reasons , 1. Tourism and economic spin off. 2. Clothing optional beaches to my experience have been better taken care of by their users than the clothed beaches around the world. 3. Surveys have found that clothing optional bathers have a higher income and educational level . Thank you for your time

in this matter . Yours Truly Ron Polly Vancouver , B.C. Canada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 237    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Weinstein, Arthur I

**Outside Organization:** Kismet Fire District; Western FI Year Round Residents Assoc. Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am a Commissioner of the Kismet Fire District and an officer of the Western Fire Island Year Round Residents Association, Inc. I concur in the attached comments on the "Alternative" approaches to the proposed Fire Island General Management Plan submitted by Marsha Hunter, President of the Kismet Community Association. The favored "Alternative" assumes the vitality of the seventeen fire island communities. The survival of those communities is dependent on the continued presence of year-round resident families whose generations provide for maintenance and repairs to homes and community infrastructure and fire protection. Any adopted GMP must meet the needs of the year round community. Arthur I. Weinstein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 238    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Hunter, Marsha

**Outside Organization:** Kismet Community Association Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Comments on Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan: Preliminary Management Alternatives of April 2010 submitted by Marsha Hunter, Kismet.

I am the President of the Kismet Community Association, a member of the Board of Directors of, and an officer of, the Fire Island Association, and am Islip Town Commissioner of both the Kismet Sidewalk District and Kismet Erosion Control District and a Fire Island property owner. As has been noted by other Fire Island property owners and Fire Island Association Directors in their comments, Alternative 3, as compared to the other Alternatives, while not perfect, has the potential to be most in sync with the 17 communities' best interests. The new management concept proffered by the Seashore of a partnership/stewardship between the NPS and the 17 communities within the Park in managing and maintaining Fire Island is to be applauded. However, all four Alternatives do not adequately address the importance and definition of beach nourishment for the long term. The Alternatives limit options as to what the Seashore would permit and allow in order to maintain the very existence of this fragile barrier beach island. Therefore, and for the most part, I concur with the extensive comments by Gerard Stoddard in his well-stated in depth analysis of Alternative 1, 2, and 4 and in particular his comments on Alternative 3 on page 6. For example: "A beach can and should be maintained, not allowed to transition to another location".

On some specific items: Alternative 4 "new opportunities for public use" p 14 & 15 refers to the Seashore working with communities to create a lateral bike road from the west entry to Sailor's Haven. I concur with Mr. Stoddard's comment that "this should be off the table" and

I would take it a step further and say it "must" be off the table. Kismet is the most westerly community of Fire Island and already is inundated with excessive transient traffic into the community from Robert Moses State Park and the Lighthouse. The community does not have the resources to support even the existing level of transient traffic. Our quality of life would be seriously threatened even more by additional bike riders entering at the western border. Such a bike road "opportunity" for the Park Service is irresponsible. We and other western communities have seen a marked increase recently in home breaks-ins and thefts-- most likely the product of transients from Robert Moses State Park. There is practically no police coverage in the shoulder or off season and our homes and property would be at risk as a result of any new bicycle "road". In addition, communities east of Kismet would be adversely impacted if "connected" in a manner that all communities reject and would indeed be the "road" through Fire Island that caused the creation of the Fire Island National Seashore! On the section on page 5 "Status of the GMP process-- Water Based Transportation Opportunities Analysis", while the Alternatives document itself is short on details and specifics, this was addressed in some detail in Mr. Stoddard's comments to which I take exception, whereby he strongly supports water transfer terminals on the island for removal of garbage, construction, utilities and the like. Many of the smaller communities such as Kismet have no available bay front land whatsoever at their marina locations. A mega terminal for garbage removal and construction deliveries exclusively by water, if located for example on the small federal strip of land directly adjacent to the last Walk in Kismet, would be intrusive and would seriously affect the community's quality of life, especially if such a terminal were to be used by several other western communities. This concept (of Island based garbage and construction terminals) received significant attention during many sessions held by FIA Board working groups with Seashore staff in the early stages of the development of the new GMP. No consensus of the FIA has ever been reached on this topic. The significant intrusiveness of garbage depots in small communities clearly outweighs the minimal intrusiveness of traditional garbage carters passing through communities during very limited time periods. Much of what came out of the FIA working groups' exercise were biased by those who have a "knee jerk" reaction to any vehicles on the Island whatsoever. They fail to understand the reality involved in garbage collection and construction management. In both fields vehicles are necessary to collect garbage within communities and transport needed building supplies. The minimal benefit of "transfer terminals" would be offset by the hugely intrusive nature of such facilities to the communities selected as "victim" sites. In addition, the effort of a contingent of summer resident property owners pushing an anti-contractor position to limit contractors' off-season use of Field 5 at Robert Moses State Park as a transitional venue to bring goods and services on to Fire Island has no place in the GMP.

I urge that the GMP recognize the importance and value of the diverse communities and the requirements for their continued maintenance, including the needs of the year-round residents who are vital for such survival. Accordingly, with respect to the section of the Alternatives entitled "Roadless Island" on page 7, I support the current "off-season" driving regulations as presently in place.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	239	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Elliott, Robert K		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To: Those considering the Plan for Fire Island National Seashore		



The remote part of Fire Island National Seashore between Robert Moses State Park and the village of Kismet (excluding a section immediately in front of the Fire Island Lighthouse) has been a designated clothing-optional beach for quite a few years. My family and I have been using this section of the beach for about fifteen years. Based on this experience, I would like to make several points:

1. There are often large crowds using this beach on summer weekends and quite a few persons on weekdays as well. Thus there is significant demand for a clothing-optional beach. 2. I have not observed inappropriate behavior on this beach nor disciplinary problems. In fact, there are a number of regulars at the beach that take it upon themselves to tamp down incipient inappropriate behavior. Thus the beach is largely self-policing. 3. Both National Park rangers and Suffolk County Marine Division police routinely patrol the beach and, to my observation, enjoy cordial relations with the beach users. 4. A number of beach regulars habitually patrol the beach for litter, collect it, and carry it off the beach. Thus the beach is ordinarily very clean. 5. The Friends of Lighthouse Beach (a clothing-optional group) hold fundraising events to support projects to improve beach facilities. 6. In opinion polls, a large majority of respondents support nude bathing on beaches set aside for that purpose. You can view one such poll [here](#). 7. The Federal government routinely sets aside areas in national parks for special types of recreation, e.g., fishing, hunting, snow-mobiling, dune-buggies, and surfing. Setting aside a clothing-optional section of a beach for clothing-optional recreation is in that tradition. (Note: the fact that a minority of people disapprove of nude bathing in principle should carry no more weight than the fact that large numbers of the public oppose snow-mobiling and dune-buggies had in failing to prevent those designated uses.) 8. Fire Island clothing-optional beach users are citizens and taxpayers who deserve public support of their recreational opportunities just as much as the clothed citizens and taxpayers that have exclusive use of the other 99+% of public beaches.

In light of these observations, I request that clothing-optional use of a portion of the Fire Island National Seashore -- specifically that portion that is currently clothing-optional -- be included in any Plan for the Fire Island National Seashore going forward.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my views on this matter.

Robert K. Elliott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	240	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	Stegemann, Bill				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Sierra Club L.I. Group Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,05,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	September 5, 2010 Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan/Wilderness Management Plan Scoping Statement				

Comments from the Long Island Sierra Club (Member of the Fire Island Wilderness Coalition)

General Management Plan

The National Park Service is to be commended for the forward-thinking objectives outlined in the Climate Change and Sea Level Rise section (Common to all Action Alternatives). Lowering the carbon footprint of Fire Island National Seashore facilities and operations; developing monitoring and adaptation strategies; implementing sustainable practices; and providing public education are important and admirable efforts. Combined with preserving the natural environment for the enjoyment of visitors, these principles will make a solid framework for the new GMP.

The science camp/eco lodge is a welcome concept, but must not result in a net loss of habitat. Exploring the use of temporary structures (Alternative 2) might be advisable here. Local environmental groups could contribute ideas and educational programs.

On April 17th, the Town of Islip banned the use of chemical pesticides on town property in favor of organic measures. The Mosquito Management Plan should be reassessed and a concerted effort made to follow suit. The Cooperative Stewardship between the NPS, local communities and other entities should include educational outreach on environmentally friendly alternatives, including natural predators (e.g. dragonflies, swallows and bats).

The removal of invasive species at a rapid pace can cause considerable stress to native and migratory fauna that may currently be dependent upon them. Organic methods of removal are preferred.

Wilderness Management Plan (Wilderness Stewardship Plan)

The picturesque parks and preserves of Long Island offer mere fleeting impressions of the boundlessness and serenity that are readily experienced in a true Wilderness Area. The Otis Pike Wilderness evokes these feelings as visitors bear witness to Fire Island's surrounding beauty in its purest form.

But in recent years, the historic Burma Road trail has become overgrown in several places, rendering it unsafe due to the substantially increased risk of coming in contact with disease bearing ticks. Some sections of the trail are impassable. This lateral trail and the major spur trails have long been maintained by the boots of hikers. This is clearly no longer an adequate solution and routine maintenance is warranted. These trails are not simply amenities; they are essential for the safe enjoyment of the Wilderness.

The amenities mentioned and alluded to in Alternatives 3 and 4 are not in keeping with the Wilderness Act and their inclusion is perplexing.

In order to preserve the authentic Wilderness experience, campers should be allowed to discover their own campsites, rather than choose from a menu of fixed locations. An increase in the number of camping permits would significantly decrease the opportunity for solitude that is synonymous with the Wilderness Act. We have serious concerns about the impacts of camping that has been allowed, without public

comment, on the beach in front of the Wilderness.

#### Conclusion

Thanks to decades of sound management by NPS and FINS staff, Preliminary Management Alternative 1 - Status Quo is the closed to a preferred alternative.

The Long Island Sierra Club advocated for the federal designation of the OPW in 1980 and we fully appreciate the opportunity to have a voice in the creation of a new WSP and GMP. As this process progresses, we look forward to commenting on documents that delineate specific actions that will ensure the preservation of these uniquely wondrous areas. The thoughtful planning that the NPS continues to demonstrate will benefit park visitors and the natural ecosystems of FINS for years to come.

Submitted by: Bill Stegemann Conservation Chair Sierra Club L.I. Group

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	241	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	Adams, John				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	9-5-2010				

#### Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan - COMMENTS

I support Alternative 3 (Recognizing the Relationship between Human Use and Nature), WITH MODIFICATIONS, because this option:

1. Accepts the reality of human use, which is something that will not and should not disappear or be discouraged on Fire Island.
2. Reflects the idea that nature and human use, in proper balance, comprise the ideal, whole FINS experience. Homo sapiens IS part of nature.
3. Recognizes that a "wilderness experience" is an extremely relative term for an island that sits approx. 45-75 miles from one of the largest cities on earth, with a metro population of nearly 20 million. [The flight paths of 2 major airports, small aircraft in the skies, fireworks displays & ambient light at night on the mainland, power craft on the Great South Bay and the Atlantic, among other things severely limit the concept of wilderness on Fire Island. Yet some such efforts CAN provide a reasonable, "natural" experience in a densely populated region if done properly . . . for example, the Ramble area in NYC's Central Park, particularly in winter.]

NECESSARY MODIFICATIONS to Alternative 3

1. the Bay - the Great South Bay shoreline is the neglected stepchild of FINS. The portions of the bay between Point O' Woods and Fire Island Pines display a severely eroded, trash-strewn shoreline. There is more to FINS than just the Atlantic coastline.

2, Volunteer & community support and interaction - currently there is not enough engagement between FINS staff and mainland & Fire Island residents and visitors. Current park staffing and budget resources should be re-allocated to encourage much more community support of park land on Fire Island . . . for example, "clean up" days, many more "in the field" tours on land and in the water to build appreciation of this ecological jewel (compromised as it is at this point in time). Don't "curate" Fire Island nature in Patchogue and at the Floyd Estate. The park on Fire Island IS the natural museum.

I believe there would be enough science teachers on Long Island who would volunteer to act as field experts for one day tours-of-duty educating young people and adults about Fire Island ecology.

3. Cultural resources - what "cultures" does FINS currently support? Does the Floyd Estate "curate" representative items from the gay culture of Cherry Grove and Fire Island Pines? Is the history and current demographic & lifestyle of Point O' Woods represented in the museum archive? Who decides which cultures and histories are to be "interpreted" (a favorite FINS term, apparently). One of the unique things about Fire Island is the vast diversity of its cultures on such a relatively small land mass. This is what should be represented.

I would very much like to be involved in helping to support the National Park Service in its work on Fire Island. Please let me know if there is any clarification that I may provide for these comments.

John Adams [REDACTED]

--Resident for 27 years

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	242	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Blumer, Karen		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	The Open Space Council Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter		

**Correspondence:** September 6, 2010

K. Christopher Soller, Superintendent Fire Island National Seashore

Re: Wilderness Management Plan Preliminary Management Alternatives

Dear Superintendent Soller:

This has been a long journey, indeed. I was present at the original Fire Island National Seashore hearing in New York City in 1975 that sparked an effort to create a future wilderness area. The Open Space Council has supported all efforts which followed that initiative in the ensuing years.

We commend the FINS and National Park Service on maintaining the Wilderness Area consistent with the provisions of the 1964 Wilderness Act. In that spirit, we find that alternative #1 is the closest approach to continuing that effort. Especially, we support maintaining the Burma Road in its entirety as a sand path for accessibility to allow for passive recreation and access to wilderness solitude.

Briefly regarding other aspects, we feel the mosquito ditches will, over time, restore to Spartina marsh. We would oppose any "act to fill in" the ditches. At most, in an effort to speed up the self-restoration process, we would support the simple approach used by the Town of East Hampton of dropping a sand bag to plug up the seaward end of the ditches to a depth of a few inches below high tide level so that material enters to build up the ditch but does not escape.

We support the NPS elements of the proposal to maintain a true wilderness character and oppose those, such as in the last alternative, which would provide greater amenities which may be inconsistent with the Act.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely, Karen Blumer Karen Blumer Vice President

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	243	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Rowley, Karen		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		

**Correspondence:** A quick note on this exceptional day We know that we are lucky to live by such a unique area , and we hope you will do everything in your power to maintain its uniqueness and not let it drift towards other though beautiful areas, not the uniqueness and specialness of this area. As a family, we have lived and grown up here, and have come to appreciate the wilderness area as unique. We hope it will stay that way.

Therefore we vote for alternative1: status quo/current management.

We hope that the old Burma Road will be minimally maintained where it remains to allow for passage as a footpath.

We hope that you will NOT increase the number of campers, either on the beach or at sites of campers' choosing.

Temporary signage may be necessary --- but only temporary. No one could get lost in this area!

Good luck in keeping wild in wilderness.

Karen Rowley [REDACTED] Brookhaven, NY 11719

Karl Rowley [REDACTED] Sunnyvale, NY

Steven and Beth Rowley [REDACTED] Kendall Park, NJ 08824

Laura Rowley [REDACTED] Seattle, WA 98117

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	244	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Sewall, Bradford H		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Natural Resources Defense Council Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	September 6, 2010		

Fire Island National Seashore GMP 15 State Street Boston MA 02109 Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager (fire\_island\_gmp@nps.gov)

Via email

Dear Ms. Carlson:

On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council ("NRDC"), I submit the following comments on the Preliminary Management Alternatives for the new General Management Plan for the Fire Island National Seashore, and specifically on the management alternatives for the Otis Pike Fire Island High Dune Wilderness area ("Wilderness Area"). NRDC has a significant and long-term organizational interest in proper implementation of the 1964 Wilderness Act, including with respect to the Wilderness Area, which is, as you are aware, the only federally-designated wilderness area in New York State. Accordingly, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important planning process, which will likely govern management ? and thus the wilderness character -- of the Wilderness Area for many years to come.

NRDC generally supports Alternative #1 ("Status Quo/Current Management). To the best of our knowledge and understanding, management of the Wilderness Area to date has been generally consistent with goals and objectives of the Wilderness Act and has resulted in the continued preservation of the wilderness character of the area, as consistent with and appropriate to its specific unique characteristics. Building on this track record of success would seem a sound strategy.

On the other hand, NRDC has particular concerns about Alternative #4 ("Recognizing the Relationship Between Human Use and Nature"). Components of this alternative, including proposals to increase camping (in what is the country's smallest wilderness area), re-install the boardwalk, and add signage, are inconsistent with provisions, as well as the overall purpose, of the Wilderness Act. If adopted for the Wilderness Area, these management actions would likely result in a significant degradation of the area and in the experience of visitors seeking a true wilderness experience in a region where such experiences are exceedingly hard to find.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Management Alternatives. Feel free to contact me at the address and phone number above if you have any questions or concerns about these comments.

Sincerely, Bradford H. Sewell Senior Attorney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 245    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Parker, Mary  
**Outside Organization:** Davis Park Association Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Response to the Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan Preliminary Management Alternatives, September 2010 As a Fire Island homeowner, my greatest concern is that the environment I know and love continues to be available for those who come to enjoy it. By

this, I mean the natural environment but I also mean the communities and the services. It is critical to me that there be homeowners in the National Park and that they have small, rustic communities with not too much civilization. It is important that all have access to the Park and have the opportunity to grow to love it the way we residents do. It is also important to preserve the beauty and natural character of the place without sacrificing the human aspects in favor of the purely natural ones. Looking at the Alternatives as presented in the Preliminary Management Plan, Alternative 3 is closest to what I would envision. I applaud the general concepts that are to be part of all alternatives: educational outreach, submerged marine resource planning, climate change preparedness, roadless island preservation, and public information and wayfinding ideas. But the one that seems most relevant to the future of Fire Island is cooperative stewardship. Agreeing to work together with homeowners and others for the future of Fire Island is FINS' best plan and the one that will assure greatest satisfaction for all parties. Although the status quo of Alternative 1 is appealing for those who love the place already, most of us also would like to see FINS make some changes. We would like to see FINS further develop its facilities for the wilderness experience: greater use of water transport for goods and services through improved ferry and freight facilities, further development of recreational facilities at Watch Hill, Barrett Beach, Sunken Forest, Sailor's Haven, etc. However we do not want to see a bike path through our communities. Facilitating inter-community passage through boat transportation (more water taxi service or lateral ferry service) would be a better approach. We also think that some types of intervention in the natural environment are essential: effective mosquito control and beach nourishment are two. Current mosquito control is inadequate and dangerous as well as destructive of a good seasonal experience for visitors. Lack of beach nourishment is so great a concern that it consumes homeowner attention and impedes a working relationship between FINS and its fellow island-dwellers. Alternative 2, Enhancing Natural Resource Values, would codify overly restrictive environmental rules. All Fire Island homeowners are conservationists; they are here because they love the environment and want to preserve it for themselves and their children. For example, imposing fencing requirements in hopes of creating environment where sea beach amaranth might grow is overly restrictive. Fire Islanders are happy to notice amaranth and build fences to protect it wherever it appears; we are not happy to be denied use of our summer beaches by an environmentalist's hope that something good may grow. Alternative 2 also sounds like it would be so interested in preserving the wilderness character of the island that visitors (and residents) would be discouraged. We humans on Fire Island often feel that every species is seen as more desirable than the human. Greater management of the public for a "very high degree of natural resource protection" does not bode well for us year-rounders on Fire Island. Alternative 4, Exploring New Opportunities for Public Use, addresses a desire to enhance the wilderness experience, but I would be cautious about the extent of development. For example, an eco-camping resort at Watch Hill is too much development. The plan to preserve mosquito ditches in Alternatives 3 and 4 does not acknowledge that the ditches are not open or functioning and are not helping with our mosquito problem. What we need is effective mosquito management that will make our homes livable and the seasonal visitor experience possible. Unless something is done, the economy of Fire Island will continue to be adversely affected: nobody wants to stay in our communities in July and August, no matter how beautiful the beach, if they can't go outside. Homeowners have sold out, renters have taken their business elsewhere, day trippers have been deterred, and campers / hikers come unaware of the problem and are unable to deal when they arrive. They also face an increasing possibility of illness from mosquito-borne disease. I see Alternative 3 as a basis for further collaborative efforts. Working together, FINS and homeowners can build a future that goes beyond the old one-note homeowner demand for beach nourishment. If even "limited beach nourishment" is allowed under the new plan, then homeowners can turn more attention to agreeing on zoning regulations, monitoring development in the CEHA zone, and establishing natural resource programs. In the Natural Resources area, Alternative 3 would allow for "a moderate level of intervention . . . to address conditions that affect human health and safety," which presumably includes the mosquito situation. Updating and expanding the Wilderness Visitor Center and better marked existing trails would do a lot for the visitor experience. And anything the Park can do to be greener at its facilities is a great idea. As a Fire Island homeowner and full-time resident, I look forward to working with FINS as it implements its new General Management Plan. Mary Parker Davis Park Association Fire Island Association



**ID:**

**Name:** Weeter, Kim

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** I understand that you are currently taking public comment regarding the future of the Fire Island National Seashore. I am writing to share how much the clothing optional beach ("Lighthouse Beach") means to my experience of Long Island. I so love the peace and serenity I experience when I visit the beach there, taking in the Atlantic Ocean, the lighthouse... there is no other place where I can just be "me" elsewhere in the area. The region is full of the hustle and bustle of the NYC regional area, and having the opportunity to literally, and therefore figuratively, "strip down" nourishes and cleanses my soul.

I thank you for this special place, and encourage you to keep it as part of the tradition on Fire Island.

Thank you taking public comments.

Most earnestly,

Kim Weeter Babylon, NY

---

**Correspondence** 247    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**ID:**

**Name:** Raymond, Dave

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** First, I would like to extend my thanks to all of you involved in this process. I am sure it is not easy, especially given the complexities of

juggling the competing interests of 17 communities, several marinas, various other entities and agencies, etc. When I have been trying to explain this process to visitors at Sailors Haven, I sometimes draw a comparison to the Adirondack and Catskill State Parks, which also have private communities within their boundaries.

To give you a sense of where I am coming from, I grew up on a farm in Vermont, went to college in the Adirondacks, and moved to Long Island in 1983, where I have worked for the New York State Dept of Environmental Conservation since. On the outside, I was involved with the Audubon Society from 1983-1995, at which time I "retired" from that organization. I became involved with FIIS about 10 years ago, first as a volunteer at the Wilderness VC, and then at the Haven, first as a volunteer, and the last several years as an Interpretive Ranger.

So I think my diverse background helps me see all sides of an issue (plus my natural instincts to "try to walk a mile in someone else's shoes"). That being said, my preference (which also seems to be the preference of people I have spoken to) is for Alternative 3. While I personally love nature and wilderness, I do not feel the nature of FIIS is to be either a "nature" park or a "recreational" park, but rather some combination where the park tries to capture the best aspects of what makes Fire Island special: the unique natural environment, the diverse histories and qualities of the private communities, the boating community, and the day tourists. Obviously, it won't be easy.

I also wish to give you my second preference, which is Alternative 1. We all know what budgets are like today, and I suspect for the foreseeable future. I remember Candidate Bush promising about 10 years ago to address the maintenance backlog, then estimated at \$5-6 billion. I now understand it is around \$10-12 billion, climbing, and the Centennial is only six years away. I would suggest the Park consider Alt 1 as a "fallback" plan in case the money necessary to carry out Alt 3 does not materialize. For example, while state of the art "green" facilities is a laudable goal, it might be more realistic to focus on renovating (and expanding, if even just slightly?) the existing Visitor Centers.

Finally, I had a number of boaters approach me the past few weeks who said they had not heard of this planning process. Any possibility the comment period can be extended, if even for just a month or so? I think it would be worthwhile to consider a short extension in order to ensure we get the best possible plan we can.

Thank you for your time, and good luck.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 248    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Duitsman, Vaughn  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I understand you are in the process of updating the General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore. As a past, and future, visitor to Fire Island I am asking that you please continue to include clothing-optional use of the beach, regardless of which management option is

ultimately chosen.

Skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices accepted by a majority of Americans. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose.

In that same survey, a clear majority (54%) of Americans believe that government agencies should set aside public land specifically for clothing-optional recreation.

Traditional clothing-optional areas, like Lighthouse Beach within Fire Island National Seashore, contribute to the diversity of our National Parks.

Thank you, Vaughn Duitsman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	249	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Christensen, Alan		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writting to you to express my thoughts concerning the plans for the Fire Island national seashore. I am a naturist and I hope you will consider designation a part of the beach as a clothing optional beach. There are thousands of other Americans who are also naturists and desire a place to practice their preffered form of recreation. Naturists and nudists are respectable law abiding citizens who just preffer to be able to be nude. There are several nude beaches throughout the US Haulover Beach in Miami FL, Collins Beach and Rooster Rock near Portland OR. A 2006 Poll by the Roper Polling Organization indicated that 74% of Americans indicated that those who enjoy nude bathing should be able to do so in areas set aside for that purpose. In that same poll 54% of Amreicans felt that government agencies should set aside lands for that purpose. This is a clear majority and traditionally clothing optional beaches like Light House Beach and Fire Island National Seashore add diversity to out national parks. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Alan Christensen Nine Mile Falls WA		

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	250	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Nardone, Enrico		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Seatuck Environmental Association Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	September 6, 2010		

VIA EMAIL (fire\_island\_gmp@nps.gov)

Ellen Carlson Project Manager Fire Island National Seashore GMP National Park Service 15 State Street Boston, Ma 02109

RE: FIRE ISLAND MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Dear Ms. Carlson:

On behalf of the hundreds of members of the Seatuck Environmental Association, Inc. ("Seatuck"), I am writing to submit comments on the National Park Service's preliminary management alternatives for the Fire Island National Seashore. Seatuck is a not-for-profit, 501(c)(3) organization based in Islip, New York that is dedicated to promoting the conservation of Long Island wildlife and the environment.

We commend the Park Service for its diligence in developing a new general management plan for Fire Island, especially its genuine and broad consideration of various alternatives, and its thorough efforts to encourage public participation and input.

We are, however, reluctant to simply cast a vote for one of the management alternatives; the initial descriptions lack sufficient detail about the policies and how they would be implemented. Here we instead offer some general thoughts about Fire Island's management and look forward to staying involved as the process continues.

First and foremost, we support an approach that safeguards Fire Island's ecological health, one that not only protects valuable wildlife habitat on the island, but also prioritizes the important functions the island serves in Long Island's broader coastal ecosystem. The management plan should recognize the island's importance for migrating birds and insects; the significance of its salt marshes and eelgrass beds as nurseries for a wide range of marine species; and the value of its un-hardened bayside

beaches for species such as horseshoe crabs. The plan should value the island as a critical part of the Great South Bay system and its vital role in shielding the mainland of Long Island. It should embrace efforts to restore degraded habitat (such as ditched salt marshes) and allow the island's dynamic natural processes to function unimpeded whenever possible.

While we recognize that the island offers unsurpassed beauty and recreational opportunities and encourage sustainable enjoyment of this wonderful resource, we support policies that will protect against allowing it to be over-built and over-used. A heedless investment in infrastructure will weigh against policies that allow natural systems to function, particularly on something as ephemeral and constantly changing as a barrier island (especially given the new, game-changing realities of climate-change-induced sea level rise). Similarly, increased housing densities and visitor accommodations will stress the island's systems, especially the ability to deal with waste in ways that won't impact water quality.

Regarding the Otis Pike Wilderness Area, we strongly oppose any management policies that would undo the wild character of the area, especially the provisions included in Management Alternative #4 (which would seemingly reverse the area's wilderness status altogether). While we agree that the Burma Road trail should be maintained (especially given the inaccessible nature of the area and the prevalence of ticks and poison ivy), we otherwise support policies that will protect and/or restore the area's native, natural condition and safeguard the

region's only wilderness.

Thank you for the opportunity to be involved in the Park Service's development of a new management plan for Fire Island. We look forward to staying involved in the process.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Very truly yours,

Enrico Nardone ENRICO G. NARDONE, Esq. Executive Director

---

**Correspondence ID:** 251    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Drabouski, Christopher  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is Christopher Drabouski and I am a frequent visitor of Fire Island National Seashore. It has been brought to my attention that the clothing-optional beaches may be at risk due to a new management option. I would like for you to make sure that clothing-optional recreation will be included in these new plans. Skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing are valid recreational choices. In 2006, the Naturist Education Foundation commissioned the independent Roper polling organization to survey Americans on the topic of clothing-optional recreation. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe that those who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so at a place set aside for that purpose. Thank you for your time, and I hope to be able to continue visiting the clothing-optional beaches at Fire Island National Seashore for years to come. Sincerely, Christopher Drabouski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 252    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Morton, Robert A  
**Outside Organization:** Naturist Action Committee Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** The Naturist Action Committee (NAC) is a nonprofit volunteer organization that exists to advance and protect the rights and interests of naturists. You may more readily recognize naturists as skinnydippers or nude sunbathers, but at other times they're your neighbors, your

friends and people you meet every day. A 2006 national survey of American adults showed that one of every four has participated in some form of nude recreation. That survey was commissioned by the Naturist Education Foundation and conducted by the prestigious Roper polling organization. You may view the poll results online at: [http://www.naturisteducation.org/Projects/NEF-Roper\\_Poll\\_2006/nef-roper\\_poll\\_2006.html](http://www.naturisteducation.org/Projects/NEF-Roper_Poll_2006/nef-roper_poll_2006.html)

Most importantly, naturists are taxpayers and citizens. They are visitors to National Parks and Seashores, and they are enthusiastic supporters of America's National Park System.

Naturists deserve consideration in the General Management Plan being considered for Fire Island National Seashore. The longstanding tradition of clothing-optional use at Lighthouse Beach deserves to be recognized, continued and incorporated into any forward looking management plan for the unit.

In the same Roper Poll referenced above, 74 percent of Americans believe that people who enjoy nude sunbathing should be able to do so without interference from local officials as long as they do so at a beach that is accepted for that purpose. That's a significant statistic.

A majority of Americans, 54 percent, believe that governmental agencies should actively set aside special areas for people who enjoy nude sunbathing. Fifty-four percent is an impressive number. In fact, we elect presidents by smaller margins.

Fire Island National Seashore has a rich culture of diversity and a significant history of clothing-optional recreation. It is altogether fitting that the General Management Plan should reflect those important aspects of FIIS. Regardless of which management option is chosen, the GMP must incorporate plans to manage positively for those who enjoy skinnydipping and nude sunbathing.

Robert A. Morton Executive Director Naturist Action Committee [www.naturistaction.org](http://www.naturistaction.org) [@naturistaction.org](mailto:@naturistaction.org)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 253    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Biebel, Tom  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** It is commendable that the National Park Service is soliciting public comment on the Fire Island General Management Plan. There have been many honorable decisions made in haste and without public input.

My comments relate to the lack of any mention of what has been historically a clothing optional beach portion of Fire Island National Seashore. My concern is that without any consideration of this area in the plan it may become a victim to the wishes of a fringe element of society that has an interest in stopping such activities.

This is reminiscent of what happened to Times Square in New York City in the late '90s. There was a very vocal group who wished to eliminate what was considered a blighted neighborhood. They all pointed out the crime rates and the types of businesses that they considered seedy and would like to eliminate. They wanted to turn all of Times Square into condominiums and upscale corporate businesses. After much public input it was discovered that the public considered Times Square a National and World landmark and should be preserved rather than eliminated. Luckily, it is still Times Square today. The planners decided that if they were to preserve it they had to define it. So they drafted a master plan that mandated the mega-signs and even preserved the proportions of honky tonk to glamour.

I consider the right to a clothing optional area to also be a National Treasure. To have a right to swim unencumbered by swimwear is true freedom. There should be more areas set aside to address the desires of that part of the population that enjoys this activity just as you would set aside any other area such as hiking or camping.

I find it ironic that the Federal Government provides funding to close large areas of beaches in its jurisdiction to protect a very small number of birding species and yet doesn't protect the rights of people who simply want to enjoy true freedom in its finest God given form. Perhaps those people should apply for endangered status.

I agree that there needs to be some methods of dealing with the reported crimes in the areas that are in or are close to the traditionally clothing optional sections. No one should have a wonderful trip to a beautiful area on a nice day spoiled by inexcusable behaviors. The problem is that the initial reaction is to simply eliminate what is perceived to be the cause, which is the nudity at the beach. If you follow that logic then you would also have to close children's playgrounds because that is what attracts predators.

There are some excellent websites that explain the reasons that people wish to enjoy nude recreation. One is : [//www.naturistsociety.com/resources/PDF/205ARGUE.pdf](http://www.naturistsociety.com/resources/PDF/205ARGUE.pdf) .

This is a treatise called "205 Arguments and Observations In Support of Naturism" by K. Bacher. It is hard to find 205 reasons to do most recreational activities.

It is my hope that there will be some serious consideration for the continuation of the current clothing optional status and the right to be truly free of everything. Please consider the following quotation:

"Prohibition...goes beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation and makes a crime out of things that are not crimes... A prohibition law strikes a blow at the very principles upon which our government was founded." ---Abraham Lincoln

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

- Tom Biebel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 254    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Anello, Russell  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** My name is Russell Anello. I ask that you include the clothing optional area of Lighthouse Beach as it stands in the General Management Plan. A change could make the beach inaccessible for many and cause inconvenience for thousands of others who attend this great beach. Along with beach user naturist groups, many regulars on Lighthouse Beach are multiplying their efforts by teaching others how to encourage people to follow the rules and abide by the law. Thank You for your listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 255    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Schatler, Jonathan  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Ms. Carlson, I have tried repeatedly tonight to access the comment page on the NPS website but have not been able to do so. My understanding was that it was to have been available until 11:59 PM Mountain Time, on September 6, 2010 (which has yet to occur), and so I hope I have not missed the deadline for sharing my public comments. I have had a long history with clothing optional usage of a number of venues within the Fire Island National Seashore. My first interaction with the National Seashore came in the summer of 1977 when I visited Robert Moses State Park and walked East beyond the Lighthouse toward Kismet. That was also the first time I became a clothing-optional user of the beaches of Fire Island, something that was to become a high value in my life. During the 1980s and early 1990s, I spent a decade of summers as a resident of Davis Park, specifically because of its proximity to the clothing optional beach between Davis Park and Water Island. It was there that I became a Naturist, a staunch environmental advocate, and also developed my interest in astronomy. Since that time I have become a frequent visitor to the clothing optional area of Smith's Point, and, for the past two decades, have been a regular user of Lighthouse Beach (which we consider to be Fire Island's eighteenth community). For many decades those seeking clothing optional recreation, such as myself, have contributed to the diversity that makes the human environment of Fire Island such a treasured and unparalleled resource. My personal choice of Management Options would be Option #3, which emphasizes the relationship between the natural processes of the Seashore and historical/traditional human uses that have flourished in its wonderful and unique environment. Although I have long been an advocate of the natural environment, I think it is critical that the human environment is taken into consideration and synthesized with the natural environment in the future stewardship of this precious natural resource. Whichever of the four alternatives is chosen, however, I consider it imperative that the National Park Service maintain the traditional clothing optional use of Lighthouse Beach as well as other currently clothing optional portions of the Fire Island National Seashore, by the diversity of its resident and non-resident populations, as a planning priority for the coming decades. Jonathan Schatler



**Correspondence ID:** 256    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Spacer, Richard

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Fire Island NPS: Please continue to allow and facilitate clothing-optional recreation of traditional locations along Fire Island including, but not limited to, the beach commonly known as "Lighthouse Beach" near Kismet. Thank you. Regards, Richard Spacer Kauai, Hawaii

---

**Correspondence ID:** 257    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Goodell, Edward K

**Outside Organization:** NY NJ Trail Conference Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:**

Sep,07,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager Fire Island National Seashore GMP 15 State Street, Boston, MA 02109

Dear Ms. Carlson, The New York - New Jersey Trail Conference was founded in 1920 to create a system of hiking trails in the New York metropolitan region for the benefit of the public. Today, the Trail Conference is responsible for the maintenance and development of over 1,700 miles of recreational trails, including: ? The Appalachian National Scenic Trail, which we manage cooperatively with the National Park Service and state agencies in New York and New Jersey ? 240 miles of trails in the Catskill Preserve, many of which are in constitutionally protected "forever wild" wilderness status.

The Trail Conference accomplishes its mission by recruiting, training and deploying about 1,500 volunteers who contribute over 50,000 hours of skilled labor annually for the benefit of the public. Our work is supported by the Trail Conference's 10,000 members and 100 member organizations, including several with Fire Island facilities.

I am writing today to express our position on the Wilderness Alternatives in the Fire Island General Management Plan. 1. It was difficult to understand precisely the outcome of each alternative give the general and somewhat vague language. 2. The Burma Road, which serves as the primary hiking trail has a history of being under-maintained and overgrown, discouraging potential visitors and encouraging ad hoc trail making. The preferred alternative must include a commitment to manage the foot traffic in cooperation with a skilled trail organization like the Trail Conference or one of its area member clubs. In this way, public access can both be encouraged and resource impacts reduced. 3. It seems to us that Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 could be acceptable with the following qualifications and in the following order of preference:

a. Alternative 2, Enhancing Natural Resource Values, with a strong to commitment to cooperatively maintaining foot trails with hand tools, including beach access to special interest areas would meet the Wilderness Act's intent to a greater extent than any of the other alternatives

and deserves our highest recommendation. b. Alternative 1, Status Quo, with an equally strong commitment to enhance foot access and resource protection while allowing existing structures to be maintained. c. Alternative 3, Recognizing the Relationship between Human Use and Nature, would seem to offer advantages by reducing the environmental foot print of structures and visitor center but it is not clear what "new or updated amenities" and "improving the sense of entry" entail. If chosen, this alternative must include the strong commitment to maintaining the foot trail system in cooperation with user groups.

I would be happy to speak with your further about any of the issues raised above.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Best wishes in developing a management plan that best meets the needs of the resource and constituents.

Sincerely, Edward K. Goodell Executive Director

---

**Correspondence ID:** 258    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Schneider, Roni  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,08,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Ms. Carlson, I was asked by a fellow boater to write a letter to you explaining my feelings about Sailors Haven and what improvements I would like to see. I am a mother of two boys ages 18 and 23. Ever since they were 3 months and 5 years old respectively, my husband and I have taken them to Sailors Haven on our boat. As my children grew, so did the size of our boat. But, the one thing that has remained the same is our love for this treasured place. So, every summer for 18 years, this is where we have landed. We have tried in the past to expose them other places but they have adamantly refused and have only wanted to come back to Sailor's Haven (even left the Montauk Yacht Club after one day!) What started out as a few acquaintances has grown to a family of many. My family and I can walk around the marina on any given day and know most of the boaters and have a warm sense of belonging. Just recently, my oldest son who plays professional lacrosse was asked to travel with a team to Lake Placid. He turned down the opportunity to come with us to Sailor's Haven. When I questioned his decision with surprise, he told me that this is his happy place. Whenever he wants to go to a good place in his mind, he thinks of Sailor's Haven and can't wait till the day that he has a family of his own so he can bring them here. We must keep the tradition going! I have read Linda Eisners letter and have agreed with all the things mentioned that needs fixing. We would love to see more dock space and other improvements but the things that we are most concerned about are safety issues. The sand needs to be cleaned of major debris. About eight years ago, my youngest son was playing in the sand and his foot was impaled by a piece of the barbwire that was from the old fence. He was in the hospital after surgery for several days. Much to my dismay, I recently found another piece of the fence in the sand behind the west dock. It would also be beneficial to have the barbeques situated towards the perimeter of the sand to give the children unobscured areas to play without getting hurt. I must say, on a positive note, that there has been a tremendous improvement in the garbage collection. Most importantly, we need to keep this marina open. It means too much to too many people. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help. Best, Roni Schneider

---

**Correspondence ID:** 259    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Clancy, Dolores

**Outside** Operation SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,08,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** Dear Fellow Human I joined Operation Splash three years ago. I feel fortunate to be part of a wonderful organization that is working so tierlessly to improve the bays around the south shore of Long Island.

Their dedication, to try to improve our waterways with "controlled tidal flushing" is remarkable. Please work together with us to make our world better. Dolores Clancy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 260    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Greenfield, Eddie

**Outside** Unaffiliated Individual

**Organization:**

**Received:** Sep,09,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence** E-mail

**Type:**

**Correspondence:** There are elements that I favor of several of the prepared management alternatives. Limited lateral (east/west) transportation on FI has contributed - currently, as well as historically - to the varied identities of the developed communities and the overall character of the Island. For that reason and others, I'm opposed to new bike paths and walkways, for example, improved pathways between Point O Woods and Sunken Forest. Existing walkways (primarily the sandy ocean beachfront) and water taxis provide satisfactory access for many people. However, there are opportunities to create improved lateral access with some additional appropriate launching areas for human powered watercraft (e.g. kayaks). If secure launching areas don't currently exist at Sailer's Haven, facilities where a kayaker could lock up for the day might be created. Launch areas might operate at no charge to non-motorized vessels - similar to public bike racks - and locked kayaks would (hopefully) be secure. There is too much motorized traffic on FI. During all seasons, the Park Service should seek to limit beach driving to permitted, essential trips. There are extremely few occasions when a summer resident of FI must make an emergency, overland (along the beach) trip to FI. Similarly, it may be possible to encourage contractors to make greater use of available ferry service by charging vehicles for beach driving (or, charging for excessive beach driving). Can the Park Service restrict advertising planes (with banners) which fly over FI? These planes seem very inappropriate over parkland. There are many advertising alternatives which are quieter and consume less fossil fuel than these planes. The Park Service should support land use planning ? and enforcement ? which is protective of the FI environment. Certain Town, Village and other regulations are not sufficiently protective of FI's resources, permitting development which potentially affect both the communities and parkland beyond community boundaries. The Park Service should play a greater role in supporting educational programs to increase public appreciation of the FI wilderness and our natural resources. We should be more aware of the impact that humans have on the natural environment. The Park Service could support programs which would inform people about the impact of swimming pools, walking in dune areas, feeding deer, dredging to facilitate increased access of larger vessels, planting and irrigating gardens, etc. Are there things that FI'ers can do to reduce their footprint on the land (and water)? Is it possible to garden more responsibly ? plant those vegetables and flowers which may have a lesser impact the natural environment? Do docks, fishing piers and/or artificial reefs have a beneficial or

adverse impact on FI's aquatic resources? My opinions are generally more supportive of Recognizing the Relationship Between Human Use and Nature; however, several of my views differ with each of the 4 Park Service's preliminary alternatives. I appreciate the work that the National Park Service has done toward the development of a new FI National Seashore General Management Plan. Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts and opinions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 261    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Toia, Ann  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,09,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** I feel very strongly that the clothing optional section of Lighthouse Beach should continue. We cannot let a few bad apples ruin it for the rest of us. If anyone is caught on the dunes, having sex, isong drugs, etc., they should face mandatory jail time and mandatory \$2,000 fines. That will get the message out that this behavior will not be tolerated. I am a nudist and I vote!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 262    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Stein, Judith  
**Outside Organization:** Sayville Ferry Service Business  
**Received:** Sep,10,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan 15 State Street Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
  
September 7, 2010

Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager

Dear Ms. Carlson:

For almost thirty years Sayville Ferry Service, Inc. has had the privilege of providing ferry transportation to Sailor's Haven/Sunken Forest, at the Fire Island National Seashore ("FINS"). In addition to the input we provide as part of our longstanding relationship, we write to briefly comment on the preliminary management alternatives that are presently being considered.

The need for protection and preservation of the unique natural resources at FINS is recognized by all who have the privilege to visit. While certain restrictions must be imposed, protection of the area is also based on the cooperation and efforts of visitors and communities who are educated about the area and have had the opportunity to visit, and participate in its beauty firsthand. Responsible use of this natural resource is achieved by educating students and teachers about FINS and the National Park Service. Such a process involves efforts by us, together with representatives of FINS, to communicate and educate teachers, school groups (from pre-school through college) and other community clubs and groups about the National Seashore and affording them the right to participate in a visit. We find that visitors leave with a distinct sense of pride and participation in the mission of NPS to protect and enhance this valuable resource. They in turn tell others about the importance of preserving and respecting FINS, which in turn creates a larger group of individuals who support the work of the National Park Service.

We have also worked to provide responsible transportation to visitors in conjunction with the Long Island Railroad and local highway systems. In doing so we stress the responsible use of our valuable national resources. It has always been a pleasure to watch students, families and individuals of all types return from an outing at the Sunken Forest filled with excitement and awe about their experience and the unique environment. We believe that such experiences not only educate them about FINS, but teaches them the importance of protecting and respecting our valuable natural resources.

In whatever plans you ultimately adopt we would urge that the facilities be carefully and properly maintained and developed so that these natural resources are preserved and available. Responsible visitation should be encouraged in order to allow other to experience this unique area and to recognize their role in protecting it for future generations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	263	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	Lund, John				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Davis Park Association Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,10,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Comments on the Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan				

## Preliminary Management Alternatives

September 2010

### Common to all action alternatives:

Conserving and preserving Fire Island for the use of future generations will require all stakeholders to explore cooperative stewardship of Fire Island. The many levels of governance must come together to preserve our roadless island, encourage more goods and services to move by water, and enlighten and educate a larger portion of the population about this local National Park with recreational as well as unique land and marine resources. As we move together we should carefully watch and record climate and sea level changes and hopefully develop a strategy to preserve Fire Island for many generations.

### Current Plan:

The current General Management Plan is about 132 pages long without the bibliography. The Preliminary Management Alternatives booklet is 16 pages without the comment page. It has taken us years and numerous meetings to get to the 16 page draft now out for public comment. The "devil is in the details" and half of the 16 pages outline alternatives we are to evaluate and then decrease by about six pages. We will have an acceptable outline for a management plan by the end of this portion of the process. The decisions reached at this time should provide the opportunity for us to create the details needed for the Management Plan that will serve as our guide for the next two decades.

### Preferred Alternative:

Most of the people from the community of Davis Park who have attended meetings or read the alternatives tend to agree that alternative three is the best path for the future. There are specifics in each of the four alternatives that may better fit a particular location on Fire Island from the varied interest groups that make up the Islands stakeholders. Infrastructure in many communities needs upgrading to fit with new technology and some newer services. Land management with federal, state, county and town regulations will be the 800 pound gorilla in the room, but the majority of owners seem to want to retain the Fire Island single family standard. Exceptions in every community exist and the zoning advisory groups need to come together with the Towns to better control variances and insist that the values and character of their communities remain intact. Fire Island's location near the 3 million plus people in Nassau and Suffolk cries out for expansion of the established facilities at Watch Hill and Sailor's Haven to encourage new visitors to Fire Island. I have never figured out why the parents of the thousands of school children who visit the FINS facilities on school trips each year are not somehow enticed into returning with their families at some time during the summer. Boaters and day-trippers need the recreational opportunities an upgraded Management Plan can provide. In this case many would like to see more of Alternative Four. Greener marinas and resolving the bayside erosion problems contained in Alternative four are examples. It would be interesting to find out scientifically if filling in old mosquito ditches would help solve the mosquito problem on the eastern portion of the Island and encourage more visitors to your largest marina, beach and camping facilities. Alternative three seems to be the starting point where we can begin together or modify a bit to reach a better consensus and a draft management plan.

## The Future:

Since the 1960s the questions of quantity of sand in front of communities and the height of protective dunes have stalled any agreement between stakeholders on the "preservation" of Fire Island. There is evidence that our barrier island is atypical in that there seems to be more sand moving to the west and lengthening the island as opposed to rolling over into the Bay as with many other Atlantic barrier complexes. We are the middle 26 to 32 miles of beach front along the approximately 130 mile southern coast of Long Island with the least development per square mile. We have unnatural structures built on either side of us protecting different buildings, inlets, and beaches. There are some current plans to modify the ones that diminish the amount of sand moving in our direction but they will never be totally removed. We seem to be at a disadvantage sand wise and additionally as a National Park operating under a complex set of regulations in the middle of the south shore that plays with a different set of rules. Communities have come together and developed sand renourishment projects with help from FINS to "preserve" their communities and the lifestyle and history found there. Current sea level rise estimates and climate changes suggest we may not be revising too many more Management Plans so we had better finish this one to the satisfaction of most and move to retain the character and charm of Fire Island as we know it.

John Lund for the Davis Park Association

---

**Correspondence ID:** 264    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Svingos, William  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,10,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** I am totally against a public access road down the length of Fire Island. Remember Robert Moses? That's why NPS came to stop the development. And the communities are for the residents -- that's why we pay such high taxes -- Let the day trippers stay on public lands like Lighthouse, Sunken Forest, and Watch Hill. Communities like Seaview should NOT be for day trippers. Robert Moses Park, Jones Beach, and NPS public lands are for day trippers. Our infrastructure cannot handle any more people!!!

William Svingos, Seaview

---

**Correspondence ID:** 265    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Mattiasen, Lori Gillman  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,10,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Do you remember that the reason the NPS was convinced by the homeowners of Fire Island to come here in 1964 was to HINDER the

development of a public access road that Robert Moses wanted to develop. We are totally against a bike path down the length of Fire Island that would open the way for a major road.

Back off and stay out of our communities! Also against day trippers coming to our private community, I pay enough taxes for the facilities -- day trippers do not!

Lori Gillman Mattiasen

Let the day trippers go to Watch Hill and Sunken Forest -- LGM

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	266	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Rizzo, Rosalie		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Fax		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Attn: Ellen Carlson, Project Manager		

In the introduction to the NPS proposals you say it all.

Fire Island National Seashore fosters a relationship between people and the natural and cultural environment that is healthy and sustainable.

My husband and I have been going to Sailors Haven for over 40 years. We have visited other areas of the island many times, and although we love them all, our primary love is Sailors Haven. Our children have grown up there. They learned to respect the delicate structure of the island. They loved and now miss all of the activities arranged by the Rangers. They unknowingly learned so much in those activities.

We spent as much of our boating season as we could at Sailors.

Our three children, that now live in Florida, come here every summer so that their children ( 7yrs. To 18yrs.) can experience what they loved about Fire Island. My children and my grandchildren give up any kind of vacations offered to them in order to come to Sailors Haven.

My children and now my grandchildren like my husband and myself have made life long friends at Sailors Haven.

PLEASE DON'T take away this wonderful place from us and from future generations.

We appreciate the improvements made over the years, but more or better improvements can always be appreciated.



We request that any future work undertaken be done by people who thoroughly understand the environment and the right way to make these improvements. Small example, this past year charcoal barbeques were placed nearer to the walkways, now whenever someone starts a fire the smoke and ash flies into the boats and the sand where young children are playing. Some then proceed to dump the burned coals in the sand right under the barbeque.

That is one place that needs work. The sand behind the walks on the bay side is really not fit for the young children that play there. It is dirty and full of broken shells because it is the sand dredged from within the marina or surround areas. Another problem is the people with dogs do not all use the dog walks, they let their animals do their business in the sand right where the children play. I even saw one dog owner bury a large dogs business. We need much better animal enforcement.

We can also use some larger slips, because today there are a lot more larger boats, or boats with wider beams. Sometimes just putting the poles further out allows a little wider boat to fit more comfortably.

Please do not build a Hotel at Sailors Haven or Watch Hill and please do not add camping to Sailors Haven. We enjoy the relative solitude of these places.

There are many things that we can suggest, but my main message is PLEASE don't take away Sailors Haven from all the people that love it deeply, and all the future generations that will also love it.

Thank you for your concern,

Rosalie Rizzo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	267	<b>Project:</b> 16782	<b>Document:</b> 33410
<b>Name:</b>	Marsh, Dr. Ronald		
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual		
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2010 00:00:00		
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Fax		
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It Concerns:		

I am writing to express hope that whatever management option is chosen for Fire Island National Seashore, that it expressly include clothing-optional recreation in those areas in which it has been practiced traditionally.

For many years my family and I have taken day trips to Fire Island and found ideal sites to enjoy skinny-dipping and nude sunbathing. These are valid and wholesome recreational choices and enhance the diverse appeal of this remarkable area. Surveys have shown that a majority of Americans favor public government-appointed sites for clothing-optional recreation.

Yours sincerely, Dr. Ronald Marsh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 268    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Jacob, Guy  
**Outside Organization:** Nassau Hiking and Outdoor Club, Inc Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,06,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** RE: Preliminary Management Alternatives Dear Ms. Carlson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft alternatives for the FINS GMP and WMP. The 550-member Nassau Hiking & Outdoor Club is s a stakeholder with deep concern for the future of the FINS. Our club leads trips the Fire Island and many of our members recreate there with friends and family.

The concept of an eco-camp/lodge (Alternatives 3, 4) is consistent with current trends and research in environmental/outdoor education and encouraging a relationship with the natural world is a critical service that governments provide. According to Richard Louv, author of Last Child in the Woods: Saving our Children from Nature-Deficit Disorder, research demonstrates that being immersed in natural settings benefits our mental and physical wellbeing. Fire Island evokes a sense of magic and provides for an experience that finds no substitute. At a time when education is overly focused on the most up-to-date technology and vicarious learning, we desperately need governmental agencies to step up to the plate and offer opportunities for scout, school and civic groups to become more fluent in the natural sciences. The NPS has a long history of partnering with public and private schools and organizations, and this is needed today even much more so than in the past. "Much of our learning comes from doing, from making, from feeling with our hands; and though many would like to believe otherwise, the world is not entirely available from a keyboard," Louv noted insightfully in his book.

Research clearly supports the kind of learning Louv advocates for. Consistent with earlier studies, in the late 1990s Stephen Kellert of Yale University found that learning in outdoor settings enhances emotional development for both regular education students and special needs children. According to Keller, "Some of the impacts include increased self-confidence, self-esteem, optimism, independence and autonomy."

Common sense and anecdotal evidence reveal that this is the kind of learning has great potential for engendering an environmental consciousness as well. Once you touch and learn about flora and fauna, you can relate to it more intimately. If you can name an organism and

know something about its adaptations, you're more likely to realize a need to protect and conserve it. Human nature requires us to connect with other living things before we learn to care deeply about them. However, all too often young people have a far greater intimacy with their cell phone than they do with nature; staffers at FINS can do much to change this sad fact. While Louv's book focuses on young people, the research he cites recognizes the benefits of outdoor education for people of all ages, and while an eco-camp/lodge should focus its services on preadolescents, teens and college students, it should also offer programs to families and adult groups.

Serious consideration should be given to locating an eco-camp/lodge at Sailor's Haven. The Sailors Haven Motel was demolished and removed over the winter of 2005-06, so land is available there. There is also a precedent set for using this location for educational purposes. The motel had been vacant for more than 10 years, and hadn't been used for educational purposes for about 20 years. However, prior to that, this facility was used for the N.E.E.D. (National Environmental Education Development) program, a residential environmental education program. Cape Cod National Seashore's current program (<http://www.nps.gov/caco/forteachers/need-program.htm>) could well serve as a model for FINS. The land where the motel once stood is beginning to vegetate, but the benefit of such a camp outweighs the loss of this open space. Moreover, plantings and gardening could be a part of the camp experience. Due to its proximity to the Sunken Forest, its historical use and its space availability, Sailor's Haven is the best location for an environmental education facility.

Because Talisman/Barrett Beach is located on the narrowest part of the island, the potential for breaching during a storm is greater. It is, therefore, not the best location for an eco-camp/lodge. The old Talisman Motel has been condemned and is awaiting demolition. Funding for its demolition should be a high priority for several reasons. Its removal would add wildlife habitat, which would compensate for habitat loss at Sailor Haven if a camp were built. Moreover, this abandoned structure is a fire trap and a potential hangout for homeless and other curious individuals who could put themselves in harm's way by trying to enter this unstable structure. If a breach were to occur, debris from the old motel would pollute the bay and provide for projectiles that could harm wildlife and people. Furthermore, in a storm event, Fire Island is much less likely to breach if there is vegetation with an advanced root system to hold it in place, rather than a rotting building.

Not unrelated to realizing the concept of an environmental camp is the problem with the Sailors Haven Marina. As is mentioned in Alternative 3, this marina must be redesigned in order to ameliorate the bayside erosion problem at the Sunken Forest. Erosion is robbing the Sunken Forest of wildlife habitat even as it creeps toward and threatens the boardwalk that meanders through the forest. This boardwalk provides for viewing of nature and is currently used in ranger programs on nature walks. An eco-camp program would also make frequent use of the boardwalk. If this path succumbs to bayside erosion, a valuable passage would be cut off, debris would litter the bay and planks could potentially harm humans and wildlife. Dead trees currently litter the eroding bayside and also could wreak havoc in the bay should a storm project them landward. A costly endeavor, rerouting the boardwalk would require habitat destruction that would add to the cumulative habitat loss caused by bayside erosion.

In order to buy time and prevent advanced loss while a new marina is being designed, the dredging-beach replenishment project at Sailors Haven should move forward quickly. A brief summary of the marina project was presented in poster format during FINS Science Conference in April 2010 ([http://www.nps.gov/fiis/upload/2010\\_ScienceConferenceAbstracts\\_links.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/fiis/upload/2010_ScienceConferenceAbstracts_links.pdf)). It was entitled Restoring Bayside Sediment Transport Processes at Fire Island National Seashore. Sand must be dredged in order open the pathway to the marina anyway. The bayside is not subjected to the same level of wave action as the ocean-side, so building up the land there is likely to have a more long-term affect. Using this dredged material to build up the bayside Sunken Forest would have a public benefit that would save money, preserve a pathway, provide for viewing of nature and restore habitat. Beach replenishment projects that are lobbied for by homeowners associations are unethical because they use public tax dollars to benefit a few wealthy homeowners that want their property values buttressed. The Sailor's Haven Beach

Replenishment Project would only benefit the public land at the National Seashore, and, therefore, is an engineering solution well worth pursuing for the public good. Highlight this project's value in the GMP relative to its significance in protecting an old-growth maritime holly forest. Moreover, emphasize the critical need to redesign and rebuild the Sailors Haven marina.

Alternative 3 calls for "a moderate level of intervention in natural systems?to address conditions that affect human health and safety." In other words, beach replenishment is justified to protect people, which is a bogus claim. No one is going to sit in his or her home while a category 4 hurricane is on the way just because the beach in front of his or her home was "nourished."

And what is the definition of moderate? Homeowners associations insist that beach replenishment is justified because Fire Island has a long history of being engineered. In other words, since inlets have been dredged repeatedly this has influenced littoral sand drift, and, therefore, we must continue to dredge and move sand. According to their logic, once you start to engineer a beach, you must continue to engineer a beach. That's like saying a smoker should continue to smoke because he has already been smoking for 20 years.

Beach replenishment increases property values, encourages development adjacent to Coastal Erosion Hazard Areas, and promotes the movement of Coastal Erosion Hazard Area lines. But it does nothing to protect human health; in fact because it encourages risky development in a dynamic system, beach replenishment endangers human health. Alternative 3 calls for both an end to new development in the CEHA and "limited beach nourishment," but these two goals are contradictory because beach replenishment encourages development-near the CEHA and in the former CEHA if the line has been moved. "Beach nourishment" is a convenient euphemism that belies the truth. Engineering the movement of sand onto the beach doesn't nourish it; it nourishes the wallets of the homeowners who live behind it. And what's worse - it doesn't last. That's why it's repeated frequently and becomes an addictive waste of financial and human resources-mostly at taxpayer expense.

Ocean-side beach replenishment doesn't protect or enhance natural land systems; instead it presents a hazard to benthic marine organisms whose habitat is being sucked away to build up the beach. Beach replenishment doesn't save beaches because the system is too dynamic to be controlled. According to Cornelia Dean (Against the Tide 1999), erosion doesn't threaten a beach because it moves inland as a consequence of rising sea levels. In fact, Fire Island has been moving visibly landward and westward for hundreds of years according to Rutherford H. Platt (Disasters and Democracy, 1999). He cites the location of the FI Lighthouse as direct evidence; this lighthouse was constructed only 500feet from the inlet in 1858 and the inlet is now about 5 miles west of the light. Fire Island is a migrating mass and has been for millennia. It's not in danger of disappearing and should be left do its thing-move west and north. There is much evidence about the dynamic nature of the beach system, which renders beach replenishment a wasteful attempt to control Mother Nature.

Any sanctioning of beach "nourishment" by the NPS would be direct evidence that this federal agency is in the pockets of the homeowners associations. There is no scientific evidence that beach replenishment engenders long-term stable beaches. Consequently, NPS Coastal Erosion Management Policy should categorically reject all ocean-facing beach engineering projects. Instead, the NPS should encourage property acquisition by the Federal government for properties that are located in the most vulnerable areas.

No one is safe on or near a beach in a major storm, regardless of whether or not it has been replenished. The best way for the NPS to support human safety in a storm event is to update its residents' and visitors' evacuation plans, and then educate people about the plans.

A hiking /bicycling trail (Alternative 3) is a concept which is consistent with the objectives of a national park because it would increase

public access, and FINS is in need of improved, low cost public access that would provide for exercise even while it would minimize the carbon footprint of visitors. Such a trail should cross as much of the island as is feasible as long as it does not interfere with natural resource protection. There are myriad hiking, birding and bicycling organizations on Long Island and throughout the greater metropolitan area that would take great advantage of such a trail. Those who call Fire Island their home would also benefit from a designated pathway. Some homeowners are resistant to the idea of a multiuse trail; at one meeting, a homeowner complained that such a trail would increase bicycle thefts. Like anyone anywhere, it is the responsibility of the bicycle owner to secure his or her own property. This comment is likely just another way of saying that he wants Fire Island for homeowners, not for day visitors. Any policy that smacks of or outright gives homeowners preference over day or short term visitors is wrong- a national park is for everyone, not just for the privileged few.

#### Wilderness Alternatives

The Wilderness Area is subject to specific federal legislation and had been managed well in the past. The Old Burma Road historical trail, however, has been inadequately maintained in recent years. It's no longer possible to safely walk more than 1/4 mile on the trail beginning at either end because of the overgrowth of vegetation, which is not being removed. This is unacceptable and must be addressed in the final WMP Preferred Alternative.

Without a lateral through trail, there cannot be a wilderness experience. Walking on the outskirts of wilderness is not akin to being immersed in it. Rather than eliminate it (Alternative 2), initiate crucial trail maintenance and restoration. The Old Burma Rd should be restored in its entirety, not just piecemeal where the worse trail degradation has taken place. Through hikers should be able to hike the entire trail in one day, from either of its start points to either of its end points. Without a trail that is maintained, hikers and campers face a significant risk of acquiring tick-borne diseases and rashes caused by some vegetation.

Enhance natural resources (Alternative 2) where appropriate by removing nonnative species and replacing them with native plants. Pay special attention to enhancing pollination corridors and bird migration route resting areas. Evaluate the effect of deer in the wilderness area. Fencing might be required in certain areas in order to support the growth of native species.

Regarding Alternative 3, "This alternative would provide a few new or updated amenities." This is vague, but if it means erecting new permanent structures apart from structures that already exist, then it is entirely inappropriate. New construction within the Wilderness Area could most egregiously affect the character of the area and negatively impact natural resources. Allowing existing facilities to remain at Old Inlet and Bellport Beach might be appropriate if the buildings are structurally sound. Erecting a new building to replace an old one should be given careful consideration before approved in a Federal wilderness area, and it would never be acceptable to eliminate open space in order to add more building square footage or erect entirely new construction on virgin land. Whatever footprint exists for a good reason is one thing, but adding to natural area loss is wholly unacceptable. Within the wilderness area, efforts should be made to avoid new construction whenever possible.

The existing Wilderness Center serves as an educational resource, and the building should meet ADA guidelines and LEED certification requirements. More visitor programming would also be welcome.

The erection of a boardwalk (Alternative 4) would be insistent with a wilderness experience and is also contrary to Federal law. Moreover, a boardwalk would be unnecessary if the sand trail were free of debris and vegetation that could put hikers at risk. Some auxiliary trails already

exist and where feasible in so much as they provide for access to waterfront areas, they should also be maintained and restored.

Permanent Trail Markers (Alternative 4) could be useful if one were erected where the Wilderness Area begins and another is erected where it ends. These trail markers should also note the distance in mileage and behavioral expectations within the Wilderness Area. In this way, visitors will not be entering an area with the excuse that they are not aware of where they are. A marker noting a dune crossing could also be helpful because it would alert hikers where to safely cross so as not to compromise the dunes. However, because the main through trail is not intersected by other trails that could get a hiker lost, there is no need for multiple trail markers. Mark the boundaries and no more than a couple of critical safety points in-between. It is standard practice for hiking organizations to minimize the use of trail markers, strategically placing them where safety is most important. On mountain trails, there are many areas where hikers can stray and easily become lost, yet the trails are not littered with distracting markers that blot the landscape. Too many markers would detract from the wilderness experience and degrade the wilderness character of the area.

The number of camping permits issued in recent years has increased; the NPS should provide statistics about the numbers of permits granted in the past decade. We fear that any further increase will effectively rule out opportunities for solitude for wilderness campers. Encouraging crowds in the wilderness area is inconsistent with the federal legislation that created it.

The concept of fixed campsites (Alternative 4) is appropriate for larger camping areas that have high volumes of people. The desire to increase permits is consistent with the desire to designate fixed campsites, and, therefore, we reject both goals. Resource degradation will only increase if more people are allowed to camp in the wilderness area. Instead, out of fairness, issue permits to individuals and families on a biennial basis, so that who camps in the wilderness area rotates on a yearly basis.

#### Conclusion

We appreciate the length of time you have allowed for comments, which gave us an opportunity to provide a more detailed response. We also appreciate your continued encouragement of public involvement.

We understand that a GMP doesn't commit to specific actions, but a GMP should be as specific as possible in justifying its goals. We hope that the Preferred Alternative will be written with a level of detail and specificity that we have not seen in your document Preliminary Management Alternatives. The clearer your goals as an agency are the better stake holders will be to intelligently respond to your plan.

The one guiding principle that should reign supreme in all your decisions is that FINS is a public resource, and your actions should always benefit the public trust. Private homeowners are stakeholders, but their minority, personal interests should never trump the public good that seeks to do the most good for most of the people most of the time.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

For a greener America, Guy Jacob, Conservation Chair Nassau Hiking & Outdoor Club, Inc.

**Name:** La Rosa, Robert  
**Outside**  
**Organization:** The Fire Island Lighthouse Preservation Society, Inc. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,04,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence**  
**Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** General Management Comments

The following are comments for consideration of the General Management Plan for the Fire Island National Seashore from the Fire Island Lighthouse Preservation Society:

? Expand interpretive experiences at the lighthouse to include all aspects of Fire Island History, including the Radio Annex and artifacts in park collection.

? Encourage volunteerism and partnerships by providing proper facilities at the FI Lighthouse site.

? Improve lateral boat transportation from Fire Island communities through the use of NPS Lighthouse Dock by permitted commercial vessels.

? Provide adequate handicapped access to and at lighthouse.

? Consideration should be given to limiting clothing optional area to 500 feet east of the Lighthouse boardwalk to allow families to access the Fire Island Lighthouse on the ocean beach to or from Robert Moses Parking Field 5.

Regards, Robert La Rosa, First Vice President

---

**Correspondence ID:** 270    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Schuttauf, Esq., Erich E  
**Outside**  
**Organization:** American Assn for Nude Recreation Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,07,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence**  
**Type:** Fax  
**Correspondence:** Remarks of the American Association for Nude Recreation and AANR - East Region Concerning the General Management Plan for Fire Island National Seashore

Dear GMP Planning Team,

As Executive Director for the American Association for Nude Recreation I appreciate this opportunity to provide input into the GMP for Fire Island. Founded in 1931, AANR has represented over a quarter million members and their families who enjoy nude swimming, sports, and sunbathing throughout North America. The AANR-East region is dedicated to advocating nude recreation within 22 Eastern states including New York.

Preserving a Tradition ...

For many years visitors to Lighthouse Beach have enjoyed a tradition of choosing to wear as much or as little as suits them in select portions of the park. We thank you very much for that tradition and respectfully request that it continue as you plan for the next decade and beyond.

The popularity of clothes-free recreation and the importance of signage ...

Polls taken of the traveling public by well-respected and independent sources such as Roper and Gallup have consistently reported that a majority of Americans support clothing optional areas for those who wish to use them. Moreover, support for such areas increases when pollsters note that they will be delineated with signs explaining where clothing must be worn and where it may be removed. (Copies of these polls are included in the package accompanying these remarks.)

For that reason, we would appreciate the opportunity to work with your agency to develop the wording for, and fund installation of, similar signs at lighthouse Beach and other areas.

As you may know, there are a number of other federal parks and seashores where clothing-optional zones are working, and working well in addition to lighthouse Beach. On Sandy Hook (Gunnison) beach within the Gateway National Seashore, New Jersey, many thousands of people a year enjoy a clothes-free recreation on Gunnison Beach within the Sandy Hook (New Jersey) unit of Gateway National Recreation Area. Additional examples may be found in the enclosed Guide to Creating Clothing-Optional Parks and Beaches. The Guide includes pictures of signage that has proven to foster good management practice, and communication, among users.

Giving back ... Those who enjoy nude recreation are committed to being good neighbors. From coast to coast, teams of AANR volunteers have gathered to clean federal and state portions of existing clothes-free beaches, and areas that are in-the-making. There are numerous examples cited within your copy of The Guide also.

If we may be of assistance ...

In closing, I would appreciate your reviewing the following enclosed materials, which AANR requests be made part of the official record:

? Copies of a three-page article appearing in the April 30, 2008 edition of The New York Times attesting to the great popularity of nude



recreation and its draw within the travel market;

? Copies of two articles appearing in The New York Times about the success of the federal nude beach at Sandy Hook, New Jersey;

? Copies of the results of nationwide polling among leisure travelers by the Yankelovich corporation which show that 10 percent of such travelers would like the opportunity to visit a nude beach while on vacation;

? Articles about the soaring popularity of "Nakations;" and

? Materials referenced elsewhere in this letter. I also invite you to contact me at ExecDir@aanr.com or by telephoning 1-800-TRY-NUDE (1-800-879-6833) as you revise the GMP for Fire Island.

Erich E. Schuttauf, Esq. AANR Executive Director

---

**Correspondence ID:** 271    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Dupas , Nick & Jamie  
**Outside Organization:** SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,17,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Dear Ellen Carlson, Project Manager

As members of operation SPLASH, both my sister and myself support our environmental conservationist, Vic Consiglio's efforts to open a new inlet along the South Shore. This new inlet will help to flush the "dead" back bays and bring back the fish and shell fish populations. Please consider Vic's ideas carefully, he knows from years of bay experiences what he's talking about.

Thanks, Nick and Jamie Dupas SPLASH members

---

**Correspondence ID:** 272    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410  
**Name:** Dupas, Diane and Andy  
**Outside Organization:** SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual  
**Received:** Sep,17,2010 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Dear Ellen Carlson, Project Manager

As members of Operation SPLASH, both my husband and myself are writing in support of SPLASH's environmental conservationist, Vic Consiglio's efforts to open a new inlet along the South shore. By opening a new inlet the back bays will be flushed periodically allowing the water to become more oxygenated which will enhance the fish and shellfish population making the "dead back bays" more profitable for Long Island fishermen. Hopefully, the FINS GMP will support Vic in his efforts!

Thank you for your time.

Diane and Andy Dupas SPLASH Members

---

**Correspondence ID:** 273    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Cullen, Leo  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,17,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** First, let me thank you on my family's behalf for making Fire Island such a wonderful place to visit and for giving us the opportunity to stay (an live\*) here. Secondly, I am very impressed and reassured by this document and the direction (whichever combo prevails). Bravo. My two thoughts are that I don't think human activities curtail natural ones and that nature often relishes the opportunities man's shelters and activities present+. In that vein, I would say build new facilities with caution, and stick to traditions and tried and tested material (mainly wood). There is a harmony between what exists today which as you so eloquently put it offers "spiritual renewal to civilization's weary people."

\*when we are able to rent a house for the season and for those lucky enough to own.

+ if it is done in sympathy with nature

---

**Correspondence ID:** 274    **Project:** 16782    **Document:** 33410

**Name:** Weltner, Rob  
**Outside Organization:** Operation SPLASH Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Sep,20,2010 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** GMP Newsletter 2, April 20 10 Topic of Comment: Fire Island National Seashore-Best site for "Tidal Flushing Studies"

9/11/2010

Given the fact that Fire Island has been a leader in stewardship and conservation and is indeed a crucial link in the chain of barrier islands it is quite apparent that it would be best suited to consider taking a leadership role in studying and implementing "Tidal Flushing". By promoting the survival and sustain ability of not only the FINS but the Great South Bay and all those Bays and Estuaries to the East and West would validate the commitment of the GMP to engage the larger region and be part of Long Islands dynamic natural processes.

This is a unique place in time as FINS is wrapping up it's extensive and long awaited completion of the GMP and in preparing to implement it's results and findings so goes the rest of the South Bays. Through very similar exhaustive efforts over the past ten years organizations such as SPLASH, the Citizens Campaign for the Environment as well as other grass roots organizations have made great headway. Their efforts in conjunction with others have just recently resulted in obtaining funding for studies of the Western Bays and also funding for Zachs Bays' connection to an out fall pipe. A culmination of organizations, community groups, local and state legislators have finally produced concrete results. What makes this point in time so very unique and important is that they are all coming together and share important commonalties.

The most difficult as well as the most important obstacles have already been accomplished A vast audience has come together to engage in dialogue to develop plans with common understanding of the relationships of the land and the sea. A vision of the future is within our grasp and an opportunity exists to share these efforts to attempt to reverse the actions of the past with a shared understanding of what we need as well as what we can actually do. Perhaps for the first time we can reach beyond our local boundaries and have a wide array of agencies and organizations sharing their findings for a common goal. We can taut the fact that we have managed to join together the EPA, DEC, USGS, NPS, FINS, Stony Brook University and Private Agency sources, among others with funding and realized commitments. As we go forward it is important to realize that these efforts are still only plans, and that some may work and others may not but the momentum now exists for us to continue moving forward.

This brings me to the topic of "Tidal Flushing" of which this comment to the GMP is intended Having reviewed much of the data of the GMP from 2006 to date it is evident that the stated goals and plans for Fire Island and the National Seashore are intertwined and in keeping with taking actions that will sbape Fire Island and its delicate surroundings for years to come.

The stark reality of our estuaries is that they have become far removed from the condition they were in just 40 or so years ago. Estuaries and their associated wetlands have been often described as "the kidneys of coastal ecosystems". They naturally filter nutrients and sometimes even pollutants but like all systems have a maximum daily load. We are beginning to recognize many areas of our southern bays and wetlands have been exceeded to the extent that is represented by the diminished population of Sea Grass, Hard Clams, Oysters and Scallops to name a few. These particular species are very much like "the canary in the coal mine", when they die, ourselves and our environment are in jeopardy. Much of which has been evolving in the waterways can be described as "eutrophication".

Without nutrients there can be no production of plants and animals. But with too much fertilization, tidal and wind mixing in an estuary can be overwhelmed and low oxygen conditions can result. Sewage and agricultural runoff, for example, may enrich estuarine waters with nitrogen, thereby increasing primary production. As the phytoplankton die, sink, and decompose oxygen depletion of bottom water can occur. Unless the bottom water is brought to the surface for aeration, the available oxygen can be consumed, resulting in many undesirable circumstances. This process is known as eutrophication, and it severely reduces the values of many estuaries. Common adverse effects of

eutrophication are increased turbidity, loss of submerised aquatic vegetation such as sea grass, harmful algae blooms, and fish kills. The losses in the quality and functioning of an estuary due to eutrophication may result in losses to fisheries, declines in public health, reduction in the value of estuarine waters, and decreases in the value of surrounding real estate. Many of these conditions already exist and can be attested to.

Point sources such as the Bay Park sewage treatment plant are flowing over 50 million gallons a day of treated sewage directly into Reynolds Channel and the Western Bays. Only one example of several other similar plants doing very much the same. Nutrient levels in the bays have elevated to levels that encourage plant species such as ULVA to proliferate and overpopulate the estuaries to the extent that native species of grasses are severely diminished and those that survive cannot support the delicate ecosystem other living species need to proliferate. High nitrogen levels and diminished populations of Sea Grass, Clams, Scallops and Oysters have been sending us vital warning signs for many years!

Vic Consiglio of S.P.L.A.S.H has been tireless in his quest to create the means and permissions to explore sources and locations for "Tidal Flushing" of our estuaries. An action found in nature through natural tides and currents to name a few. Man with has overwhelmed this process with over development, improper use of our resources and very little oversight. We have become masters at plumbing creating an artificial planet here on 'Long Island, by tapping and piping our aquifers for fresh waters, plumbing our storm drains and sewer systems while watching our water tables drop and our streams dry up as they go underground As we are flushing more we are inadvertently flushing less when it comes to our natural estuaries. If events and conditions as described previously make apparent that "Tidal Flushing" could help restore our environment it would seem natural to explore that avenue.

As this process is by no means the ultimate solution it can serve as a viable stop gap and allow nature to take over again while we explore ways to diminish our intrusion and adapt to our environment as it can no longer adapt to us!

There are many documented stories many from baymen of Long Island waters of breaches created from storms that were not immediately closed resulting in improved water conditions and record catches of many species in a relative short period of time. Fire Islands own history of the hurricane in the 1930's causing a breach separating it from the once -continuous barrier resulting in the "Fire Island Inlet" may have inadvertently delayed the conditions we now experience in our bays. Only the fact that conditions were more pristine at the time led many to believe that it was a bad event and remembered mainly as the loss of access to the mainland resulting in isolating Fire Island Given the conditions that exist today that may have been a blessing in disguise as the Island would most likely have been over populated as well and have little resemblance to its state of today. We can remember fishing in a dead end canal in Merrick just yards from Merrick Road with schools of small blue fish in abundance. Gradually as time went on we would need to tie up to the Meadow Brook bridge just south of the Jones Beach barrier island and wait for the change of tide in hopes of catching adult Blue Fish. We just assumed the decreased populations were the result of migratory habits and that they were following bait fish coming in to feed No one could have imagined they were following oxygenated waters and leaving with the outgoing tide. Low levels of oxygen are prohibitive to spawning and most probably have been instrumental in reducing the bay environment as a nursery ground for many fish species we see in short supply now. Invertebrates can exercise some limited options of seeking healthier environments but shellfish do not have that luxury for survival and the results have been apparent! Much of the same goes for our plant species of which we have found difficult to repopulate when their presence diminishes to very low levels. Many attempts to replant have been unsuccessful resulting in the realization that with nature it is easier to save a species than reintroduce them. Our marine environment is a delicate mix of ocean, bay, inlets and tide, and the exchange between them. Nature's rhythms of change and renewal provide the natural balance to support our estuaries, which in turn can again be productive nursery grounds and a

source of harvest for years to come. Fire Island is once again in the forefront of change and its geography as a thin barrier island of some 26 miles under close scrutiny, observation and constant study would lend itself to be a prime location for a Tidal Flushing study. It would require some cross-island controlled channeling from ocean to bay. This could split the distance between two inlets and provide an exchange of waters needed to flush and rejuvenate the Great South Bay within the already allocated and funded study areas of the Fire Island National Seashore marine preserve. If considered as part of the GMP or a separate endeavor it would provide a timely opportunity to interpret results on our rich and interconnected ecosystems and promote discussion about their health and management. All stated goals established in the nearly completed GMP. Such early results could provide fruitful information for the Western Bays revitalization as that study is just beginning and will not be completed for another two years. Successful findings could lead to further implementation in more densely populated and developed barriers of the "Western Bays" and those to the east and aquatic areas between the North and South Forks as they all have experienced sea life degradation, algae blooms and fish kills over the years. All factors that could appreciate the successful study and implementation of controlled "Tidal Flushing".

This is a unique time in our rich history when so many resources have come together to solve problems which could result in the preservation and restoration of our Long Island waters, while setting a precedent of success encouraging future studies and plans for more mainland conservation and preservation as well.

We fully believe after studying the FINS GMP that this proposal is worthy of serious consideration as "Tidal Flushing" although not particularly mentioned in the Management Report seems well within the purview of its stated goals and proposed accomplishments for our future. On behalf of myself and fellow members of the SPLASH organization we look forward to the success and implementation of the GMP and extend our offer of help and cooperation in hopes of working together in the very near future.

We extend our thanks for the opportunity to express our thoughts and concerns by enabling this forum for comment.

Rob Weltner President Operation SPLASH PO Box 228 Freeport, NY 11520

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	275	<b>Project:</b>	16782	<b>Document:</b>	33410
<b>Name:</b>	Beck, Deborah B				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,20,2010 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Other				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Maintaining the current communities and ensuring that the number of non-resident visitors (except for their guests) is limited to prevent				

desecration of the natural beauty of the island and safety of its plants and animals, as well as residents. I am a 45 year homeowner and feel the detrimental effects of vandalism, theft, and debris filled beaches, the excessive use by commercial vendors of large trucks and SUVs, during the season especially. These vehicles damage property and plants and endanger the young and the elderly.

---