

Correspondence ID: 276 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410
Name: Farre, Tom
Outside Organization: Appalachian Mountain Club Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,24,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern

From Tom Farre

Re: Comment on the Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) for the Otis Pike Wilderness area on Fire Island.

As a resident of New York State and active member of the Adirondack Mountain Club, I would like to support Alternative 1- the Status Quo -- on the condition that the hiking trail be maintained over its entire length, and that the plan will be fully detailed.

I support this because I like the idea of a primitive wilderness area on Long Island, as currently exists, but feel that trail maintenance is a high priority.

When I was president of the Long Island chapter of the Adirondack Mountain Club a few years ago, I hiked the trail and found its condition unacceptable -- overgrown with brush, difficult to follow because of the lack of maintenance, and impossible to avoid ticks due to the overgrown trail. There was no way to avoid rubbing against tick-infested brush along much of the trail. As a result, even though I bundled up and used all accepted precautions, I got bitten by a deer tick that could have led to Lyme disease. Most of us were picking ticks off us all day -- not because we diverted from the trail into the brush, but because the brush encroaches on much of the trail.

Other experienced hikers who are members of the Adirondack Mountain Club share my concerns. When we had a club hike on the trail, after slogging through a poorly maintained area, most of the hikers gave up and headed for the beach. These are experienced hikers, many of them trail stewards and members of the Adirondack 46ers and Catskill 3500 Club, who found the trail unacceptable. It's now well known among our 800-member chapter that this trail is barely usable and potentially dangerous to one's health in its present condition.

Sincerely, Tom Farre

Education Chairman Adirondack Mountain Club, Long Island Chapter

Correspondence ID: 277 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Myers, Jr., George J
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,21,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: I have recently read of the plans for management of the Fire Island National Seashore: Wilderness Alternatives, on the website: LISierraClub.org and would like to express my support of the first alternative, the so-called "status quo" and here are my reasons:

As a past member of the Suffolk County Archaeology Association I attended the public hearings at the William Floyd High School on establishing the National Wilderness designation and presented their report into the hearing as a positive vote for the then proposed Fire Island National Seashore or F.I.N.S. I also worked with them in an original archaeology survey of the William Floyd Manor house, a signer of the "Declaration of Independence" and perhaps the first New Yorker. His sister was married to Ezra L'Hommedieu, notable representative and the first on our New York State Board of Regents, certifying professionals and education.

As a Brookhaven Town Parks Department employee, in 1976, I had won a summer job lottery, I traveled on the occasion of the "tar balls" sightings on the "Burma Road" and the beach, usually Town vehicles travel along the waters edge, to the excluded Bellport, NY, Brookhaven Town section, so I have some knowledge of it and that town's historic district legislation. I have also read the results found by Mr. Swanson of the NOAA, the lead researcher who investigated the wash-up, of the "tar balls" a result of pier fires in New Jersey and not moving sediments from the New York Bight, where dumping had occurred for a number of years before taken further offshore. "Penalties" Section 105 moved the 12 mile permit dumping to 106 miles offshore but a deadline for that was extended until at least December 1991.

When the William Floyd Manor property was transferred, it required some rehab before the public could safely use it. This required clearance archeology in the "impacts" (improvements) which was done by the Dept. of Interior's Denver Service Center under the supervision of Dana Linck, archaeologist, (now "Great Chain Consulting") and there, I was part of the crew. The interpretative work that has gone on subsequently is to be commended and this support should no way be interpreted as recommending that it be stopped, in fact I am of the opinion there should be more archaeology there, in the national interest, reconstruction, for example of the side garden, as is proposed for another Montauk Highway former manor, Rufus King Park in Jamaica, Queens, a NYC Landmark, I've also worked on a number of times. Rufus King was an important figure in the early days of the United States, the "last Federalist" and a Presidential candidate. He served as our first Ambassador to Great Britain after the war.

That said, I stand by the recommendations of the Suffolk County Archaeology Association and that the rest of the FINS remain "forever wild" and whatever is done there, the minimum. I might also bring to your attention the possibility of ordnance, for a seaplane base for Yale University students was once nearby on the north side of the Great South Bay in the 1930s, I've read online. There was a gun emplacement

there and large "deadly swirling holes" were described on the south side of the bay on Fire Island proper, the range, effect and surviving shells not accounted as described. Perhaps a survey should be conducted or a limiting perimeter established, as there is now at Camp Hero, the New York State Park at Montauk, NY.

Thanks for your time,

George J. Myers, Jr.

Correspondence ID:	278	Project: 16782	Document: 33410
Name:	Stoddard, G		
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual		
Received:	Sep,22,2010 00:00:00		
Correspondence Type:	Letter		
Correspondence:	Personal Comments on Preliminary Management Alternatives G. Stoddard AJune 2010 Comments are keyed to page numbers.		

Status of the GMP Process (p. 5)

Community Character Analysis and Visioning

The Nelessen Associates analysis is very valuable. The presentation to the FIA board on May 11 was the clearest articulation yet made to homeowners of the values they themselves place on Fire Island. There would be an equivalent benefit if Mr. Nelessen made a similar presentation to mainland groups such as the Lighthouse Volunteers, the Friends of Fire Island and interested environmental groups at a joint meeting. This would do much to explain homeowner motivation to mainlanders.

Water Based Transportation-Opportunities Analysis

In cooperation with contractors, haulers, utilities, law enforcement and others who must drive on the island, the park should build new marine transfer terminals on the island to make removal by truck of garbage, and construction and agricultural debris, less necessary. The terminals could provide other facilities and services, such as storage and off-road vehicle parking. Adjoining communities, contractors and ferry operators would all probably object, if for different reasons, but if the new facilities served their purposes as well as others', all might quickly adapt and the park would win praise for finding solutions to seemingly intractable issues. These include reducing shoulder season driving, and decreasing the amount of garbage, debris and other material moved by vehicle. Shoulder season driving, and pick-up by contractors of off-island labor might also be reduced by closer cooperation between the park and NYS Parks to end labor staging and real

estate client pick-up at Field 5. The GMP should not ignore this problem.

Management Objectives Common to All Action Alternatives (p. 7)

Cooperative Stewardship

1. The park may think there is more of this than actually exists. My conversations with those in town government and other mainland institutions leads me to think there is more distance between the park and these entities than the park does. To some extent this is because people adopt an "us against them" attitude when talking about any other group. (When the "us" changes, so does the attitude toward the third party.) The usually negative reaction to "I'm from the federal government and here to help you" may also play a part. Whatever the cause, all should be able to agree that "a proactive, collaborative approach to island stewardship" will require a concerted effort on the part of all who consider it important. 2. Working more closely with the Seashore on land use regulations has long been an objective of those in communities where there is concern about the proliferation of group houses, bed and breakfast lodgings and other pressures for commercial development based on appeal to mainlanders and transients. Well organized communities, such as the villages and Seaview, have been able to tighten zoning standards and limit code violations; communities that tolerate use of residential structures for other than single-family residential use have not.

Educational Outreach

The park and its program might benefit from a closer relationship with public schools. Jack Hauptman used to say that it was important to have every fourth grade science class within reach of Fire Island spend a day at Sunken Forest, so that the students would gain a sense of place and heritage. Teachers who have brought their classes there agree. A "science teachers' day" with a qualified NPS presenter showing how to maximize the value to students (and for all I know this is already done) might establish a relationship with schools that could help the park in its other relationships with mainland communities, and ultimately with the local political structure. I don't know if trips to Sunken Forest are still held. If they are not because of cost, federal grants should be available for the purpose, if not through the park then through the Friends of Fire Island or other not-for-profit organization. Ferry concessioners would likely provide a vessel without cost to the students. Grants might also be available to pay for class visits from schools that serve underprivileged children.

Climate Change and Sea-Level Rise

This paragraph is not needed. At most the issue might be acknowledged with a reference to the ongoing but as yet unsettled science that may affect park policy and procedure in the future. As written, it serves only to announce that park staff is on board with the environment community view of how the science should be "settled." This is neither necessary nor appropriate and sets up an "us against them" background to the GMP process. The park need only acknowledge that the science is developing and will affect future park policy.

Roadless Island

The Nelessen analysis indicates that islanders place an extremely high value on the island's roadless character. No one actually enjoys pulling a wagon full of luggage and goods delivered by the ferry, riding a bike with a sand chair slung across your back, or the ferry ride itself, which tends to be crowded, noisy and expensive. It is just that these are all miles above the alternative: a car or SUV in every driveway, and all that that implies. It is not clear what the word "sustainable" means toward the end of this paragraph.

ALTERNATIVE 1 / STATUS QUO / CURRENT MANAGEMENT

In Alternative 1, the park would continue its laissez faire approach, interacting with the communities and the mainland towns to the minimum extent necessary. This would be likely to result in a general deterioration, first of the communities where certain forms of rental are permitted, and eventually by adjoining communities. Communities that have asserted strong control over zoning and land use issues could be expected to continue this practice. These include Point O'Woods, Seaview, the villages and other communities with a strong central organization (Dunewood and Summer Club come to mind), along with communities with minimal commercial attractions.

At the other extreme are communities with commercial enterprises that rely mostly on mainlanders and daytrippers, and which have a season of about ten weeks, beginning on Memorial Day and effectively ending on Labor Day. Ocean Bay Park, Kismet, Fair Harbor and Davis Park are in this category. Fire Island Pines and Cherry Grove also have a very active business and social scene that attracts more of a metropolitan New York and international clientele. Both value their thriving nightlife, but recognize there are downsides to it. Outdoors speaker systems can annoy homeowners and, if "bed and breakfast" operations come to be permitted it seems likely they will proliferate in these communities more so than in Ocean Bay Park, say. Bed and breakfast operations are often run by the homeowner; "group rentals" are preferred by owners of multiple units who need to lease to a single operator for a full season. Neither requires more than one kitchen, something both towns will inspect for on request, although few such requests are made. Group houses and bed and breakfast units also are not permitted, but enforcement is rare and pressure is growing for allowing them.

In some communities, Ocean Bay Park, for example, short term family rentals are becoming popular. A vacation of a week or two on Fire Island may be preferable to one in a distant theme park to many Long Island families. The park might be able to facilitate such arrangements as a way of expanding the benefits of Fire Island to a larger population segment. Owners and realtors might find it possible to standardize leases to begin and end on weekdays in order to minimize impact on weekend ferry traffic. Group rentals of one sort or another may be inevitable in some communities, given the realities of property ownership. Recognizing this and regulating it in ways that serve owner, community and park objectives should be looked into.

Communities may adopt an attitude of "we will not pit owner against owner," or "live and let live". Some property owners take the position that they did not buy a house on Fire Island to get involved in zoning disputes. A few believe that being outspoken against an owner's wishes could result in retaliation against his or her property. Whatever the reason for doing nothing, property values and quality of life may be expected to suffer as a result.

ALTERNATIVE 2 / ENHANCING NATURAL RESOURCE VALUES (p. 10)

This alternative will appeal mostly to those who assert that resource values, meaning conditions in as close to their untouched form as possible, must be preserved, even at the expense of the island's residents, their property and their communities. In other words, Alternative 2 contemplates a continuous battle between park management and park residents over control of key aspects of life on Fire Island, rather than cooperation aimed at mutual benefit.

There are only two ways to gain control over key parcels (e.g., "high priority lands" such as property on or near the dunes). One is by voluntary sale by the owner to someone willing to deed it to the park, or when an owner agrees to keep it in an unimproved condition. The second is by operation of state law. Under New York's Coastal Erosion Hazard Area Act, a house sufficiently damaged by a storm must be removed, and may not be replaced, by the owner. This is an inducement to those who believe such houses should be removed to withhold approval of any beach protection measure likely to prolong their existence. Most owners will resist this policy for reasons that are obvious.

As the homes are a source of property and sales tax revenue, tourist dollars and jobs (of those who maintain the properties), municipal and county government generally oppose measures likely to result in beach property becoming vacant, especially as federal and state law provides almost 90 percent of the cost of protecting it. The federal Dune District is largely coterminous with the state's Coastal Erosion hazard Area (CEHA). While neither seems likely to want to cede control to the other, it is unlikely that the state will yield its present authority voluntarily.

Major environmental groups, supported for the most part by individuals who do not own coastal property, spend heavily in support of state policies expected to result in removing beach front property from individual owners.

CEHA regulations are part of state law, whether the statute is implemented by the state (as in Islip) or the town (as in Brookhaven), and are part of the regulatory landscape. But the state has an obligation to manage and maintain its immensely valuable beaches in a way that preserves them for its citizens, just as the Fire Island National Seashore does under the park's enabling act ("to preserve and conserve for the benefit of future generations"). While both statutes contemplate the acquisition of private property in extreme situations, they do not allow state or federal authorities to follow a policy calculated to cause the destruction of private property by withholding ordinary and necessary shore protection measures. "Compensating affected property owners" is not a substitute for a rational program of coastal management.

Management Alternative 2, when all is said, amounts to environmental extremism aimed at converting Fire Island from its role as a provider of a broad array of visitor uses to a single use that is suited only to the environmental elite. The fact that the description of the Alternative contains zero consideration of the need to protect the south shore of the mainland is a reason it should not receive serious consideration as a practical alternative. Fire Island may be a federal enclave, but it is also a part of New York and Long Island, which are responsible for protecting the coastline.

ALTERNATIVE 3 / RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN USE AND NATURE (p. 12)

Alternative 3 balances human needs and uses of Long Island's pre-eminent natural resource: the ocean shore. As a solution that "links the natural and cultural environments," it is generally the most practical of those offered. It places emphasis on helping residents and users realize their own concepts of community, as different influences come to bear at different times in the community's development. This is the opposite of simply letting things happen as they will, on the one hand, or dictating an approach that will cause some existing homes near the beach to fail, and then requiring their removal.

Unfortunately, the park presses hot buttons when it describes how it proposes to "help the communities attain protection of natural resources and community character." For example, to many, "Land Use Strategies" is shorthand for telling people how they may use, or should "manage" their property so that it may "transition to a more natural (landward) dune alignment." To many, these are fighting words. It is time for the park to acknowledge, as many in the scientific community already have, that the absence of regular inlet bypassing, or replenishment of sand lost to routine storms, or in the presence of erosion hot spots caused by anomalies in the offshore bar, a beach may well recede. The Plan authors assume that is a good (or "natural" and therefore good) thing. It is not. A beach can and should be maintained, not allowed to "transition" to another location. At the same time, it is a good idea for the park, the towns and the communities to agree on appropriate restrictions on new structures in the dune area, whether it is called a Dune District, a CEHA zone or dune overlay. It might be appropriate to agree, for example, that a storm-damaged house may only be replaced where and as originally built. Just because a two-room beach shack has survived decades of storms is not a reason to allow the owner to rebuild it as a five bedroom mansion, or by a structure that requires increased lot area coverage or greater height above the surrounding ground elevation.

Similarly, if an owner of dune property wants to develop previously unimproved property, expand an existing house, or rebuild a house destroyed by a fire or storm, and is not permitted to do so, he or she is, of course, entitled to reasonable compensation.

If a rational program of beach nourishment can be agreed on in this context; i.e., enough to keep the dune line more or less in place, an existing dune structure should be permitted to remain, but no new building on that dune parcel should be permitted. Clearly, the park and the towns are going to have to work together to accomplish this, but if they can agree, the communities, as opposed to individual litigants, should be willing to help.

It would be appropriate for the towns, and/or villages, to declare a moratorium on any new building in the dune area, other than the "in place and in kind" exception noted above, until the park, the communities and the towns can agree on new regulations.

ALTERNATIVE 4 / NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC USE (p. 14)

While no one would object to the park arranging for more, and more affordable, boat transport to park facilities, building a bike trail to accommodate a select type of visitor is not a good idea. Any change in the Wilderness Area may go beyond the authority of the park in updating the GMP, but the fact that the park would consider greatly increasing the amount of paved roadway and encourage a basic change

in the character of its communities, shows it is past time to re-raise the logic of a Wilderness Area in this location.

Had the National Park Service, as planned, built two or three more Visitor Centers between Watch Hill and Smith Point, a bicycle path connecting them would be completely appropriate. (Such a path seems popular at Sandy Hook.) As it is, the space needed to function superbly as an urban National Park providing diverse recreation opportunities to a major population and tourism center, has been given over to an area used only by a few members of the environmental elite, and sport fishing in fall and winter. While a hard surface road for bikes "from the west entry to Sailors haven" should be off the table, a new look at the Wilderness Area should not. Indeed, it may be that keeping the area "on the shelf," so to speak, will have served to allow the park now to recommend, based on study and reflection, how the area can best serve the American people.

The Wilderness Area could become a multi-functional area of recreational beaches, interconnected bike paths, with camping, boating, shell fishing and other attractions available throughout.

As noted above, the park believes it now "collaborates" with local, county and state officials as needed. This has not included much in the area of land use and zoning, however, since the 1972 court ruling that these fall within the area of responsibility of the towns, not the federal Seashore. This is one part of the "status quo" that demonstrably hasn't worked. In part, this is because of the seasonality, and second-home character, of most Fire Island houses. Both of these attributes translate to reasons why a Zoning Board of Appeals has little incentive to strictly interpret the zoning code for the benefit of the island. The code itself is written by mainlanders for implementation on island properties. (All the federal government did was "approve" the town codes, which, apart from dune district overlays, could as easily apply to both types of community. This might have been sufficient in a mainland context: year-round neighbors are less likely to tolerate variances that have a negative effect on their homes than they might if a "summer place" is at issue. Nor is the town rewarded by requiring strict adherence to the code. Aggressive landowners who need a zoning variance are, in some cases, willing to outspend the town's Zoning Board of Appeals and Law Department to get what they think they are entitled to. And, where the Board has allowed something similar to a previous applicant, a variance becomes an entitlement, or a precedent, because the other guy got it, and not the result of practical necessity or undue hardship. In these cases, denying a variance can be difficult, even in the rare cases where neighbors take the trouble to object.

After forty years of what amounts to federal and municipal indifference, reversing this experience won't be easy. A starting place, however, would be new federal legislation, drafted in cooperation with the communities. The first step would be creation of a task force that would review all variances allowed since the park was created to determine the nature and extent of the problem. Second would be to draft new rules, in the form of hamlet overlays, that would set forth what communities themselves would decide represented the best path going forward. The Nelessen Associates survey could be a key guideline to what each community finds acceptable.

If the park and the unincorporated hamlets can agree that it is in the long term interests of both that the codes be enforced, they can meet to set out what the ZBAs should be presented with and request a meeting.

Correspondence ID: 279 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Fedder, Norman J
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,23,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Dear Fire Island National Seashore Authorities:

I am writing in response to your call for public comment on the Preliminary Alternatives of the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for the Otis Pike Wilderness.

I strongly endorse Alternative 1. Status Quo/Current Management. I see no reason to make any changes in an area which, for the most part, has well served the public from its beginnings under highly effective management.

The only condition that I think needs changing is the maintenance of the lateral hiking trail to its full length.

I am opposed to the three other alternatives as follows:

Alternative 2. Enhancing Natural Resource Values:

This would do away with the main attraction of the wilderness area - the lateral hiking trail.

Alternative 3. Recognizing the Relationships Between Human Use and Nature: This is too general in its formulation. A plan to provide "amenities" without specifying them allows any kind of changes to be made, some of which may be contrary to the public interest.

Alternative 4. Exploring New Opportunities for Public Use: Confining public use to specified campsites is contrary to the establishment of a wilderness area as a place for campers to enjoy "opportunities for solitude or for primitive and unconfined recreation."

Finally, I suggest that the final Fire Island Wilderness Plan be written up in detail and distributed to the public, so there will be no question as to just what is being proposed.

Sincerely yours,

Norman J. Fedder

Correspondence ID: 280 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Velay, Marie-Laure
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,23,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Dear National Park Service: As a resident of New York City who periodically visits Fire Island I would like to express my support for the first proposed alternative : Status quo/Current Management for Otis Pike Wilderness, with the condition that the trail be maintained over its entire length, and that the plan be fully detailed.

Regards,

Marie-Laure Velay

Correspondence ID: 281 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Williams, Thomas B
Outside Organization: Post-Morrow Foundation, Inc. Conservation/Preservation

Received: Sep,24,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Ms. Carlson, We are writing in response to your request for comments on the Preliminary Management Alternatives planning document recently issued by FINS.

In particular, we are concerned about changes in the Otis Pike High Dune Wilderness area. FINS has cared for this area well over the years and we believe it is important to keep the area as it is today. The opportunity to go to a wilderness area so close to our intensively developed community is precious. We can appreciate the wildlife and solitude that the Wilderness area offers in a way that enhances our daily lives here on Long Island.

We support the maintenance of the minimal facilities at Old Inlet that are treasured by many residents. We strongly believe that the Burma Trail should be maintained so that visitors can enter and enjoy the area but do not feel that there should be further development or "improvements" there.

So our position is that we would strongly support Alternative #1 that calls for FINS to continue to "maintain the wilderness character of Otis Pike High Dunes Wilderness Area." Some of the statements in Alternative #3 are appealing. Certainly working with Bellport Village to expand their role as stewards appears to be a good idea but we are concerned as to what that role might be. "New and updated amenities" is unclear and leads us to imagine additions to the area that would not be in keeping with the nature of the wilderness area. The other alternatives seem vague and uncertain to us and in some cases antithetical to the existing use. We fear changes that would degrade the character of the area.

We are interested in the development of the Management plan and hope that you will keep us informed as it is developed. If we can be helpful in any way please do not hesitate to let me know.

Thank you for your consideration, Sincerely yours,

Thomas B Williams Vice President

Correspondence ID: 282 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410
Name: -
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,24,2010 21:15:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please add my name to the GMP mailing list

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 283 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410
Name: Davis, Judy
Outside Organization: Great South Bay Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual
Received: Sep,29,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: E-mail
Correspondence: RE: Comments on Preliminary Management Alternatives

The Great South Bay Audubon Society has always advocated for the preservation of the wild aspects of the Fire Island High Dune Wilderness Area. We realize that this beautiful Wilderness Area, which is close to New York City and borders the suburban area of Suffolk County, deserves the highest priority to remain in its pristine natural state.

The Great South Bay Audubon Society would like to vote for Alternative 1 - "Status Quo/Current Management."

As stakeholders, we would also like to see the Burma Road footpath opened up as this path has become impossible for walkers to navigate. Re-opening the footpath in the Wilderness is critical so that people can enjoy the charm of this area, as it was up until just a few years ago when the path became overgrown.

We would also like to ask that the General Management Plan being developed address all of the critical points of the Wilderness Area. We ask that you maintain the separate character of The Wilderness Plan in the distinct manner as it is in the current General Management Plan. This will highlight the importance of the Wilderness Area.

The Great South Bay Audubon Society requests an environmental review of allowing camping so close to the Wilderness Area because of the lack of close-by sanitation facilities. At the present time campers have no other viable means of relief but to utilize the nearby dunes in the Wilderness.

I am sure that the +/-1,000 members of the Great South Bay Audubon Society will be happy to know that you are giving us the opportunity to voice our opinions and I wish to thank you for listening to our concerns on these issues.

Judy Davis Chapter President Great South Bay Audubon Society PO Box 267 Sayville, NY 11782

Correspondence ID:	284	Project: 16782	Document: 33410
Name:	Fait, June		
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual		
Received:	Oct,05,2010 00:00:00		
Correspondence Type:	E-mail		
Correspondence:	I have written to you before regarding the Otis Pike High Dunes Wilderness Area. I have hiked there many times and feel very strongly that Preliminary Management Alternative 1 is the only answer to maintain this area's natural & unspoiled beauty. Please take my comments under consideration as you finalize the plan.		
	Thank you.		
	June Fait		

Correspondence ID: 285 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Albright, Earl

Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,26,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: I support Alternative 1, status quo, with the condition that the trail be maintained and the plan be full disclosed.

Corr ID: 286 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Dropkin, Robin

Outside Org: Parks & Trails New York Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,27,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Soller:

Parks & Trails New York welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary Alternatives for management of the Otis Pike Fire Island High Dune Wilderness. Parks & Trails New York, representing more than 7,000 members and supporters, is the only statewide not-for-profit organization dedicated to enhancing the health and quality of life of New Yorkers through the use and enjoyment of a growing network of parks, trails and open space around the state.

In general, we believe that the Wilderness has been well managed under the 1983 Wilderness Management Plan and that major changes in management are not needed. Therefore, at this point, we would support Alternative 1 in order to assure continued appropriate management to protect the wilderness character of the area and maintain appropriate use. In particular, we support maintaining the lateral trail (Burma Road) for which this alternative provides.

We would also note that we could support Alternative 2 if it were modified to allow the continued existence of the lateral trail. In addition, we believe that the Wilderness Visitor Center serves a useful purpose and do not object to its maintenance as a contact point to help visitors understand and appreciate the value of wilderness.

For Alternatives 3 and 4, we are concerned about unspecified "amenities" in the Wilderness. Given that permanent structures are prohibited in Wilderness, we are unsure what amenities might be envisioned. In any case, visitors to Wilderness should encounter nature on its own terms except for trails and adequate signage.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your ongoing efforts to protect Fire Island National Seashore for the enjoyment of future generations.

Sincerely,
Robin Dropkin
Executive Director

Correspondence ID: 287 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Siegal, Jennifer

Outside Unaffiliated Individual

Organization:

Received: Sep,28,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence E-mail

Type:

Correspondence: Please include my comments in the upcoming decision about to be made on the Fire Island Wilderness Area.

I fully support Alternative 1. or the Status Quo with Current Management in place. It is not broken so please do not change it.

The only condition for change is that the lateral hiking trail be maintained over its entire length, and that the plans for this to be fully detailed and made available for all of the public to review for approval.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours, Jennifer Siegal

Correspondence ID: 289 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Braman, Dr. Stuart

Outside Unaffiliated Individual

Organization:

Received: Sep,30,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence E-mail

Type:

Correspondence: As a long-time Long Island resident (since 1982) and lifetime wilderness lover I am writing to comment on the Preliminary Management Alternatives for the Wilderness Stewardship Plan for the Otis Pike Wilderness.

Since the beginning the wilderness area has been well managed and the primary opportunity for wilderness experience comes from the "Burma Road" lateral hiking trail. Accordingly the Status Quo Alternative 1 is the one that should be pursued. All the other opportunities compromise or eliminate the potential for this wilderness experience of the hiking trail and they should be rejected. It is critical that the hiking trail be maintained over its entire length.

Dr. Stuart Braman Adjunct Associate Research Scientist Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory

Correspondence ID: 290 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: McMonagle, Jean
Outside Organization: Unaffiliated Individual

Received: Sep,30,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Fire Island National Seashore (FIIS)

General Management Plan (GMP)

Preliminary Management Alternatives (PMA)

Review Comments from

Jean McMonagle, Year Round Resident, Kismet, Fire Island:

Draft Park Purpose: It is generally accepted, especially by those Fire Island (FI) residents involved with the original petitions to the United States (US) Congress for the establishment of the National Seashore, that the ultimate intentions of FIIS, which has a much longer available timeline than the mere 15 to 30 years this document will control, is to achieve the removal of all human inhabitants & their property from FI to ensure the resources of FI retain the "high natural and aesthetic values to the nation as examples of great natural beauty and wildness in close proximity to large concentrations of urban populations."

Please provide definitions for this document's terminology either at first usage in the document, in glossary at end of document or link to NPS/FIIS dictionary. Terms such as "government agencies", "other partners", "conserves, preserves & protects", "historic structures", "cultural landscapes", "museum collections", "archeological resources" & in general "resources" are not fully described in any part of this document & therefore, appears to be an intentional misdirection on FIIS part to deny the US public of full understanding of the FIIS's true goals for the park's purpose.

Draft Management Philosophy

It should be noted here, so not to be forgotten, that the dynamic place of Fire Island was in existence long before the creation of the FIIS. It must also be noted in this section, Congress was invited by the existing population of year-round & seasonal residents within the established communities to create the FIIS approximately 40 years ago to save it from total destruction by the civic planning & enabling legislative intentions of Robert Moses, as a representative of the State of New York.

At this point a definition of "long term resource protection" must be included to clarify FIIS long term intentions within its interpretation of the Congressional legislation giving this agency a primary purpose to protect & preserve FI's natural resources for future generations. Isn't another legislative goal for FIIS to assure the protection & preservation of resources while also mutually maintaining & protecting the integrity & resources of the pre-existing communities?

It would be prudent to include a declarative statement making it absolutely clear the Fire Island National Seashore has no intentions, at any time in the future, to remove by inaction or legislation, all existing communities, thereby completing an internal FIIS ultimate goal of removing all human inhabitants from FI land & property to support "long term resource protection".

Other areas that require clear definitions, delineated communication processes & unambiguous guidelines are FIIS' understanding, intentions & expectations in the collaboration & stewardship among "the island communities, the government agencies, and all Seashore partners". To date, FIIS interactions & communications with the island communities' inhabitants are unreliable, inconsistent & thereby suspect, at best. This is exemplified by FINS conducting only two public meetings in The Pines & Ocean Beach regarding this document within the last few weeks of August 2010 before the final comments are due back to FIIS.

If FIIS is relying on the input from representatives of voluntary FI or community organizations, it is FIIS responsibility to validate these so called association representatives are not acting only for themselves; but rather communicating with all members of the island or community before rendering any opinions back to FIIS.

The Kismet Community Association leadership has a history of making documented decisions representing this voluntary community organization member's opinion before the membership, never mind the community population are even aware of the issue for consideration, discussion &/or agreement.

What is FIIS' validation plan to assure this type of poor communication, lack in judgment & subsequent misrepresentation of FI community opinion does not occur in the development of this park management document & future communication to achieve a collaborative approach to the stewardship of FIIS management?

Draft Park Goals

Resource Management

1. There is no mention or reference to the preservation of the FI communities' resources & distinctive characters. What is the true intention of this goal?
2. Please define the term "holistically" & its function as a FIIS process of management?
3. What are the current & future FIIS guidelines & information that determines the maritime environment & its cultural & natural systems

needing preservation? Will this goal end the individual use of watercraft for more controlled systems such as the Fire Island Ferry for transportation or Captree Charter fishing boats for fishing?

4. Without definition of "cultural & natural resources park wide with consideration of their broader context"; this goal makes absolutely no sense, except to establish that FIIS will do whatever they want to do when they want to do it!

Land Use & Development 1. "Partnering with others" is an ominous goal. Please define the qualifications & FIIS selection process for these "others", as well as the FIIS decision tree & oversight table of organization for this goal & these "others". Visitor Experience, Interpretation, Education & Outreach

1. Does this goal include vigorous outreach & education to the FI year-round & seasonal community residents to support their vital stewardship role in the park management?

Transportation & Access 3. This goal is completely ingenuous & panders to impress an uninformed public. At this time, the round-trip cost for one adult on the FI Ferry is almost \$20.00. Does this mean FIIS will be supporting & enabling legitimate business competition to the Fire Island Ferry Co. or subsidizing the ferry transportation costs to meet the goal of broad public access to FIIS park resources regardless of income?

Park Operations, Maintenance & Facilities

1. If FIIS is serious about this goal, then why has it consistently been obstructive in support of the tickicide project & has now completely prevented the continuation of the deer contraception program by not providing the necessary paperwork to the Department of Environmental Control (DEC)?

The deer contraception project has successfully decreased the birth rate of the FI deer population for many, many years, thereby negating the need to intentionally hunt & kill the deer to control the population.

The tickicide project has decreased the deer tick population existing on the FI deer population receiving treatment, therefore is successful in decreasing the number of parasites available to carry lyme disease to visitors, residents & NPS employees.

Preliminary Management Alternatives Overview

This introductory summary of the following pages of plans & information is evidence of FIIS' actual "fishing expedition" of a mission for this entire document to discern the true level of the public's knowledge of the park, their interests, concerns & what level of FIIS "management, control & ownership" will be accepted & tolerated by the general public, as well as the citizens of the existing FI communities.

After all is commented upon, FIIS clearly states it will do what it "prefers to do" or rather doing exactly what it wants to do to meet the

"park's purpose & goals" without ever clearly stating whether those true ultimate goals amount to the systematic removal of all people, communities & properties, until all within & adjacent to FIIS on this barrier beach island is completely controlled by & a financial benefit to the FIIS & subsequently the National Parks Service (NPS) of the USA.

The final paragraph is the initial document discussion of the financial distributions to FIIS & "partners". The plan completion & subsequent financial remuneration will occur within the vaguely described systems such as "cooperative stewardship" or "implementation of the management plan forward in a collaborative way". There are two organizational formats suggested which encompass the ridiculous to the sublime.

The Fire Island Law Enforcement Council site found at www.suffolkremsco.com/clientupload/downloads/fire_isl_safety_and_law_enforcementdescription.pdf contains a 1/2 page of undated, unverifiable & poorly identified information. The council page contains no details about the legitimacy, qualifications, accountability processes or an overseeing agency; never mind if it is a volunteer or monetary fee for service organization.

The Long Island Pine Barrens Commission site found at http://pb.state.ny.us/chart_stewardship_main_page contains an extensive, detailed & verifiable source of information about the laws, multiple agencies, guidelines & legitimacy for the Commission's existence & functions. The site provides easy access to mission statements, meeting schedules, regular meeting minutes & annual reports. This is not a volunteer organization.

In either organization's case, the process of how the monetary funding is budgeted, approved or overseen is not clearly identified or described.

It is imperative in the development of this FIIS GMP, especially in the current untrusting political climate of the USA, any fiduciary relationship between FIIS & whatever form of worker or "partner" employed for the park's support or purpose must be clearly documented. The selection, payment & accountability processes must be documented & made transparent to the general public for their understanding & oversight.

Status Of The General Management Planning Process

Except for the 6/25-27/07 Stakeholder's Foundation Workshop report found on the FIIS website, all other workshop reports referenced in this section were NOT found after a long & tedious FIIS website search; therefore unavailable for review & consideration.

On Going Activities

Community Character Analysis & Visioning

Where, when & how is the independent consultant, A. Nelessen Associates of New Jersey conducting the workshops to complete the community character & visioning activity? Being a year-round resident of Kismet, this is the first time I'm aware of such an opportunity &

would like to be involved with this data collection process.

Water Based Transportation ?Opportunities Analysis

I do hope the US Dept. of Transportation's Volpe Center completes an analysis that keeps in mind water transportation is very costly in terms of money, time & especially fossil fuel requirements. To my knowledge, there are no current ferry or boat building plans that use renewable or sustainable energy sources. Also, multiple service providers encourage a competitive business atmosphere which helps to keep control costs.

Preliminary Management Alternatives:

Common To All Action Alternatives

Cooperative Stewardship

This is an area where FIIS must be very clear on their definition of "stewardship" & "others"; as well as the vetting & qualification process for those "others" that will work with FIIS "to improve land use planning & regulations & make positive change related to the management of the Seashore & related areas & entities".

Ultimately, a well documented & transparent interaction, communication & accountability process between these "others" & their constituents &/or communities must be included to assure cooperative stewardship is operating & effective.

Educational Outreach

Education is excellent! What's the plan? Where is it happening? How will FIIS assure this education is equally available to the individual FI communities as it is to the general public, especially with the realities of transport restrictions on FI?

Submerged Marine Resources

Please define "cultural marine-based resources" and how this management plan will affect the recreational use of the Great South Bay & the individual community activities.

Is it possible for FIIS to encourage & support the reinvigoration of oyster & clam growth & development for local FI community use?

Climate Change & Sea Level Rise

Please define FIIS intentions & potential actions to "implement sustainable strategies for adapting human activities to dynamic coastal processes & climate change & sea-level rise".

Roadless Island

The GMP PMA states, "The Seashore would work with the communities, county, state and others to manage the island's transportation system in a manner that supports a roadless environment where driving is kept to a minimum, except at designated areas on Fire Island's east and west ends.

The questions for the above reference are: What is the designated area on east and west Fire Island? Specifically, does it include the hamlet of Kismet?

What exactly does FIIS mean by asking the "FI communities to do the same with their ferry operators" to encourage ferry operators to operate more sustainably? Doesn't FIIS have a working relationship with the ferry operators servicing the FI communities?

Public Information, Orientation & Wayfinding

I must insist that FIIS establish a documented, verifiable & transparent process to request & receive an entire community's approval before implementing or installing any physical FIIS public, orientation or wayfinding information, such as the FIIS posters now in physical existence on Kismet's Bay Way.

Although a very good idea, there was no community discussion for approval of this FIIS installation. Whomever in Kismet gave their approval, did so while misrepresenting the community's approval and subsequently the posters have been established in an unattractive & inappropriate location.

Preliminary Management Alternative 1

Status Quo/Current Management

Natural Resources

Cultural Resources

Community Resources

Please define the purpose & process for FIIS use "of land acquisition & would consider the use of condemnation consistent with the current law to meet resource protection goals".

The ability for damaged or destroyed properties to be allowed to rebuild or repair is of MAJOR VALUE to the FI communities.

A reference is made to a NPS sponsored ethnographic overview & assessment of the FI communities in 2004 which is not available on the FIIS website for review, yet is used as supportive information to maintain the status quo. Please provide a link to or document copy to enable review of this study.

The FI driving permit application, qualification & approval process remains a convoluted & mysterious mess; highly suggestive of inequality, dishonesty & corrupted activities.

It is also one of the biggest, never ending, pain in the butt issues for FIIS. The final FIIS management plan should create a well documented & transparent process map inclusive of all individuals & municipal agencies involved in the permit approval, as well as the detailed approval process itself.

To be effective, this process information should be all together in one place, not separated as it is now. All approval agencies should be verified & vetted by FIIS with this information readily available for review by the public.

Where is the impact study which determined the actual numbers of vehicles allowed on Fire Island? I didn't find it on the FIIS website.

Visitor Experience

One reason for the segmented visitor experiences between FIIS & the FI communities is due to the expensive, inconvenient, tedious & therefore discouraging transportation system between the two areas.

Also, the park's experience although beautiful & serene is rather dry & dull, not very imaginative or exciting after the initial experience, such as the FI Lighthouse ghost stories event.

Facilities

The new structure for the FI Lighthouse lens is a very good idea, but is it the UGLY, MONSTROSITY of a structure which is being constructed to the western side of the FI Lighthouse? The lens does not warrant a building that large. It has already ruined the pristine beauty of the lighthouse area.

Wilderness

I have been told the dunes were full of vegetation such as rose hip bushes before the deer ate it all away only a few decades ago. This plant life also held the dunes in place.

Is there a way to replenish this vegetation & still coexist with the deer?

Preliminary Management Alternative 2

Enhancing Natural Resource Values

Natural Resources

This plan would decrease the number of visitors enjoying & using the park, is that really a desired FIIS goal?

Cultural Resource

Does this plan include moving the FI lighthouse museum?

I don't understand the goal of moving cultural resource items of interest to park visitors off Fire Island, thereby making them unavailable for interaction & enjoyment.

Community Resources

Is this entire section actually code for "FIIS is planning with the help other people & outside agencies to take your individual property & decrease the size of or remove the communities entirely from Fire Island"?

The proposed plan of "No reconstruction would be allowed after a major storm event within the communities or in the Seashore district" is completely unacceptable! Please define the "others" that would work with NPS "to arrive at a meaningful strategy for compensating affected property owners".

Visitor Experience

Under this plan would the visitor experience in the Seashore center "on close contact with and immersion in the natural landscape" also mean that all concession stands selling profit generating items be removed, as well as any camping opportunities to make the park usage "lighter on

the land"?

Other than blocking the Burma road or the beach itself, how could the physical connections between Seashore sites and the communities be more limited or diminished?

The final plan in this section proposes to turn the FI experience into a virtual, rather than real experience. Is this really the primary mission of the NPS & FIIS? Does the US public want "Fire Island Under Glass"?

Facilities

FIIS proposal to erect & dismantle temporary facilities, as well as the storage of same is a labor intensive & costly plan with little benefit to keeping the FIIS landscape a more natural experience. Whether permanent or temporary, the park facilities existence alters the landscape from its original, untouched appearance.

Wilderness

If FIIS' desire is to remove all traces of humanity from the wilderness sections of the park, that is its prerogative, but it must also be remembered the communities of FI were in existence many, many decades before the NPS was invited by those community members to create the FIIS. Therefore, any FIIS management plan changes to the areas around the FI communities, would be interfering with FI's natural state.

Preliminary Management Alternative 3

Recognizing The Relationship Between Human Use & Nature

Natural Resources

Please define FIIS understanding of "adaptive management" & "change".

Please define FIIS interpretation of "A moderate level of intervention in natural systems? to address conditions that affect human health and safety".

To date, FIIS has been relatively discouraging of the 4 poster-deer tickicide project which is proving to be very effective & environmentally friendly, as well as not completing the necessary work with the DEC to continue the deer contraception program. Cultural Resources

FIIS willingness to share their technical assistance with the island communities wishing to inventory, protect & interpret their historic and cultural assets is generous & an excellent way to breakdown those invisible barriers keeping the FI communities & FIIS relationship at a

precarious & untrusting distance.

Prior to this type of mutual project beginning, to assure success, it is imperative to prepare a defined & transparent communication plan, work group selection process, functional responsibilities, organizational table, reporting & follow-up procedures.

Implementing a thorough public communication plan will enable a positive work group experience & ultimate communication of same back to the communities; especially by assuring that all community members are aware of this opportunity, thereby not just relying on the usual FIIS supporters. If FIIS is honestly interested in developing better relationships with the communities, an efficient use of time will be to search out the community individuals really interested in the project & not just those involved only for the associated appearance or reality of influence or power within FIIS.

Community Resources

FIIS understanding, definition & intentions of "the communities will continue to evolve in a responsible & sustainable manner" must be included in the final management plan.

As stated here, "The Seashore would work closely with Island communities/towns using a variety of means (e.g., community design initiatives, town regulations, community infrastructure, selective land acquisition or transfers) to help the communities attain protection of natural resources & community character".

Again, this is an area where clear definitions & transparent processes are essential for understanding, harmony & success to occur.

One major, overall issue is how the community representatives be qualified & selected to work with FIIS on these highly important decisions for FI community life.

For example, the current & longstanding elected & self-appointed representatives of Kismet tend to be exclusionary, myopic & disrespectful of any ideas, opinions or projects, other than their own, for the Kismet community.

Community representatives selected to work with FIIS on the proposed management strategies & committees must possess objective interpersonal & communication skills to adequately represent the entire community of Kismet inhabitants on the development of regulations enabling & controlling important issues such as transitioning the dunes to a more natural, landward alignment; rebuilding or not rebuilding demolished home properties in the CEHA or working to arrive at a meaningful strategy for compensating affected property owners, e.g., those home owners losing their homes & property.

As stated in the previous cultural resources section, FIIS' interest in creating a more integrated park/community experience must begin with

the communities' positive experiences while interacting with FIIS.

The FI communities are not interested in any FIIS plan that would NOT ALLOW the beach renourishment as needed, the current dune line to be maintained & any beachfront or other home to be rebuilt or remodeled, especially after damage has occurred.

Visitor Experience

A more linked visitor experience between the FI communities & the Seashore sounds great. What exactly does FIIS have in mind to accomplish this goal?

Facilities

Making the FIIS facilities more efficient, eco/energy sustainable & user ready for the 21st century visitor is an excellent goal. Although proposed over & over again as a FIIS facility improvement, the bike/hike trail is a fantastic idea. It would improve access for residents & visitors to more easily visit & interact between the park & community areas along the trail.

If FIIS honest intention is less separation between the park & the communities, then easy & less expensive access must be made available to accomplish the goal.

Would the creation of this bike/hike trail affect or diminish current or future property rights or ownership in the FI communities?

Wilderness

Rehabilitating the Wilderness Visitor Center to meet ADA compliance is the RIGHT THING TO DO! LEED certification is good too.

Preliminary Management Alternative 4

Exploring New Opportunities For Public Use

Natural Resources

Cultural Resources

Community Resources

This alternative allows for home rebuilding, BUT does not define the intentions of the proposed "adopted plans, land use regulations &/or

design guidelines" permitting the rebuilding. Would the proposed "limited beach nourishment" require the dredging of the Moriches inlet or would separate sand be supplied?

Visitor Experience

The proposed expansion to "integrate complementary experiences throughout the region" is an EXCELLENT IDEA.

It should increase the number of visitors to the park & communities; thereby improving business & revenue generation all around.

Facilities

Working towards making the Fire Island communities & the park part of a regional model of sustainability & working together with the South Shore communities to achieve coordinated conservation are very attractive & laudable goals; but how would it be possible, while maintaining the FI communities' individuality & independence?

A lateral bike/hike trail from the west entry to Sailor's Haven WOULD BE FANTASTIC!!!!

The location, subsequent ownership & management are the real questions.

Wilderness

This alternative is the polar opposite to PMA 2. More access to the park is a good thing, as long as it doesn't turn in to Disneyland. The serene beauty of FI must be sustained & maintained.

Corr ID: 291 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410
Name: Krause, Susan
Outside Org: Four Harbors Audubon Society Conservation/Preservation
Received: Sep,30,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,

Four Harbors Audubon Society, with members totaling over 500 people,
Support Alternative 1- the Status Quo - with the condition that the trail be maintained over its entire length, and that the plan will be fully detailed.
Thank you, Susan Krause President FHAS

Correspondence ID: 292 **Project:** 16782 **Document:** 33410

Name: Cox III, Robert L
Outside Unaffiliated Individual
Organization:
Received: Sep,30,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Letter
Type:
Correspondence: Re: Fire Island National Seashore General Management Plan

Dear Ms. Carlson;

Attached please find comments for your consideration concerning the alternatives proposed in the Preliminary Management Alternatives document published for public comment

I understand that these comments are being submitted after the official deadline, but understand that the deadline may have been extended to the end of this month.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment and hope that the views expressed may be of assistance in your work to devise a General Management Plan for the oversight of the park going forward.

Comments on Proposed General Management Plan

The Fire Island National Seashore is a unique park among the constellation of national parks. It is at once an area of relatively unspoiled and undeveloped beaches, dunes and other natural features and yet, at the same time, home to some 17 vibrant, long established and pre-existing residential communities. This unique blend of residential and natural characteristics requires a General Management Plan that acknowledges and accommodates the needs of both aspects of its unique personality.

The residents of the Fire Island communities have a long-standing and intimate love and appreciation for the fragile nature of the barrier island. They have been active and forward-looking stewards of the seashore. It is well established that the residents of the barrier island were key opponents to development plans proposed nearly 50 years ago that would have fundamentally transformed the island by having a highway constructed down the center of the island. In many ways it was this activism by the residents that led to the formulation of the Fire Island National Seashore.

This historical background is crucial to formulating a statement of purpose that captures the nuances of this unique habitat Accordingly, the Draft Park Purpose and Management Philosophy must reflect two somewhat divergent and competing segments of the Park. Some concepts that should be incorporated are as follows:

? The GMP must promote and protect the preservation of the natural environment in those areas that have been and remain undeveloped.

? The GMP must also actively preserve and protect the beach front and shore line in the areas of the park that have been historically developed and recognize that those communities have a legitimate presence and rightful claim as joint stewards.

? The GNP should balance the enhanced access of the Public to the parklands with the fragile and limited infrastructure that exists or can exist on the barrier island. This requires a thoughtfully developed plan for expanded Park services.

? The GNP must recognize and protect against the risks of overdevelopment both within the residential communities as well as within the park services facilities.

"Natural Change"

There appears to be a bias running through the draft narrative that presupposes that natural, unchecked forces should be allowed to proceed unabated to establish a proper outcome for the barrier beach ecosystem. This may be a proper determination for a truly isolated, undeveloped barrier island, but it can't be a proper, rational, or practical philosophy for the unique barrier island that Fire Island represents. First and foremost, it is well documented that Fire Island has been the object of external intervention for many decades. This intervention fundamentally altered the natural forces that would have renourished the south facing beaches. Second, there are residential communities that have been long established and represent a vital interest in and have a significant financial stake in the properties that would be compromised by such a policy. Third, the residential communities provide a sizable tax base that support local government and the broader economic community. Finally, the barrier island provides a critical function in protecting the low-lying communities that run the length of the south shore of the Long Island mainland. The deterioration or destruction of this protective barrier island through a benign acquiescence to "natural unchecked forces" would have catastrophic consequences on these communities and the essential services that they provide.

Accordingly, any reference to a policy of acquiescing to or accepting the consequences of "natural change" should be stricken and replaced with a policy of controlled management of the barrier island to protect and preserve the existing shoreline, beaches, and dunes. At the same time the policy should protect against over-development or further encroachment into the dune front. Structured beach management and of the entire eco system must be identified as a mandate.

Land Use and Development Goals

The NPS should commit to a partnership to ensure that land use practices balance ecological, health and environmental qualities within the context of valid, legitimate residential usage.

Visitor Experience The NPS must recognize the fragile nature of the ecosystem and the limits in the available supporting infrastructure. These limits pose real constraints on visitor traffic and development of expanded services.

Transportation and Access

NPS must be mindful that access can and must be limited by the natural or practical limits of local infrastructure. NPS and community sanitation, utility and public health and safety support services are not able to accommodate significant expansion.

Preliminary Alternatives- Common Elements- The draft should not over emphasize or endorse the hypothesis that we will experience near term change in seas levels or climate. At present there is no consensus in the scientific community to support these theories and, therefore, a plan that embraces these risks may drive decisions that are speculative based on the science.

Alternative 1 - Status Quo. This is an attractive outcome, although better efforts must be made to manage against over-development in some of the communities. Further a better balance must be struck between the preservation initiatives and residential needs.

Alternative 2- Enhancing Natural Resources. This alternative is not desirable. The emphasis of natural resource restoration in the current situation is a non sequitur. The barrier beach does not represent a natural resource as it has been fundamentally altered by mismanaged intervention of external forces over the past many decades. The beach today is not in a natural condition, and the unhealthy condition has been created by the intervention has caused the beach communities and the government's to engage in numerous active nourishment activities to compensate for the disruption of the natural littoral flow. A prerequisite to a well grounded strategy to enhance natural resources would require first and foremost the reestablishment of the natural flow of sand as contemplated in the comprehensive, system wide restoration project that has languished in governmental review for decades now.

Alternative 3- The Relationship between Human Use and Nature. This alternative proposes a moderate level of intervention in natural systems to address conditions that affect human health and safety. The proposal that the NPS would promote strategies that provide for a northern alignment of the dune line is not acceptable. For the reasons stated earlier, the northern retreat of the dune line has been abetted by the interference of the normal littoral drift and preservation initiatives that can continue to support the existing beachfront topography. While there is room for improvement in the limits to be placed on further development in the dune districts enhanced beach re-nourishment must be a priority and not limited- other than to say there is a sculpted beach profile that must be maintained.

The linkage of visitors between the park facilities and the residential communities must acknowledge the strain on resources that this can place on the community infrastructures and take those limits into account The establishment of a formal bike/hiking trail must be limited to those facilities within the Park area and not through the residential communities which run the risks of introducing higher per diem traffic and associated crowd control and public safety support issues.

Alternative 4- Exploring New Opportunities. Again we object to the formal adoption of a policy that accepts as "more natural" a northern dune migration given the "unnatural" state created in the beach ecosystem. Beach nourishment needs to be a mandated not a moderate level of activity. Facility expansion must take into account the expanded infrastructural support and public health and safety services that would be required along with it.

A bike trail from the western entry point to Sailor's Haven creates a host of unintended consequences for the communities that would be bisected- most of these relate to public health and safety support to control the visitors -especially in the off season when local resources are at their lowest ebb.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments and observations.

Robert Cox Saltaire, New York September, 2010

Correspondence ID:	293	Project:	16782	Document:	33410
Name:	Posillico, Mario				
Outside Organization:	Village of Saltaire Town or City Government				
Received:	Sep,30,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Fax				
Correspondence:	Re: GMP Newsletter				

Dear Chris:

Thank you for including the public and the communities in the planning effort for the development of the General Management Plan prior to the issuance of the official Draft GMP/EIS for public review. I offer the following comments for consideration in preparation of the official draft.

Draft Park Purpose The draft lists three overarching purposes for the Fire Island National Seashore, that is to conserve, preserve and protect: (i) "relatively unspoiled beaches, dunes and other natural features and processes", (ii) "historic structures, cultural landscapes, museums collections and archeological resources associated with the Fire Island National Seashore" and (iii) the primitive and natural character of the Otis Pike Fire Island High Dune Wilderness." What is glaring in its omission is the purpose of preserving, conserving and protecting the cultural, social and economic resources of the 17 communities within the park. They are a significant component of the Fire Island National Seashore and a major part of what makes it unique and attractive to residents, guests and visitors. The Village will be happy to meet with the you and the planning team to assist in drafting language that will add that important component to the Park Purpose of the Draft GMP.

Draft Management Philosophy

The concluding statement in this section that "a collaborative approach to stewardship among the National Park Service, the island communities, government agencies, and all Seashore partners is essential" is well stated, precisely what is needed for long term management and an encouraging direction away from the unfortunate adversarial positions of prior administrations. This direction makes it all the more

imperative that a component be added to the Park Purpose including the protection of the resources provided by the communities so this cooperation is indeed mutual and can be used to assist in that vital purpose as well.

Common to All Action Alternatives

It seems that providing for a sustainable strategy of shoreline management would be consistent with all four alternatives. We request the opportunity to meet with the planners to support that position and to help draft acceptable language for inclusion therein.

Community Resources in Alternatives 3 and 4

Both alternative numbers 3 & 4 have the following statement: "Land management strategies would provide for a transition to a more natural (landward) dune alignment". Without getting into the debate of whether landward dune alignment is indeed a natural occurrence, it seems not a proper goal of land management strategies. The first two alternatives have the more correct goal of land management, that is to "foster land protection" and not the promotion of landward migration as stated in the final two alternatives. The current language seems inconsistent with the overall direction of Alternative #3 and may become a poison pill for what otherwise might be a very manageable alternative. We request the opportunity to discuss this further and assist if possible in the re-drafting of this language for land management strategies.

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate in the planning of the Draft GMP. We look forward to the Village of Saltaire's increased participation as the process continues.

If you have any questions about any of the foregoing, please feel free to contact me at (631) 58375566.

Sincerely, Mario Posillico Village Administrator

Correspondence ID:	294	Project: 16782	Document: 33410
Name:	Solomon, Nancy		
Outside Organization:	Long Island Traditions Conservation/Preservation		
Received:	Oct,13,2010 00:00:00		
Correspondence Type:	Other		
Correspondence:	In reading through the proposed Management Plans, I would recommend the following:		

Management Alternative 3 or 4 are perhaps the most conducive to maximizing the potential for appreciating the cultural and natural resources of the area, and would strengthen the role of communities on and off the island. The recommendation of using ecologically sensitive approaches to existing camp sites, marinas and trails is a valuable one, and will help local communities integrate these strategies

into their shoreline planning efforts. From a visitor standpoint it will also help integrate the various perspectives of the Island's history and cultural traditions in a more thoughtful manner, one that recognizes the various stories and experiences of different types of residents and visitors. Ideally this will also lead to more cultural resource surveys, hopefully funded by NPS to local communities, which will lead to more interpretive opportunities such as self-guided audio tours, guided walking tours, festivals and other events that provide a stimulating experience for year-round and seasonal residents and visitors alike. Within this context it would be exciting to see local traditional bearers such as fishermen, boat builders, carpenters and those involved in the building trades, boat captains as the leaders of interpretive tours.

Alternative 2 is worrisome in that it can lead to the elimination of commercial and recreational fishing, long standing traditions in this area and an important economic engine to the region, and also limit the interpretive approach to natural resources, rather than one that examines the cultural development of the Island.

Correspondence ID:	295	Project: 16782	Document: 33410
Name:	Teague, Doug		
Outside Organization:	Unaffiliated Individual		
Received:	Oct,11,2010 00:00:00		
Correspondence Type:	E-mail		
Correspondence:	Special consideration needs to be a part of any driving regs for the eastern communities. All regs have been designed and written for the western communities as they are more involved. The eastern ones however, are, and function very differently. Service work for example takes place during the day and the only way to access between the eastern communities is via the beach. There are no inland roads and limited public boats. Also by current regs "residents" can abuse their permits based on the school season. From the first day of school to the last for example, W. Boss drives garbage and materials on and off regularly even though there are adequate ferries freight boats and his own work boat for several overlap months.		
