

APPENDIX P

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P.1 INTRODUCTION..... 1
P.1.1 Public Comment Period and Public Information Meetings 1
P.1.2 Summary of Coordination..... 1
P.1.3 Public Views and Comments 2
P.2 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES..... 4
P.2.1 Form Letter Comments and Responses 4
P.2.2 Categorized Comments and Responses 6
P.3 CONCLUSION 16

LIST OF TABLES

Table P-1. Agencies and Organizations That Submitted Comments 3

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment P1 Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses

P.1 INTRODUCTION

This Comment Response Document (CRD) provides an overview of the public comments received subsequent to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) public outreach and coordination conducted for the Fire Island to Montauk Point New York (FIMP) Coastal Storm Risk Management Project and the associated responses.

Section 1 of this document presents introductory material, including: the public comment period and the public information meetings (Section P.1.1); an overview of coordination efforts during development of the Draft Hurricane Sandy General Re-evaluation Report (Draft HSGRR) and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) (Section P.1.2); and a summary of the public views and comments (Section P.1.3).

Section P.2 presents the specific comments that were received on the DEIS in greatest number, with corresponding responses. Section P.2.1 presents the Form Letter comments and responses, while Section P.2.2 presents a response to additional comments from individuals and local entities, grouped by topic/category and responded to collectively. Lastly, attached is a detailed list of the public comments received, with responses; this list is included as Attachment P1.

P.1.1 Public Comment Period and Public Information Meetings

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York District (USACE NYD), in partnership with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) announced the availability of the Draft Hurricane Sandy General Re-evaluation Report (DGRR) with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on July 19, 2016. Initially the public comment period on the DrGRR/EIS that was scheduled to end on September 29, 2016. USACE extended the comment period to October 19, 2016, resulting in an overall 90-day public comment period. USACE requested public comments via mail, e-mail, and facsimile.

During the comment period, two public information meetings were hosted by the cooperating agencies, USACE NYD, NYSDEC and the U.S. Department of Interior, along with Suffolk County to provide information to the public about the Project. The meetings were held in Suffolk County on September 27 and 28, 2016. The presentation materials from these public meetings are available on the project website¹.

P.1.2 Summary of Coordination

Throughout the NEPA process, the USACE has coordinated closely with other Federal, State, and local agencies, and the public. In addition to the public information meetings identified in Section P.1.1, USACE has met with Federal, State, and local agencies on many occasions. These meetings have provided the parties an opportunity to better understand the Project, discuss issues of interest, and develop proposed improvements to the Project. The description of the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) as presented in the DEIS is reflective of these coordination efforts. Ongoing coordination, including that reflected herein as part of the comments and responses on the DEIS, has led to the development of the Recommended Plan, as described in the Final EIS (FEIS).

¹ <http://www.nan.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Projects-in-New-York/Fire-Island-to-Montauk-Point-Reformulation-Study/>

The specific agency, organization and individual comments received on the DGRR and DEIS, and USACE's responses, are summarized in Section P.2. In addition, comments received from cooperating agencies, such as the Department of Interior (DOI), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), New York State were responded to separately; these comments and the associated response letters are provided in FEIS Appendix L – Pertinent Correspondence.

P.1.3 Public Views and Comments

The public comments related to the DGRR and DEIS, and USACE's responses, are summarized and presented in Section P.2. A synopsis of the public views and comments is as follows:

- Commenters expressed support for the Project;
- Commenters advocated for even greater protection measures;
- Commenters requested additional information and details regarding the potential impacts of the Project, including coastal process features, raising of homes and roads, buyouts, dune/berm elevation, recovery action, sea level rise, beach replenishment, sewer system, and more;
- Commenters requested an extension of the comment period and additional public meetings in which formal comments could be stated and officially recorded.

These views, as well as numerous additional comments, were extracted from the numerous agencies, organizations and individuals that submitted comments. Table P-1 lists the agencies and organizations that submitted comments on the Draft HSGRR/DEIS, grouped by type of organization. In addition, more than 1,000 private citizens also submitted comments. A full list of commenters is provided in Attachment P1.

Table P-1. Agencies and Organizations That Submitted Comments

Name of Organization (listed alphabetically)	
<i>Homeowner Associations, Marina, Clubs</i>	<i>Towns/Municipalities</i>
Cherry Grove Community Association, Inc.	Bellport, Village of
Cherry Grove Dune Fund Inc.	Brookhaven, Town of
Cherry Grove Property Owners Association	East Hampton, Town of
Corneille Estates Home Owner's Association	East Quogue, Town of
Davis Park Association	Islip, Town of
Fire Island Year Round Residents Association	Ocean Beach, Town of
Fire Island Summer Club	Quogue, Village of
High Dune Condominium	Saltaire, Village of
Island East Management	Southampton, Town of
The Kismet Community Association	Suffolk County, NY
LaRonde Beach Club	Westhampton, Town of
Mastic Beach Village	Westhampton Beach, Village of
Moriches Center Yacht Club & Eastport Marina	Quogue, Village of
Napeague Home Owner's Association	
Parchogue Community Development Agency, Village of	<i>Local Agencies / Non-Governmental Organizations</i>
South Shore Board Yard	Audubon New York
Sunset Lane Association	Audubon South Shore
Yardarm Beach Condominiums	Every Action
	First Coastal
	Fair Harbor Beach Erosion Control District
	Fire Island Association
	Fire Island School District
	Montauk Chamber of Commerce
	Peconic Baykeeper
	Point O' Woods Association
	Preserve Montauk
	Robbins Rest Oceanview Erosion Control District
	Save the Great South Bay
	Surfrider
	Twomey, Latham, Shea, Kelley, Dubin & Quartararo LLP Law Firm
	New York State Floodplain and Stormwater Managers Association
	The Nature Conservancy of New York
	The Nature Conservancy, Long Island Chapter

P.2 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Over 1280 public comments were received on the DGRR and DEIS for the FIMP Project, including those from local entities and organizations and local home and business owners. Given the volume of comments, separate and distinct responses to each is not feasible or in some cases necessary.

Numerous comments were easily condensed and could be grouped. Section P.2.1 presents the “form letter”, its comments, and imparted group response. Section P.2.2 presents grouped or categorized comments, by topic/category, responded to collectively.

In addition to the concise and easily condensed comments, numerous complex and highly technical comments were received; these were primarily submitted by federal and state and local agencies, as well as several other entities. Unique, direct response letters to these comments were warranted, and in many cases updates were incorporated into the Final HSGRR and/or Final EIS. Copies of these agency response letters are included in the Pertinent Correspondence Appendix of the FEIS (Appendix L).

P.2.1 Form Letter Comments and Responses

This section summarizes the numerous comments that were received as “form letters”, primarily from South Shore Audubon supporters, as well as additional comments that were either form letters or had nearly identical subject or concerns.

South Shore Audubon Supporters

Nine hundred and sixty seven comment letters were received from supporters of the Audubon South Shore. The letters were written individually (via form letter) expressing the identical interests of Audubon’s letter, which can be read below. A synopsis of the comments therein, followed by USACE’s response, is provided following the letter.

Dear Project Biologist Robert Smith,

As someone who is deeply concerned about the protection of birds and wildlife and the habitat needed for their survival, I stand with Audubon New York, in providing the following comments on the Draft Reevaluation Report and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, NY, Coastal Storm Risk Management Project (FIMP).

The project area is one of the most significant stretches of habitat to many priority saltmarsh and shorebirds, including the at-risk Saltmarsh Sparrow and the federally and state-listed Piping Plover and Roseate Tern. The south shore of Long Island is a critical breeding ground for Piping Plover, supporting over 50% of Long Island's total nesting population, and Saltmarsh Sparrows, which are experiencing unsustainable population decline at 9% each year.

While the draft EIS and FIMP Report acknowledge the ecological significance of this unique area and the many species the coast line supports, it is clear that the project will reduce critical habitat and limit opportunities for the creation of new habitat.

Therefore, as the project is finalized, please consider and address the following:

- 1) The Report overstates its ability to protect communities from future storms and underestimates its impacts to federally listed species. Given the list and number of priority species found in the project area, a Biological Opinion should be developed.
- 2) The project will prevent the creation of overwash habitat, which provides optimal habitat for Piping Plovers, and the Report must include appropriate mitigation for this habitat.
- 3) The Report should include updated and readily available projections on sea level rise.
- 4) This project needs should include a more thorough assessment of managed retreat from the coast and climate change adaptation, which are notably absent. FIMP should focus on voluntary buyouts, converting flood zone properties into natural areas that serve as buffers during future storm events, and preventing further development of flood zones. Managed retreat is the only strategy that will reduce direct impacts to communities and reduce long-term economic impacts from storm damage.

In conclusion, critical components of the Report need to be revisited to ensure this project is the best long-term solution to manage the risk of coastal storm damages on the south shore of Long Island. As it stands now, the project unjustifiably impacts federally listed species and habitat without adequate mitigation to offset impacts and misses notable opportunities to manage retreat from the coast and climate change adaptation strategies that could directly reduce damages from future storms.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

USACE Response:

- 1) *The final Biological Opinion will be included with the Final EIS.*
- 2) *Twelve Barrier Island locations where Coastal Process Features (CPFs) will be reestablished are included in the Recommended Plan. These locations will receive a total of approximately 4.2 million cubic yards of sand over the project life to offset the loss of sediment/overwash inputs to the Back Bay that result from the Recommended Plan. In addition, two mainland CPF locations are included in the Recommended Plan to further provide for improved CPFs.*
- 3) *The DGRR considered both the "Intermediate" and "High" rates of Sea Level Change (SLC), in addition to the historic rate of SLC, consistent with USACE policy.*
- 4) *The Recommended Plan includes a non-structural component, including buy-outs, as coordinated with the non-federal sponsor.*

Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road

Fifty six commenters wrote individual but identical letters, requesting: 1) the Breach Response Plan include additional sand as "Advance Fill" above the quantity identified, and 2) "road raising" of Dune Road be included for structural integrity of barrier island.

USACE Response:

- 1) *A specific breach response will be undertaken in accordance with overall Breach Response Plan as identified in the Recommended Plan.*
- 2) *“Road raising” of Dune Road is not provided by the authorized project and would require a separate authorization.*

Westhampton Groin Modification

Twenty nine commenters wrote individual but identical letters, expressing opposition of the Westhampton groin modification.

USACE Response:

The Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan.

P.2.2 Categorized Comments and Responses

Similar comments were submitted or concerns were expressed by numerous persons. These topics are categorized below; the subject heading is listed, followed by a synopsis of the comment and USACE’s response.

Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant

More than ten public comments requested USACE assistance in expanding/upgrading the Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.

USACE Response:

“Expanding sewer treatment in Ocean Beach” is not provided by the authorized project.

Ocean Beach Groins

Approximately ten public comments expressed concerns about removing Ocean Beach groins.

USACE Response:

Removal of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.

Endangered/Rare Species and Habitats

Numerous comments requested an explanation of the effects on of the Project on migratory birds, marine life, habitats, plant species.

USACE Response:

The FEIS provides a detailed assessment of the potential project impacts on rare, threatened and endangered species. The FEIS and the Biological Opinion (BO) appendix to the FEIS describe, and the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan (MAMP) appendix to the FGRR describe these impacts and the measures that will be implemented to minimize impacts.

Raising of Homes

More than 20 comments/questions inquired about the raising of homes.

USACE Response:

The non-structural plan includes non-structural solutions, including raising of homes, that are within the 10 year floodplain.

Vehicular Beach Driving

Does USACE have authority to limit vehicular beach driving?

USACE Response:

USACE does not have the authority to regulate vehicular beach driving. This is a local responsibility.

Buyouts

There were more than 25 comments/questions regarding buyouts, some of which expressed preference for a voluntary buyout program rather than retrofitting existing homes.

USACE Response:

The Recommended Plan includes retrofitting or buyouts of homes that are within the 10 year floodplain. Voluntary buyout will be considered during detailed design if costs are comparable to retrofitting homes.

Data Collection

Numerous comments asked for more data collection, analysis and research.

USACE Response:

The Recommended Plan is based on a thorough economic and environmental analysis of potential alternatives and has been determined to best address of the project objectives.

Dune and Berm Elevations

Several comments requested changes to the dimensions of proposed dunes and berm elevations.

USACE Response:

The profile of the Recommended Plan is based on the design parameters and comprehensive analysis and meets the project goals and objectives for the identified level of protection. Refer to the FGRR for the final Recommended Plan dimensions across the Project Area.

Project Costs

Various comments related to the project costs were received.

USACE Response:

The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders.

Local Stakeholder Participation

Multiple comments requested that local stakeholders (towns, villages, hamlets) be included as active participants in future planning for Fire Island shore management.

USACE Response:

For all future planning on Fire Island shore management USACE will coordinate directly with the non-federal sponsor, NY State DEC, who will be the primary contact with the local stakeholders to obtain input with regard to future planning with regard to Fire Island shore management. Before construction of any USACE project for coastal storm risk management (CSRSM), the non-federal sponsor must agree to participate in and comply with federal floodplain management.

Future Local Recovery Action

What is the mechanism to allow local entities to take immediate recovery actions in the event of delays in USACE response?

USACE Response:

The standard easement language and the Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) Manual, which is included as an appendix to the FGRR, outlines the responsibilities of the non-Federal sponsor (State of New York) under the Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) to ensure the project is maintained to perform during extreme events. Specifically, the FIMP OMRR&R outlines requirements for maintaining dunes, beaches and groins. It also outlines the expectations for periodic inspections and beach monitoring. As discussed in the OMRR&R Manual, local interests could supplement the beach fill provided by the project, particularly after year 30, to maintain the design template. Such activities should be coordinated with the USACE and non-federal sponsor to ensure no violation of environmental regulations.

Constructing Additional Groins

Commenters requested the construction of additional groins along entire FIMP shoreline to stabilize beaches

USACE Response:

Providing additional groins along the barrier island was considered during Phase 1 of the Formulation process and rejected since it was not consistent with the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes.

Project's Nourishment Commitment

More than twenty commenters requested a 50 year management commitment.

USACE Response:

The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. The O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years.

Sand Nourishment

Commenters requested that sand for nourishment be taken from the Bay to improve navigation.

USACE Response:

The grain size of sand from the Bay is not suitable for nourishment on the ocean beach.

Hard Structures

There were eight public comments concerning hard structures.

USACE Response:

In order to meet the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes to the extent possible, the Recommended Plan does not provide for constructing any new hard structures.

Inlet Sand Bypassing

There were more than 40 public comments regarding inlet bypassing or inlet dredging.

USACE Response:

The Inlet management component of the Recommended Plan includes inlet dredging and sand bypassing, or placement of dredged sand on downdrift beaches. The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life.

Inlet Closings

Multiple public comments raised questions regarding closing of the inlets.

USACE Response:

There are no plans to close any currently existing inlets.

ADA/Handicap Ramps

Various comments expressed interest in providing handicap accessibility.

USACE Response:

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the project provides for handicap accessible beach access.

Wilderness Area

The Breach Contingency Plan (BCP) needs to be updated consistent with the Fire Island National Seashore Management Plan and specifically the DEIS and EIS for the Wilderness Area.

USACE Response:

The breach response feature of the Recommended Plan includes Wilderness and Wilderness Conditional Breach Response measures that have been developed in coordination with the National Park Service and are consistent with the Fire Island Breach Closure and Management Plan.

Water Quality

Current WQ data needs to be included in DEIS.

USACE Response:

The FEIS describes water quality in the Study Area.

Septic/Sanitary System

Multiple comments were received that requested upgrades to septic systems and replacement of aging sanitary system with alternative systems that remove nutrients from wastewater.

USACE Response:

Project authorization does not provide for upgrade or replacement of sanitary systems. Upgrades to septic and sewage systems is a local issue and responsibility.

Dune Construction

Numerous commenters stated that construction on dunes should not be permitted.

USACE Response:

No construction on dunes will be permitted, per easements.

Town Infrastructure

Protection of Town infrastructure should be included as part of project so they eligible for repairs as effectiveness is reduced because of storms or sea level rise.

USACE Response:

Town infrastructure would potentially eligible for repairs resulting from storms under the authority of PL 84-99.

Road Raising

Multiple comments were received that expressed opposition to road raisings.

USACE Response:

Road raising is not included in the Recommended Plan.

Davis Park Dune/Berm Elevation

Multiple comments were related to the project details in the vicinity of Davis Park.

USACE Response:

The Recommended plan provides for a 15 ft dune and 90 ft berm in the vicinity of Davis Park.

Gilgo Beach Stockpiles

Who will maintain the Gilgo Beach stockpiles?

USACE Response:

The NYS DEC maintains sand stockpiles in Gilgo Beach and may provide other stockpile areas as they see fit.

Breach Response

Multiple commenters requested nourishment for four communities east of Point O'Woods?

USACE Response:

Per request of the Department of Interior (DOI), the Recommended Plan provides for conditional breach response for the Sailor's Haven subreach between the communities of Point O'Woods and Cherry Grove.

Napeague Beach Sand Nourishment

Commenters asked why the TSP did not include sand nourishment for Napeague Beach, which is suffering from severe erosion?

USACE Response:

Placing sand at Napeague Beach for purposes of Storm risk management is not economically justified.

Mastic Beach

Multiple commenters asked if there would be buyouts in Mastic Beach.

USACE Response:

The Recommended Plan includes retrofitting or buyouts of homes that are within the 10 years floodplain, as identified in the FGRR. The Recommended Plan provides for the buyout of approximately 16 homes in the Mastic Beach area, with the exact number subject to change during the design. The NY State Department of Conservation would be responsible for acquiring the properties.

Replenishment at Atlantique Marine/Ocean Beach

Several commenters raised concerns regarding replenishment at Atlantique Marina and erosion at Ocean Beach bayside and asked that the USACE explore possibility of replenishing the northern shoreline of Great South Bay.

USACE Response:

Twelve Barrier Island Coastal Process Features (CPF's) are included in the Recommended Plan that will receive a total of approximately 4.2 million cubic yards of sand over the project life to offset the loss of sediment/overwash inputs to the Back Bay that result from the Recommended Plan. These CPF's are located along the barrier island side of Great South Bay. Sand placement at the CPF sites will be performed in

coordination with renourishment cycles of the beach fill features. Two CPFs are located on the mainland, or north shore of Great South Bay.

2-Year Floodplain

Several commenters asked how many buildings are in the 0-2 year flood zone?

USACE Response:

There are approximately 1,100 homes within the 2-year floodplain.

FEMA/NY Rising Funding

Commenters inquired about the eligibility for homeowner benefits through FIMP, such as building elevation or voluntary buy-out, if they had previously received FEMA and/ or NY Rising assistance after Sandy.

USACE Response:

Homeowners would be potentially still be eligible for elevation or voluntary buy-out if the home was not raised above the 100 year floodplain

Describe FIMP Extent

Several commenters requested clarification on the extent of the FIMP Reformulation Project in relation to the Atlantic Reformulation and South Shore (Long Island) Reformulation?

USACE Response:

The FIMP Reformulation Study addresses the federally authorized project that extends from Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point.

Storm Event Modeling

Questions regarding the basis and the calculations for renourishment were received. Specifically, they inquired about the basis for needing 120,000 cubic yards every 4 years? Specifically how many storms and what severity of storms are in the model that results in a sand budget of 120,000 cubic yards? 5 year storm, 10 years storm??

USACE Response:

The estimate is an average based on the models that takes into account the likely storm events over the 50 year project period of analysis.

Fire Island Lighthouse

Multiple commenters asked why the lighthouse was not being addressed?

USACE Response:

At the Fire Island Lighthouse and Talisman tracts, Proactive and Reactive Breach Response, respectively, would be implemented.

Beach Replenishment

Numerous commenters inquired about future public beach access in towns where beach replenishment with Federal funding is conducted.

USACE Response:

While initial construction is 100% Federally funded within the available PL 113-2 2 funds, periodic renourishment is cost shared with the non-federal sponsors, while O&M is a non-federal sponsor responsibility, consistent with the Project Cooperation Agreement to be executed.

Vision Statement

Several comments requested an explanation of the Vision Statement for the project.

USACE Response:

The Vision statement was developed in 2004 and integrates the policies of the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Interior (representing the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the US Geologic Survey) and the New York State Department of Conservation that established specific goals to be adhered to during the formulation process. The Vision statement remained unchanged since 2004 and was the basis for a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding that was signed in July 2014 between USACE and DOI.

Flood Water Management

Several comments inquired about water management during flood events.

USACE Response:

Appropriate drainage will be provided in conjunction with the building retrofits.

Offshore Barriers

Several commenters suggested sinking trains or cars or plastic sheet piles offshore to function as breakwaters.

USACE Response:

Sinking old trains and other offshore barriers was considered during Phase I of the Formulation process and rejected, since it was not consistent with the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes.

Feeder Beach on Montauk Beach

Multiple commenters inquired about the feeder beach on Montauk Beach.

USACE Response:

The Recommended Plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.

Montauk Buyouts/Relocations

Several commenters raised the question of buyouts or relocations in the downtown Montauk area.

USACE Response:

While evaluated, buy-outs and private and public asset relocations in Montauk were not economically justified.

Project Sponsorship

Commenters asked how the local sponsor is determined and whether Suffolk County could be the local sponsor?

USACE Response:

The State of New York designated the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) as the local sponsor for the project; Suffolk County will be a sub-sponsor to NYSDEC.

Sustainability/ Resiliency/ Coastal Features

Several commenters posed the question of “sustainability”; inquiring whether the project would “last” and whether it was necessary to maintain the same shoreline over the project life. Several raised the question regarding the migratory nature of barrier islands.

USACE Response:

The GRR considers describes the Recommended Plan, how it was selected, and the costs, including the estimated maintenance costs. The USACE recognizes that the coastal environment is dynamic and responds to many different factors. Resiliency in design was considered in the development of the recommended plan.

Subsidence

Commenters asked if subsidence an issue in the project area.

USACE Response:

Subsidence is not considered to be a significant issue for the project area relative to potential sea level rise over the 50 year period of analysis.

Quogue Sandbar

Several comments were specific to the sandbar near the Quogue shoreline, stating that it protects the beach and dunes and suggesting elevation of the sandbar to prevent its possible disappearance in the future.

USACE Response:

There are no plans to alter the sandbar near the Quogue shoreline.

Storm Protection

Commenters asked what the level of protection the project would provide to beaches and dunes in terms of Storm (hurricane) Categories 1,2,3 or 4?

USACE Response:

The project provides storm risk management as described in the GRR, with a certain amount of residual risk remaining.

Sea Level Rise

Approximately 25 comments/questions were received that related to Sea Level Rise (SLR).

USACE Response:

The GRR considers three SLR scenarios as required by USACE guidance. The Recommended Plan is based on a detailed analysis of the costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of various alternatives, as well as taking into account sea level rise. In addition to the historical rate (“low”) which is a 0.7 ft. increase over the period of analysis, the project was also evaluated using “intermediate” and “high” rates derived from modified NRC Curves I and III, which for this Interim Study are estimated to be 1.1 ft. and 2.6 ft. increases, respectively over the fifty year period-of-analysis.

Point Source Pollution

Several commenters requested that the project addressing point source pollution.

USACE Response:

The authorized project does not provide for addressing point source pollution.

Borrow Area

Comments requested clarification of the borrow area locations and uses, whether for the project or for other beach nourishments in the area. Comments also asked if commercial fishing was considered in borrow area selection

USACE Response:

Among the selection criteria for the borrow sites was little or no impact to active commercial fishing areas. Refer to the Borrow Area Appendix of the FGRR for additional information on the planned borrow sites.

Oyster Programs

Comments requested that the FIMP project include measures related to oyster programs.

USACE Response:

The evaluation and revival of the oyster industry in the region is outside the scope of the FIMP project.

Renourishment/Saltwater Intrusion

Commenters raised issues related to shoreline profile, the depth of offshore waters and the potential for the project to influence saltwater intrusion into the aquifer?

USACE Response:

The reestablishment of coastal process features is one of the goals of the Recommended Plan. Project will not impact in salt water intrusion into the aquifer.

National Flood Insurance

Several commenters asked how the project will affect homes and businesses covered by the National Flood Insurance Program?

USACE Response:

Since project does not provide a line of protection that exceeds the 1% probability storm, Flood insurance will likely still be required for homes within 100 year flood plain.

Request for EIS

Multiple commenters requested a copy of the EIS.

USACE Response:

The EA is available on the USACE - NY District web site.

Comment Period Extension

Numerous commenters requested an extension of the comment period.

USACE Response:

An extension to submit comments was given.

P.3 CONCLUSION

The USACE appreciates the submission of public comments by all entities and have considered all comments/suggestions thoughtfully into the development of the Recommended Plan. Any further comments or considerations will be considered during the detailed design phase of the project.

Attachment P1

Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses

The following acronyms are used in the comment response table:

BM	breach management
BR	Beach restoration (dunes, berm, fill, sand nourishment)
DST	dredge/sediment transport
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESA	Endangered/rare species and/or habitat
GCM	groin construction/modification
GRQ	general report question
MR/B	managed retreat/buyouts
OS	Overall Support
RS	raising of structures (roads, homes)
SE	socio-economic/ town/local involvement
SLR	sea level rise
STP	sewer treatment plant
WR	Water resources

Also refer to FEIS Appendix L – Pertinent Correspondence

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1	Marian Russo, Exec Director	Provided mark-up of Plate NS-13; additional comments to follow (must pull up the document to see this mark-up)	Thank you for your comments.
2	Diana Di Prima	Objects to dredge/remove sand from her community (Cherry Grove)	The recommended plan provides for a 15 ft. dune and a 90 ft dune in the community of Cherry Grove. There are no plans to dredge or remove sand from Cherry Grove.
3	Stephanie Caravolos, Sunset Lane Association	Supports raising of homes on Sunset lane	The non-structural plan includes non-structural solutions, including raising of homes, that are within the 10 year floodplain.
4	Pamela Jayakar	Suggests sinking old trains and subways off the coast to reduce erosion	Sinking old trains and other offshore barriers was considered during Phase 1 of the Formulation process and rejected, since it was not consistent with the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes.
5	Robert Cooperman, President, HOA	Asks following questions: 1) Why no sand nourishment for Napeague Beach which is suffering from severe erosion? 2) Does USACE have authority to limit vehicular beach driving?	1) Placing sand at Napeague Beach for purposes of Storm risk management is not economically justified. 2) USACE does not have the authority to regulate vehicular beach driving. This is a local responsibility.
6	Edward Janssen	Requests project rebuild South shore beaches of Mastic Beach.	The Recommended Plan includes retrofitting or buyouts of homes that are within the 10 years floodplain.
7	Bill Tunney, South Shore Board Yard	Requests additional groins along entire FIMP shoreline to stabilize beaches	Providing additional groins along the barrier island was considered during Phase 1 of the Formulation process and rejected since it was not consistent with the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes.
8	Michael Hirschorn	Support project	Acknowledged; thank you.
9	Frank Fugarino	Provides following comments: 1) objects to raising Riviers Drive; 2) outer beach east of Pattersquash Island needs to be rebuilt; 3) supports raising homes; 4) leave Bellport Bay breach open; 5) Moriches Inlet should be properly maintained	The Recommended Plan includes retrofitting or buyouts of homes that are within the 10 years floodplain.
10	Joseph L. Arabia Jr.	Hold off on the project. Take data from the breach in Bellport. See Dr. Charles Flagg research. Work on reef building, not taking sand from offshore.	The plan recommended for implementation was based on a thorough economic and environmental analysis of potential alternatives, and has been determined to best address of the project objectives.
11	Prudence Ferraro	Supports project.	Acknowledged; thank you.
12	Gerri Losquadro, President - Cherry Grove Property Owners Association	Supports project. Would however like to ask that the following be considered: amend the plan in terms of the stated dimensions of dune and berm systems. Whereas your plan includes 15-foot dune elevations and 90- foot berms; we suggest dune elevations should be 17-20 feet to provide better protection from catastrophic storms. o Formulate a plan for the FI renourishment project so that it can be implemented independently of the other segments of FIMP; o Provide a mechanism to authorize immediate recovery after severe storms, allowing local entities to take emergency action if there is a delay in USACE response; o Include local stakeholders (towns, villages, hamlets) as active participants in future planning for Fire Island shore management.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. For all future planning on Fire Island shore management USACE will coordinate directly with the non-federal sponsor, NY State DEC, who will be the primary contact with the local stakeholders to obtain input with regard to future planning with regard to Fire Island shore management. Before construction of any Corps project for coastal storm risk management (CSRM), the non-federal sponsor must agree to participate in and comply with federal floodplain management.
13	Joanne Tobin	Oppose Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
14	Jerome Feder, Deputy Commissioner, Fair Harbor Beach Erosion Control District	Supports project.	Acknowledged; thank you.
15	Sally Sheck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
16	Brien Weiner, South Shore Audubon Society	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
17	Janice Webb	Supports project; prefers 50 years of nourishment; project needs mechanism to allow local entities to take immediate recovery actions in the even of delays in USACE response	Acknowledged; thank you. The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years.
18	Jayne Robinson, President, Davis Park Association	Supports project. 1) 50 year management commitment, 2) no hard structures, 3) inhabitants contribute financially, 4) long term independent plan of LI, 5) commitment to protecting existing homes, 6) implement beach/dune profile, 7) more robust dunes in Davis Park, 8) stockpile emergency sand, 9) emergency response in breach mgmt, 10) no clean water benefits to Davis Park community, 11)inlet bypassing to restore littoral drift, 12) town rep on Breach Mgmt Committee, 13) mitigate erosion, need sand, 14) O&M Manual	Acknowledged; thank you. The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years. The Recommended Plan does not provide for constructing any new hard structures. The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life. Recommended plan provides for a 15 ft dune and 90 ft berm in the vicinity of Davis Park. The NYS DEC maintains sand stockpiles in Gilgo Beach and may provide other stockpile areas as they see fit.
19	Brian J. McCarthy (email dated 17 Oct 2016)	Opposes Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
20	Andrew Miller, Corneille Estates HOA	Supports overall project: requests complete removal of Ocean Beach groins; handicapped ramps should be provided on north side of dune as well as south side; need to clarify O&M responsivity for walkovers and beach sand; need to ensure access for emergency vehicles on Burma Road	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the project provides for handicap accessible beach access.
21	Kathryn Sekulo	Supports overall project: requests that FI be implemented as stand alone project and also include local community leaders in all planning aspects.	Acknowledged; thank you.
22	Tom Golden	Supports overall project: requests complete removal of Ocean Beach groins;	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.
23	Sean O'Neill, Baykeeper - Peconic Baykeeper	Supports overall project: consider soft, sustainable solutions. Concerned about cost transferred to residents. Breach management needs to be reconsidered in light of the current breach near Old Inlet in the Fire Island Wilderness Area. Currently lots of wildlife. Do benefit cost analysis of raising structures vs acquisition.	Acknowledged; thank you.
24	Dave Tyers	Supports overall project: concerned about erosion at SPCP; requests modification of Westhampton groins or placing groins at SPCP to protect beach.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
25	Lynn Joyce	Supports overall project: particularly sand bypassing at Shinnecock Inlet	Acknowledged; thank you.
26	Judith Gerardi, PhD	Supports project. Needs plan to include maintenance and repair of our beaches.	Acknowledged; thank you.
27	John Alters	Opposes project - too expensive and difficult to maintain given SLR; requests Montauk hotels be removed and plastic sandbags be removed	Opposition acknowledged.
28	Jill Feighan, Facilities Manager	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
29	Diane Solomon	Supports project; concerned about removing Ocean beach groins	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.
30	Bob Hies	Opposes Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
31	Erik Lief	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
32	Vincent de Sartre	Supports project; requests dunes be 20 ft and berm 150 ft.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders
33	Robert Gaudiso	Opposes groin shortening in Westhampton/Westhampton Beach.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
34	Melissa Russell	Oppose Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
35	Krissa Schandelmaier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
36	Thomas Moore	Oppose Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
37	Ellen Khalifa	Supports project.	Acknowledged; thank you.
38	Roseanne O'Farrell	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
39	Janet Thigpen, Public Policy Committee Chair -	New York State Floodplain and Stormwater Managers Association (NYSFSMA) concerned about repeated commitment of Federal/State resources, would rather it go to something more sustainable long-term. Request proposal for 4,000 bldg retrofits in 10-yr floodplain be removed from FIMP.	Thank you for your comment. The recommended plan provides for storm risk management for the FIMP project area for a 50 year period of time, and includes non-structural measures for buildings within the 10-yr floodplain, such as retrofits and buy-outs.
40	Linda Thornberg	Supports project; prefers 50 years of nourishment; project needs mechanism to allow local entities to take immediate recovery actions in the event of delays in USACE response	The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years. The standard easement language and the OMRR&R manual (which will be finalized during construction), will specify beach/dune maintenance or restoration activities that local interests municipalities would be allowed to undertake on the beach with their own resources. Modifications can be requested post construction and would be considered as part of the normal regulatory permit process.
41	Thomas Ryan	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
42	James S. Mallott, Mayor - Village of Ocean Beach	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
43	Robert Spencer, Exec VP	Supports project; requests nourishment for 4 communities east of Point O'Woods	Per request of the Department of Interior, the recommended plan provides for conditional breach response for the Sailor's haven subreach between the communities of Point O'Woods and Cherry Grove.
44	Michelle Grady	Supports project.	Acknowledged; thank you.
45	Pat Pitta & Eric Kirk	Audubon supporter. Oppose Westhampton groin modification.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
46	Patrick and Sarah Luijpers	Supports project.	Acknowledged; thank you.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
47	Maria Silsdorf	Supports project. I am writing to you today to express my strong support for the FIMP project. I own a home at 768 Ocean Breeze Walk in Ocean Beach. I've been a resident there my entire life, many of my family and friends also reside on Fire Island. Now that the FIMI project is fully underway, we need to address the need for ongoing repair and renourishment of our new dunes. Fire Island, and Ocean Beach in particular, is a truly remarkable place where residents, visitors, businesses and the seashore have co-existed for a long time. It is a unique environment, home to many, and a destination to many more. Those of us that own homes here, and run businesses here, are all too aware of the fragile nature of our beloved sandbar, and the critically important role that our dunes play in our safety and future. Please do everything in your power to support FIMP so that Fire Island and Ocean Beach continue to be the very special places that they are today.	Acknowledged; thank you.
48	Michael Giaccone	Oppose Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
49	Rona Mendelsohn	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
50	Milton Meri	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
51	Carolyn Bodner	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
52	Nancy Sepal	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
53	MacEllis K. Glass, MD	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
54	Karen Kostroff	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
55	Glenn Shapiro	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
56	Sharon Shapiro	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
57	Bruce Ratner	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
58	Arlene Elkind	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
59	Arthur Elkind	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
60	William Weinberg	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
61	Janet Friedlander	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
62	Joyce Doyle	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
63	Donna Shaw	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
64	Scott Lawin	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
65	Jay Shevins	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
66	Richard Sussman	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
67	Ellen Dank Cohen	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
68	Fred Brunswick	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
69	Michael Dean and Maykin Ho	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
70	Barbara J Gormley	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
71	Mitchell Rechler	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
72	Deena and Michael Diamond DDS	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
73	Richard and Nina Goldweit	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
74	Philip Weingord	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
75	Roger Heomann	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
76	Sydelle Ratchik	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
77	Gale Spitalnik	Oppose Westhampton groin modification	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
78	Debbie Savino, Center Yacht Club & Eastport Marina	Support project; requests that sand for nourishment be taken from Bay to improve navigation	The grain size of sand from the Bay is not suitable for nourishment on the ocean beach.
79	Lisa Pesce	Support project; requests that sand for nourishment be taken from Bay to improve navigation	The grain size of sand from the Bay is not suitable for nourishment on the ocean beach.
80	Howard Freilich, President, Blondies Treehouse	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
81	Michelle Yeh - Environmental Defense Fund	Requests EA	The EA is available on the USACE - NY District web site.
82	Edward P. Romaine, Supervisor - Town of Brookhaven	Support Sand bypassing at inlets and creation of berm and dune protective features; Problems and concerns with Plan are as follows: 1) BCP needs to be updated consisted with DEIS and EIS on Wilderness Area; 2) Plan needs to take into account most current estimates of SLR; 3) voluntary buyout program should be included rather than retrofitting existing homes; 4) oppose road raisings; 5) Benefits of Wilderness area breach needs to be incorporated in GRR/EIS; 6) Current WQ data needs to be included in DEIS; non-structural plan must replace aging sanitary system with alternative systems that remove nutrients from wastewater; 7) no construction on dunes should be permitted; 8) Protection of Town infrastructure should be included as part of project so they eligible for repairs as effectiveness is reduced because of storms or SLR.	Responses to "Problems and concerns" raised are as follows: 1) BCP has been updated consisted with DEIS and EIS on Wilderness Area; 2) Plan takes into account SLR based on USACE guidance; 3) voluntary buyout will be considered during detailed design if costs are comparable to retrofitting homes; 4) Road raisings have been eliminated from Recommended plan; 5) Benefits of Wilderness area breach are discussed in GRR/EIS; 6) Updated WQ data is included in EIS; project authorization does not provide for replace aging sanitary system with alternative systems that remove nutrients from wastewater; 7) no construction on dunes will be permitted, per easements; 8) repairs to Town infrastructure would potentially eligible for repairs resulting from storms under the authority of PL 84-99.
83	Judith Klein Steinman	Supports project. Long overdue and will have positive impacts.	acknowledged; thank you.
84	Karl Riemenschneider	Asks that Price street be included in home raisings.	The non-structural plan includes non-structural solutions, including raising of homes, that are within the 10 year floodplain.
85	Sharon Fiyalka	Supports overall project;	acknowledged; thank you.
86	Robin Eshaghpour	Supports project. Wishes to speak about particular parcel of land.	acknowledged; thank you.
87	Camille Guigliano	Supports project	acknowledged; thank you.
88	Jeffrey Fortgang	Supports project. Must include maintenance and periodic repair.	Acknowledged; thank you.
89	Marty Edelman, Former 1/LT, US Army Corps of Engineers	Opposes modifying Westhampton groin field	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
90	Marvin Vipler	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
91	Pamela Esterman	Supports project.	acknowledged; thank you.
92	Minkie McKevitt	Supports project.	acknowledged; thank you.
93	A L	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
94	A. Elizabeth Zumchak	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
95	Abja Midha	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
96	Adam Danberg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
97	Aimee Labarr	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
98	Alan Jasper	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
99	Alan Stein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
100	Alan W. Altman, Commissioner - Robbins Rest Oceanview Erosion Control District	Supports project generally. Concerned that the groins at Ocean Beach will undergo a "modification" rather than being fully removed.	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.
101	Alexa Lehoczi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
102	Alexander Sarnacki	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
103	Alexandra Denman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
104	Alison Coccarri	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
105	Alissa Sollitto	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
106	Allan Goldstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
107	Allison Hirsch	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
108	Allison Matos	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
109	Amanda Pachomski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
110	Amanda Scuder	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
111	Amanda Smock	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
112	Amy Graves	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
113	Ana Scolavino	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

**Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS**

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
114	Anastasia Hanifan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
115	Andrea Zinn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
116	Andrew Robbins	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
117	Andy Sessa	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
118	Angelease Rosa	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
119	Angie M. Carpenter, Supervisor - Office of the Supervisor-Town of Islip	Refer to letter sent by Christopher Poelker. Supports project generally. Concerns regarding replenishment at Atlantique Marina and erosion at Ocean Beach bayside. Use Marina only at off season. Erosion at Ocean Beach on bay side- any improvements there? Explore possibility of replenishing northern shoreline of Great South Bay.	Seventeen Barrier Island Coastal Process Features (CPFs) are included in the Recommended Plan that will receive a total of 4.2 million cubic yards of sand over the project life to offset the loss of sediment/overwash inputs to the Back Bay that result from the Recommended Plan. Of these 12 of which are located along Great South Bay. Sand placement at the CPF sites will be performed in coordination with renourishment cycles of the beach fill features.
120	Anise Baron	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
121	Ann Aquanno	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
122	Ann Millonig	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
123	Anna Feldi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
124	Anna Gasner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
125	Anne Lazarus	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
126	Anne Maltz	Supports Project (tentatively selected plan)	Acknowledged; thank you.
127	Anne Niland	Supports project. Requests USACE assistance to upgrade Village of Ocean Beach sewage treatment plant.	"Expanding sewer treatment in Ocean Beach" is not provided by the authorized project.
128	Anne Petrie	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
129	Annie Bien	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
130	Annamarie Rivetti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
131	Anthony Baldo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
132	Anthony Caliri	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
133	Anthony Straka	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
134	Anthony Sturniolo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
135	April Hoffmeister	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
136	Arlene Forward	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
137	Artie Schlette	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
138	Aubrey Minutaglio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
139	Audra Sparrow	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
140	August Oberli	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
141	August Scheer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
142	B. Fingerhut	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
143	Barb Fitzgerald	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
144	Barbara Becker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
145	Barbara Chichester	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
146	Barbara Dillon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
147	Barbara Edelstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
148	Barbara Ehrlich	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
149	Barbara Greenwood	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
150	Barbara Hathaway	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
151	Barbara Hough	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
152	Barbara J Slater	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
153	Barbara Ledbetter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
154	Barbara Mallon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
155	Barbara Milano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
156	Barbara Ortner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
157	Katie Sepenoski	I am in support of the draft HSGRR and DEIS. I support a two-year stabilization plan for 30 years for the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets. In regards to beach replenishment, I would encourage you to take up sand from the channels within our bays. This will not only accomplish the end goal of building up barrier islands to protect the mainland, but will also help in the increasing issue of maintaining safe navigation within the bays.	acknowledged; thank you. The Inlet management component of the project includes inlet dredging and sand bypassing, or placement of dredged sand on downdrift beaches.
158	Barbara Rizzotti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
159	Clete Galasso	I am in support of the draft HSGRR and DEIS. I support a two-year stabilization plan for 30 years for the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets. In regards to beach replenishment, I would encourage you to take up sand from the channels within our bays.	acknowledged; thank you. The Inlet management component of the project includes inlet dredging and sand bypassing, or placement of dredged sand on downdrift beaches.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
160	Roy A. Bartel	As a marina owner for the last 38 years on the Moriches Bay, I have seen the shoaling first hand I am in support of the draft " HAGRR & DEIS. I support a two-year stabilization plan for 30 years for the Moriches and Shinnecock inlets. In regards to beach replenishment, I would encourage you to take sand from the channels within our bays. This will not only accomplish the end goal of building up the barrier islands to protect the mainland, this will help in the increasing issue of maintaining safe navigation within our bays. In regard to the dredging of Moriches Bay west to east channel, I think the dredged channel would last longer if it were to dredged the way the incoming water flows, their is a natural channel in to the Harts Cove north of buoy 26 and 27, it could be maintained easily instead of digging the channel straight through a sand bar that fill in with the first storm.	acknowledged; thank you. Please note that the sediment in the Bays is not suitable for nourishing the oceanfront beach.
161	Vincent R. Pesce	I am in support of the draft HSGRR and DEIS. I support a two-year stabilization plan for 30 years for the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets. In regards to beach replenishment, I would encourage you to take up sand from the channels within our bays.	acknowledged; thank you. Please note that the sediment in the Bays is not suitable for nourishing the oceanfront beach.
162	Barbara Rogers	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
163	Barbara Rosen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
164	Barbara Stewart	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
165	Barbara Thomas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
166	Barbara Trypaluk	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
167	Barbara Valente	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
168	Barry Bergman	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
169	Barry Zuckerman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
170	Laura Levine	I am a homeowner in Ocean Beach on Fire Island, and would like to write you in support of FIMP (the Fire Island to Montauk Point project). FIMP will provide us with something desperately needed and excluded from FIMI -- beach repair and maintenance. Please do whatever you can to make FIMP happen.	Acknowledged; thank you.
171	Marilyn Woodman	I write to add my voice to others who treasure the jewel that is Fire Island. My husband and I have had the good fortune to vacation in Ocean Beach at 326 Bay Walk every year for each of the last summers since 2002. We have seen how the beach has changed over the years, and especially the impact that superstorm Sandy had on the area. At the same time, we appreciate how much the barrier beach maintained by the Army Corps of Engineers was able to mitigate damage to the south shore of Long Island. I understand that efforts to maintain and repair the dunes in the future is meeting opposition. I want to express my support for the continuing [effort]to ensure that the Fire Island coastline is preserved. Maintaining the dunes will extend the efforts and expense of the beach re-nourishment plan for decades to come - benefitting current and future residents and vacationers. Fire Island generates enormous tax dollars to Suffolk County and richly deserves this protection. Please do all that you can to ensure the dunes are both maintained and preserved for the benefit of all. I am happy to add my name in support of this effort.	Acknowledged; thank you.
172	John Romero	Re: 178-179 Cottage Walk Ocean Beach, NY 11770 Mr. Smith and Mr. Luka I'm writing to you expressing my concern that FIMP will not be implemented by the Army Core of engineering. Please let me advise you that this project is need to be done on Fire Island NY for the sovereignty of the Island. I hope you will both consider the project and move forward with it. I thank you in advance.	Acknowledged; thank you.
173	Becky Lechner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
174	Bernice Reinharth	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
175	Beth Birnbaum	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
176	Beth Mandelbaum	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
177	Pieter Greeff	I am in favor of Army Corps of Engineers FIMP beach nourishment project for Quogue, N.Y. and urge its expedition. Since 1937 I have resided at 182 Dune Road, Quogue, in the house my father built in that year. Three major dunes and the beach before them, about 30-40 feet in height and 100 yards in breadth, have been eroded away in that time frame so that now there is practically no barrier dune or beach before the sea. If the barrier beach is broken though, as it was in 1938 (Shinnecock Inlet) there exists a distinct possibility of the Village itself being destroyed inasmuch as the barrier beach is only separated from mainland housing density by a narrow canal rather than broad bays.	Acknowledged; thank you.
178	Beth O'Brien	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
179	Shelly Rodgers	First, let me say I am grateful for the work the Army Corps of Engineers is currently doing to create dunes to protect Fire Island. In understand that the plan to maintain and repair the dunes in the future, however, is under attack. I am in favor of maintaining and repairing the dunes for the following reasons: * As a barrier beach, it did exactly what it was supposed to do: it buffeted superstorm Sandy and greatly reduced the damage to the south shore of Long Island. * As a barrier island, is vital in protecting Long Island in the storms to come * Fire Island deserves protection as it generates tax dollars to Suffolk County * Maintaining the dunes will extend the efforts and expense of the beach re-nourishment plan for decades to come * NOT maintaining the dunes will nullify the current effort and assure that the current money being spent is wasted * This is an investment in our future. Much like making needed repairs on your home, making needed repairs to the dunes is the right thing to do to maintain your investment.	Acknowledged; thank you.
180	Betty Trentlyon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
181	Anne Grosshansse	I love Fire Island and all it has to offer. I have stayed with friends at 326 Bay Walk, Ocean Beach. Please support FIMP plans to protect the island. * Fire Island, as a barrier island, is vital in protecting Long Island in the storms to come * Fire Island deserves protection as it generates tax dollars to Suffolk County * Maintaining the dunes will extend the efforts and expense of the beach re-nourishment plan for decades	Comment acknowledged.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
182	Lance Evans	I am writing to express my strong support of the FIMP to maintain and repair the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point dunes in the future. As you are fully aware, the barrier beach did exactly what it was supposed to do during Superstorm Sandy, protecting the South Shore of Long Island from even worse damage than it would have suffered without the protection of the barrier beach. As more powerful storms are forecast for the future, the importance of the barrier beach will become even more important. Fire Island is worthy of the project's protection as it is a special place that is enjoyed by thousands of residents, home owners, and visitors, from summer renters to day-trippers, generating significant tax income for Suffolk County. Furthermore, maintaining the dunes will extend the efforts and expense of the beach re-nourishment plan for decades to come. I know that these may seem to be generic talking points, but they are genuinely at the core of the importance of and my concern for the future of the FIMP Project. Thank you for considering my comments and for your continuing efforts to protect this treasured asset.	Acknowledged; thank you.
183	Paula Meighan	I strongly support the activities underway to rebuild our dunes to protect Fire Island for decades to come. The barrier beach did exactly what it was supposed to do: it buffeted superstorm Sandy and greatly reduced the damage to the south shore of Long Island. * Fire Island, as a barrier island, is vital in protecting Long Island in the storms to come * Fire Island deserves protection as it generates tax dollars to Suffolk County * Maintaining the dunes will extend the efforts and expense of the beach re-nourishment plan for decades to come. Thank you for your efforts!	Acknowledged; thank you.
184	Beverly Drucker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
185	Terri Gumula	Fire Island is an integral part of the storm protection for the south shore of Long Island. Any plan by the Corps needs to build AND MAINTAIN the dunes, because without the latter, the former is for naught. Maintaining the dunes will extend the efforts and expense of the beach re-nourishment plan for decades to come. Fire Island, is a very special place, and it's very specialness generates millions in revenues for Suffolk County as well as the ferry towns. Everything from train fares, to last minute claims at the dock to taxi rides to a fun beach cover-up. They all provide much needed tax revenue, and without Fire Island, a lot of revenue would be lost.	In accordance with the Recommended Plan USACE will participate in periodic nourishment of the barrier island which includes restoring the dune and berm as needed. O&M of the dune is the responsibility of the non-federal interests.
186	Michael Bobson	I write to you to endorse my support for the FIMP project. I am a long time homeowner and resident of Ocean Beach and am in favor of the benefits to the beaches and the bay that the project will provide. I also believe that the Sewer plant upgrade is necessary to the long term health and future of Ocean Beach.	Acknowledged; thank you.
187	Lisa Schreibersdorf	I am a homeowner in Ocean Beach, NY and I am writing to let you know that I support FIMP. Unless there is a long-term plan for the preservation of our town and homes, the effects of global warming will have a disparate impact on our community simply because it is closer to the shore. Other communities throughout the world are taking action to improve their response and resilience to the increasing quantity and harshness of summer and winter storms and we should do the same. Please let me know if there is anything further I can do to effectuate actions to be taken sooner rather than later. We had two serious hurricane scares this season which thankfully did not come to pass, however, the next one may very well and we should be prepared on a continuous basis.	Acknowledged; thank you.
188	Marika Brahe	This is a brief note in STRONG SUPPORT of new dunes, wider, more resistant beaches and new hope for better, resilient protection against future storms. We are aware that another, more comprehensive project, the FIMP (Fire Island to Montauk Point) has been in formulation for more than 50 years. We are in STRONG SUPPORT of the FIMP which has begun in earnest. Its goals to identify, evaluate and recommend long-term solutions for hurricane and storm damage reduction for homes and businesses within the flood plain (extending along 83-miles of ocean and bay shorelines from Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point) is in keeping with our OWN VIEWS. This FIMP adaptive management of our bay and ocean shores is strongly supported by all our Ocean Beach and surrounding Towns' residents/businesses, and we urge that it include the periodic repair and renourishment of our dunes for up to at least the next 30 years.	Acknowledged; thank you.
189	James Heller	I am writing to you today to add my support for the FIMP project. I live on Fire Island my address is 538 Bayberry Walk in Ocean Beach. I support the project because we on FI are a measure of protection for the Long Island mainland. If FI was not here the water damage to mainland LI might have been catastrophic when superstorm Sandy occurred. The improved infrastructure on the beach with the FIMP project would for the first time stabilize the beaches for years to come. With the ability to replenish the beach when needed it would allow the project to last for years to come. With the Corps and FIA having looked closely at this project for a long time it has given me confidence that the plan has been thought out by all entities and will be built with the best ideas available. I hope that the plan is acted on in a positive way and will go forward.	Acknowledged; thank you.
190	Ralph Cafuoco	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
191	Edward Corballis	The proposed sand by pass recommendation is very important for areas West of Shinnecock where there has been a sand deficit effecting Hampton Bays, East Quogue, and Quogue for some time. This has been confirmed by coastal geologists who are recommending beach replenishment for Quogue. along the same line, the beach nourishment proposal for Tiana Beach is equally as important to prevent a breach that could adversely effect the mainland. These FIMP recommendations show foresight and a forward looking plan for the coast.	Acknowledged; thank you.
192	Blythe Clark-McKittrick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
193	Board of Directors - The Swordfish Owners Corporation	Strongly oppose project. Adjacent landowners not notified properly. Not leaving time to comment. Swordfish has invested in maintaining the dunes over the years. No economic impact or safety study?	Acknowledge opposition.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
194	Eric J. Kreuter, Esq., President - Association of Marine Industries	I am the President of the Association of Marine Industries, a marine trades group that represents over 100 marinas and marine related business all over Suffolk County, New York. The marine trades total economic impact to our region is in excess of \$1.6 billion dollars and we create over 3000 jobs in Suffolk County alone. We support the Fire Island to Montauk Plan to revitalize our beaches and remove sand from our inlets. We find this project as extremely important to maintain our public waterways all across the Long Island's south shore and further ask that you consider inlet stabilization as part of your plan. We do understand that this plan calls for dredging the inlets every two years for the next thirty years, but also feel that it is important to stabilize these inlets so no further problems will occur. We further ask that it be considered to use sand from the inter-coastal waterways to provide additional support to our barrier beaches. Many of our bays along Long Island are being choked off with sand and removing this sand would continue to allow a great water flow and stabilization of our bays. Once again, I lend my support to this project and would be available should you have any further concerns.	Acknowledged; thank you. Please note that the sediment in the Bays is not suitable for nourishing the oceanfront beach.
195	Bob Schalit	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
196	Bonnie Bassey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
197	Bonnie Bernstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
198	Bonnie Howard	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
199	Bonnie Ocke	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
200	Bonnie Weber	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
201	Brenda Best	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
202	Brenda Frey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
203	Brenda Lee	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
204	Brenda Rodriguez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
205	Joel Stark	I purchased my primary residence at 110 Clipper Rdwy in Corneille Estates in 1986 and have been living there since that time. We have experienced some very difficult storms on this barrier island and hurricane Sandy was the most damaging. For years we have advocated for dune nourishment. The occasional scraping to rebuild them has been helpful. The current FIMI project is very welcome. Hopefully, it will prevent another breach and further erosion of our protective barrier island. However, the need for periodic repair and renourishment of our dunes is essential especially for homeowners like myself in Corneille Estates. I urge you to support this project over the next thirty years.	Acknowledged; thank you.
206	Linda Miller	I am writing to support FIMP. Fire Island is a wonderful place. Because this area provides a great recreational area, downstate New York is a wonderful place to live. It is beautiful and natural. I support our taxes going to this local area that many people live in and visit throughout the year, from far and wide. Personally, I ride the ferry to Fire Island every weekend in the late spring, summer and early fall. As a resident of Long Island, I appreciate the protection this area provides to the southern part of Long Island. While we may have been responsible for climate change and rising sea levels, it is also our responsibility to protect our resources from destruction due to storms. I support making a commitment for the next 50+ years to keep the dunes maintained. Could you increase the berm to 150 feet? Thank you for considering my opinion in favor of this project.	The plan recommended for implementation was based on a thorough economic and environmental analysis of potential alternatives, and has been determined to best address of the project objectives.
207	Carl Lobue	1. Can you say how many buildings are in the 0-2 year flood zone? 2. If you got FEMA and or NY Rising assistance after Sandy would that impact your ability to be eligible for elevation or voluntary buy-out through FIMP?	1) There are approximately 1100 homes within the 2-year floodplain; 2) Homeowner would be potentially still be eligible for elevation or voluntary buy-out if home was not raised above the 100 year floodplain
208	Carl Itrace	Can you please describe the FIMP Reformulation in relation to the Atlantic Reformulation and South Shore (Long Island) Reformulation?	The FIMP Reformulation Study addresses the federally authorized project that extends from Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point.
209	Jay Levine	It is not rational that the Army Corps Fed Govt will spend \$18 M to armor Montauk Point while essentially neglecting to protect the infrastructure and economy of our community with a more substantial beachfill project. Please explain the rationale for this seemingly irrational and fiscally irresponsible decision.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. This analysis shows that the project benefits over the 50 year period of analysis exceeds the cost with a Benefit to Cost Ratio of (TBD)
210	Gerard Cutillo	1. Has the concept of "artificial barrier reef been explored for MTK - I believe it could help soften storm surge. 2. Sand pumped from offshore [Fire Island Inlet] to Town of Babylon beaches worked in 1950s & 60s, will that concept be revisited?	Utilizing "artificial barrier reefs" is not acceptable to either the project sponsor or to the Department of Interior. Offshore borrow sites have been identified for providing the sand required for the construction of the dunes and berms and for subsequent periodic renourishment.
211	Peter Strugatz	What is the basis and the calculations to project a 120,000 cubic yards need every 4 years? Specifically how many storms and what severity of storms are in the model that results in a sand budget of 120,000 cubic yards? 5 year storm, 10 years storm?? What was the recent storm that caused minor damage?	The estimate is an average based on the models that takes into account the likely storm events over the 50 year project period of analysis.
212	Peter Strugatz	With several historical breaches east of East Hampton, what if any breach preparedness is presently in place by the Corps? Stockpile sand? Equipment availability?	Other than a feeder beach at Montauk Beach, the recommended plan does not include any project features east of East Hampton.
213	Anonymous	Why aren't you addressing the issue of the lighthouse?	At the Fire Island Lighthouse and Talisman tracts, Proactive and Reactive Breach Response, respectively, would be implemented.
214	Alex Greja	Thank you, Southampton Town Superintendent	Acknowledged; thank you.
215	Joseph Mullen	Is there going to be access for the public after the beach replenishment is done in Village of Westhampton Dunes, West Hampton Beach, Village of Quogue and East Quogue? The erosion control distance in Watermill, Bridgehampton, East Sagoonack was paid for by the oceanfront property owners. The Village of Asharoken has been told that they must give parking and beach access if Fed dollars are used.	While initial construction is 100% federally funded within the available PL 113-2 2 funds, Periodic renourishment is cost shared with the non-federal sponsors, while O&M is a non-federal sponsor responsibility, consistent with the Project Cooperation Agreement to be executed.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
216	Thomas Moore	1. Who developed the vision statement? 2. When? 3. Is it subject to modification? On the vision statement is a "priority" more important than a "preference"	The Vision statement was developed in 2004 that integrates the policies of the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Interior (representing the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the US Geologic Survey) and the New York State Department of Conservation that established specific goals to be adhered to during the formulation process. The Vision statement remained unchanged since 2004 and was the basis for a subsequent Memorandum of Understanding that was signed in July 2014 between USACE and DOI.
217	R. Gardner	The assignment of Quogue to proactive seems to rest on mocking the 90 ft berm and 13 cy dune criterion, which I believe was pretty much do. But part of the criterion is that the berm is at 9.5 ft NGVD. Seaman's eye tells me our berm is more like 5 ft NGVD. How do you justify this?	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders.
218	Carol Winklevoss	What is being done for long range planning versus "temporary measures" that are not permanent e.g. sand dredging - millions of dollars for a 5 yr expectancy must repeated sand to form to	The Recommended Plan provides a level of coastal storm risk management for the FIMP project area over a 50 period
219	Ed Warner JK	Has the commercial fishing industry been considered when selecting borrow sites?	Among the selection criteria for the borrow sites was little or no impact to active commercial fishing areas.
220	M. Johnston	Response to retreat	The Recommended Plan provides a level of coastal storm risk management for the FIMP project area over a 50 period
221	Frank Fugurcino	I want to be sure that all parties agree that raise up the roads in Mastic Beach will not work without pumping plans in place should the roads be beachfill. Note: water rose 4-5 feet during Sandy on roads along Sheeps Pen Creek.	Road raising in Mastic Beach has been eliminated from the Recommended plan.
222	Geoffrey Marshall	I am a 4th gen. Patchogue zip code resident, I remember going to the beach with my sand there. We commended that when were a kid there were three sets of dunes. When I was a little kid there were 2. Now there is barely 1. This is a natural process. Mother Nature won't be stopped what makes you think that beach replenishment will alleviate all of that?	Acknowledged; recommended plan includes non-structural measures, including buy-outs
223	Don Hester, President - Cherry Grove Dune Fund Inc	Our community has no internal roads. Mutual aid by neighboring fire departments need uninterrupted access, especially off season - plan says closed. As the pres. Of org. for over 40 years building our dunes where are said to be best on FI. Concern beach supplement will swamp and destroy snow fence and grass planting. Past 12 months private funds put in over 20,000 private money, worried about work being buried under your "replenishing FINS put approximately 100' without community created truck, breach in dunes lower than Ocean Beach, washed through in Sandy. Will taper off beach included rebuild dune on FINS truck.	Acknowledged; recommended plan includes non-structural measures, including buy-outs
224	Keenan Boyle	Have you seen what they did to downtown Montauk? Would you consider that a success worth copying? Once we move forward we can never go back and the land will be forever changed. "Nature will find a way."	Comment acknowledged.
225	Glenn Walton	My suggestions for wavy construction instead of straight line design. If is a formula for coastal storm wave energy per coastal shoreline distance could be shown it would look like this. WE (wave energy)/Length (miles) so if WE = 100 100/100 or 1 erosion energy. Now if the same WE were to be figured on wavy coast such as one with scallops it may change the formula to WE/Length = 100/150 or 2/3 the erosion energy.	Acknowledged; recommended plan includes non-structural measures, including buy-outs
226	Andrew Netter	If pumping sand on the beach doesn't last, why do we keep doing it? Is the plan to keep replacing sand forever? Why don't we use this budget to move out of the way?	Acknowledged; recommended plan includes non-structural measures, including buy-outs
227	Yolando Vannoni Jr.	As a lifelong, fulltime resident/business owner/ x fire chief/ current fire commissioner (Ocean Bay Park Fire District) of Ocean Bay Park Fire Island, seeing any work done to protect Fire Island and Long Island is great news. Thank you for your efforts in trying to find the best solution possible. One point I would like to address is the proposed automobile dune crossover (cut) in Ocean Bay Park. I recommend this new crossover be located at the southern end of Seneca Street on the west side of the current (and future) boardwalk dune crossover for the following reasons: 1. direct bay to ocean access 2. fully paved road 3. easy on and off of the beach 4. no rework of roads or personal property around the houses in the area of the current cut. If you have questions, please contact me at 631-583-5271. Thank you for your time and attention to this suggestion.	Your recommendations will be considered during the detailed design phase of the project.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
228	T. Jeff Adamo, MA	<p>Comments on FIMP. Thank you in advance for your attention. 1. BARRIERS AND DRAINAGE I understand raising waterfront roads are part of the FIMP proposal. It is an excellent idea until a very severe storm surge over washes them. Therefore drainage for the trapped water needs to be addressed, lest it remains in the catch basin and becomes a health hazard. So POST FLOOD DRAINAGE of water is essential. Pumping equipment is expensive but gravity flow is free. Simple PVC drainage pipe with one-way valves may be all that is needed. For example depending on engineering calculations, let's say every 100' a drainpipe and 1 or 2 one-way valves would run from catch basin to bay. It may also include groundwater filtration so the outflow is cleaner. One of several such systems is Cromaglass.</p> <p>http://www.septicssystem.com/brands/cromaglass.html One such unit may serve several sewers in a connected system. 2. FLOOD WATER MANAGEMENT Some ground rise surrounding inland hard structures will soften FLASH FLOOD IMPACT. However when raising inland houses, other than those in waterfront sand on pilings, drainage runoff depends on LAND CONTOUR surrounding the structures. So it must be considered to be directed to the above mentioned drainage areas. 3. BEACH SAND EROSION In order to prevent ECONOMIC RESOURCE waste of replacing barrier beach sand every two years, hardened structures such as railroad cars and steel plates to retain sand or encourage reef building have been used right on the eastern beaches as well as offshore Miami and many other areas. Offshore placement may, be under Federal control outside the jurisdiction of NYS DEC. Whereas the numerous jetties and groins to the East have deprived our beaches of natural LITTORAL DRIFT of replenishing sand, the jetty system or a substitute must either be extended westerly, starting at Smith Point then Bellport Inlet to urban areas that are concrete hardened. In the above instances I more or less agree with the Town of Brookhaven's assessment, but I strongly disagree with other statements as follow. 4. WATERFRONT VEGETATION It has been found from "Ducks Unlimited" research that replacement of unnatural Invasive Phragmites with natural sea grasses/ Partanae, absorb more floodwater and strengthen the shoreline. It invades bird nesting and thus mitigates mosquito born health hazards. 5. SEA LEVEL RISE It is clearly a geological fact that planet Earth has experienced severe climate, sea level and magnetic polar changes throughout pre-history i.e. before the existence of human activity. It would be impossible to argue that these were manmade events. They were most likely caused by astronomical and volcanic events. I inspected the National Weather Service records from 1870 to 2010 and from these unadulterated records only found temperature hikes from 1870 to 1901 and from 1913 to 2010. However from 1920 to 2010 the climate appears to be stable with some reversed changes lasting one decade. I have made measurements of ground water rise over 17 years I've owned property in Mastic Beach which show a total rise of approximately 2.5"-3" which is .15"- .19"/year, or 7.5-9" over the next 50 years. Barring unforeseen catastrophic astronomical events, I see no "acceleration". Predictions of 3.5' per 50 years appear exaggerated. In addition to calculating the effects of evaporation and Equatorial latitude into any prediction of the effects of global climate change, the ground does not behave like a glass bowl of water but as far as a far more complex hydrodynamic system, like a sponge with huge reservoirs of underground water. The final truth will tend to elude all predictions. Even the prediction of weather events is too complex for the most sophisticated computer models, so how certain are we of climate 50 years hence? Therefore I concur with the conservative Federal estimate and differ with Town of Brookhaven's hypotheses. 6. POLITICAL vs. NATURAL FORCES: The constitutional directive of the US Army is to protect all citizens. Some 'green' notions attempt to encourage a state of mind to run and hide from the onslaught of nature. If these notions prevailed, the Netherlands, the city of Miami, the art of Venice Italy, New York City's Battery Park and civilization itself would not exist. 7. HUMANS AND NATURE ARE NOT ALWAYS AT ODDS and in the case of the Army Corps replenishment of the Fire Island barrier dunes; the Piping Plover's habitat was preserved as well. No island - no nesting grounds. 8. LOCAL POLITICS of the TOB AND MASTIC BEACH. The NYS DEC, Suffolk Co., Southampton and Brookhaven have endorsed many shoreline-hardening procedures, yet there are always objections to the protection of our homes in Mastic Beach! How did the TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN agree to major shoreline modification in Mt. Sinai's Harbor Hills, Village Beach Rd.? In itself this illustrates that decisions are often made on an ECONOMICAL/POLITICAL rather than an ecological basis. We see no 'retreat' from the waterfront on Wall Street, of from Brooklyn to the Hamptons. This unequal treatment based on social economic status and race, is in defiance of the U.S. Constitution, and should be heard by the supreme Court before acted upon! We have seen profitable reversals from "green" condemnation to builders' banquets as close as the Smithpoint condos. How much closer are they to the so-called "natural" retreat of the wetlands? Our current Mastic Beach mayor Sperry is a real estate agent and landlord in Brooklyn and Mastic Beach. She has decided to ally herself with TOB's 'retreat' politics, if I may speculate as in the above example, in order to profit. The mayor herself has no intent to retreat! She had her own rental houses raised, and I am sure will avail herself to government funds to raise her residence. This is the height of hypocrisy. The mayor does not have a majority mandate, therefore does not represent most of her constituents, so I plead surge you to listen to the Village of Mastic Beach trustees who represent a large voting block, which strongly objects to 'retreat'. The Board of Trustees, Civic leaders and voting citizens will be watching the politics and treatment of middle class Mastic Beach relative to wealthier areas to the East, North and West. I hope and expect that Congressman Zeldin and others will address the inequity.</p>	<p>Responses to specific comments are as follows: 1. BARRIERS AND DRAINAGE Road Raising is no longer included in the Recommended Plan; 2. FLOOD WATER MANAGEMENT Appropriate drainage will be provided in conjunction with the building retrofits; 3. BEACH SAND EROSION - In order to the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes to the extent possible, the recommended plan does not include any hard structures; 4. WATERFRONT VEGETATION Comment acknowledged; 5. SEA LEVEL RISE Comment acknowledged; 6. POLITICAL vs. NATURAL FORCES: Comment acknowledged; 7. HUMANS AND NATURE ARE NOT ALWAYS AT ODDS Comment acknowledged; 8. LOCAL POLITICS of the TOWN AND MASTIC BEACH. Comment acknowledged.</p>
229	Glenn Walton	The ACE straight line construction of placing new beach areas where erosion has sculpted a more natural slope seems counter productive and money not well spent. A large amount of money is being spent on engineering that repetitively is not working. How about trying some of the longshore currents that are responsible for removing vast quantities of sand. I have some perpetual sand bar designs that will behave like reefs protecting erosion prone locations where the coast turns.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. This analysis shows that the project benefits over the 50 year period of analysis exceeds the cost with a Benefit to Cost Ratio of (TBD)
230	Glenn Walton	Surfing reefs built with submerged plastic sheet pile in various shapes that control wave activity and create inner lagoon areas would add to the recreation benefits while stabilizing a zone. These underwater walls would likely only protrude up from the bottom 3 or 4 feet. They would be jettied in as in the dockbuilding industry. They likely would be most effective and last a very long time. I believe several test models should be included in the work.	Sinking old trains and other offshore barriers was considered during Phase 1 of the Formulation process and rejected, since it was not consistent with the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes. .
231	George Simms	I'm concerned that this plan was created by engineers with sufficient scientific input, and that it will be a waste of money and will not be a lasting solution.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. This analysis shows that the project benefits over the 50 year period of analysis exceeds the cost.
232	Legislature Bridget Fleming	Will submit written comments want to express appreciation for public comment process. I represent LD-2 in the Suffolk County Legislature which runs from Each Moriches to Montauk.	Acknowledged; thank you.
233	Michael Kobasiuk	How is this project looked at by the National Flood Insurance?	Since project does not provide a line of protection that exceeds the 1% probability storm, Flood insurance will likely still be required for homes within 100 year flood plain.
234	SP	Really, does it take this much time to analyze the FI beach conditions since the 60's. What happened to Irine isn't even mentioned in the draft. It did more damage in some areas than Sandy did! We have wonderful computers to model the conditions and make predictions for contingency plans. Do not see any mention in the report. Now I assume you all are career employees milking the government as long as possible, maybe for retirement, what a coincidence. Stop with all the high brow jawboning, pretty pictures, confusing statements and dumb assessments. Let me fill you in on something, if a category 4-5 hurricane hits FI, similar to 1938, you isn't gonna stop it from flattening out Fire Island. If you really want to do something useful and save the taxpayers all this money, make a decision to stop studying and do something useful.	Acknowledge opposition.
235	Stefan Beaumont	Restoration of Montauk failed. What's left?	Comment acknowledged.

**Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS**

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
236	Robert F. Meyer	I am shocked to learn that a group of self-proclaimed "do-gooders" will lobby Congress "to return the ocean to its natural state. THIS IS THE HEIGHT OF IRRESPONSIBILITY! The potential devastation to the main land in Suffolk and Nassau counties is mind-boggling. As a property owner at 225 Cottage Walk, Ocean Beach, Fire Island I am writing this protest.	Comment acknowledged.
237	Marshall Brown	Discuss how effective your efforts to rebuild the east coast - Sandy has been past - Hermine.	The plan recommended for implementation was based on a thorough economic and environmental analysis of potential alternatives, and has been determined to best address of the project objectives.
238	William Booth	Dear sir, I am opposed to the beach erosion project along the South shore of Eastern L.I., N.Y. I am, a resident of Quogue, N.Y. I don't think the Army Corps of Engineers project will actually help with erosion. It is waste of money that will make the problem worse.	Acknowledge opposition.
239	Heidi Oleszczuk	As predicted by last year's protesters, the Montauk seawall did not hold, and that part of the beach struck by rough waves and high tides has been virtually destroyed. Might the Army Corps consider taking seriously the recommendation of coastal geologists who can contribute their proven expertise to the discussion and formulation of plans that directly affect economic- as well as the environment - future of Montauk? Allowing for RETREAT NOW could save our children and grandchildren from the economic burden of dredging sand (which after 30 years the state will not be funding) in the face of an unstoppable ocean and sea level rise in order to allow nature to find a balance unimpeded by hard structures in order to waste again the beach which is one of the main reasons people come to Montauk.	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
240	Aram Ferchunan	Review of engineering and economic conspirations of Downtown MTK Project	Comment acknowledged.
241	Anonymous	Will you be removing the bags now that they are causing chemical burns of people? And proved ineffective. A sample of the bag is currently being tested by Bureau Ventas	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
242	Perry Duryea III	Last night I attended the Army Corps forum regarding proposed beach replenishment for downtown Montauk. Unfortunately, the renderings depicting the portion of the downtown beach to be replenished fall far short of what is needed to protect Montauk village from catastrophic water intrusion. Roughly sixty years ago, during Hurricane Carol, I witnessed a wave come over the dunes and break where the Montauk IGA sits today. Obviously sea water levels are much higher than they were in the 1950s, and the current dune line has been greatly reduced by wave and wind action. The diagrams presented last night showed beach replenishment occurring east of where the IGA is located, and even with westward sand migration following replenishment, the vulnerable sector running from the beach just west of the village north to Fort Pond and on Fort Pond Bay on the Sound side is dangerously exposed. We have not had a Category 3 Hurricane here since the Great Hurricane of 1938, but it is quite conceivable that during a storm of such magnitude, the ocean would surge northward across Fort Pond and on to Fort Pond Bay, thus cutting Montauk in half and totally disrupting transportation and telecommunications. I feel it is imperative that the proposed beach replenishment for the Montauk commercial sector be extended westward to a point near the eastern juncture of the Old Montauk Highway and State Route 27. This measure would provide the long-term protection that the community requires.	The Recommended Plan only provides for sediment management in Montauk, in which approximately 450,000 CY of sand will be placed approximately every 4 years in Montauk as a feeder beach to help restore the natural longshore sediment transport coastal processes. While evaluated, buy-outs and private and public assets relocations in Montauk were not economically justified.
243	Anonymous	Since the hard structure (Bags) in Downtown Montauk have proved themselves unsuccessful. Is there a possibility of removal and replacement with sand?	The Recommended Plan does not provide for constructing any new hard structures.
244	Chris Carillo	Given the failure of the sandbag based erosion control in areas such as Topsail Island, N.C. and the damage to the project already sustained here in Montauk, it is clear our community has major concerns about the success and future of this type of plan. Although I understand there are topographical differences, Duval County, Florida has maintained successful beach renourishment for 3 decades by pumping sand from offshore every 4 years. Please discuss cons of this type of project here in Montauk.	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
245	Stephen White	Is there a way to contain the plastic in bags in town and the lighthouse the brown or tan ones in town have already become exposed and washed as far as Ditch Plains, and the black woven plastic from years ago are exposed on the sand by the lighthouse and disintegrating at least five places this weekend. We need no new plastic on the beach or in oceans as fish and newborn humans no all contain plastic	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
246	Peter Joyce	As coordinator for hurricane preparedness for the Montauk Fire Dept. This project is crucialto the survival of Montauk. I feel that Ditch Plains should also be included as it has a large impact in Lake Montauk if there is a breach. We feel that what has been proposed is too little. Montauk is crucial to the economy of the Town, County and State. There is no moving the structure to other areas as there is no available land. I also feel that history of our beaches and dunes should be taken into account. Thank you.	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
247	John Alters	I am concerned that it will be the property owners in Montauk that will bear the brunt of the financial burden of maintaining this project.	While initial construction is 100% federally funded within the available PL 113-2 2 funds, Periodic renourishment is cost shared with the non-federal sponsors, while O&M is a non-federal sponsor responsibility, consistent with the Project Cooperation Agreement to be executed.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
248	Lou Cortese	Ditch Plains is a feeder beach to the Downtown area beaches. Wouldn't it make sense to renourish it so as to feed the beaches to its west?	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a initial fill volume of 450,000 cy, with subsequent renourishment about every 4 years. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
249	Karen K. Hess	Beach access at Lowenstein Court need to be made handicapped accessible - (21" drop bottom step descending to original path) - ramp needed. Drainage pipe at Lowenstein Court spews polluted water (needs to be covered child could drown when filled with water it never spewed that much water previously). It's not a good idea to mess with Mother Nature she will have the last word. I live on Oceanview Terrace.	In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the project provides for handicap accessible beach access.
250	Pathu Kaszwska	Why do we have to sacrifice a local beach for erosion control? That is what happened. Why is a drainage pipe draining onto a public beach? There is no sewer system so it doesn't take much imagination as to how clean the water is.	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
251	Araine Creya - Montauk Chamber of Commerce	Why isn't the IGA part of the Downtown restoration? In the last Hurricane Carol 1954 the IGA location was covered with a surge of water! What will you do to protect that area?	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
252	Kevin McAllester	Downtown Beach Nourishment - With the installation of the geotextile sandbag revetment and likelihood of accelerated beach loss, what is the rationale for not prescribing a larger-scale renourishment project? Is borrow site 8d (Napeague) comprised of beach compatible sediments? Is it considered a reasonable distance for transport to downtown and points east?	The Recommended plan includes the establishment of a feeder beach on Montauk Beach with a variable width at an elevation of +9.5 feet NGVD 29. The berm width will be determined based on a fill volume of 450,000 cy. This volume is designed to offset the long-term erosion within these areas, and to maintain a stable beach configuration. The fill would also cover the sand bags placed as part of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project.
253	Kenny Hilderbrandt	2. Why not have Suffolk County be the local sponsor? 3. Who determines who is the local sponsor?	The State of New York has designated the NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation (DEC) to be the local sponsor for the project; Suffolk County will be a sub-sponsor to the DEC.
254	Edith Charlton	Supports project. As an owner of a home in Ocean Beach, Fire Island I wish to address the work going on along our oceanfront. Our dunes are beginning to be re-built and what we fear now is that when they are completed there is no organization set-up to maintain and repair these dunes. If FIMP is not given the authority and finances to follow-up, all the work and expenses spent on re-building the dunes will be wasted, because more storms are imminent. This cannot be permitted. As a barrier beach, we have the support of Suffolk County. We also have the support of the Fire Island National Seashore and the Army Corps of Engineers. These supports cannot be ignored and minimalized. Thank for reading the above.	Acknowledged; thank you.
255	Chris Goodwin	inlet sand bypassing- please explain concept. Public comments - will be available copies for public? FAQ database? Where is environmental study on old inlet impacts? Marine life has flourished since breach.	The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life.
256	Chris Goodwin	Sustainability - Will is last? Why maintain same shoreline? Old Inlet - Closing up? Environmental Impact - Affect on seabed. "Dynamic environment" Doesn't that reduce wave dissipation? Economically justified - Any estimate on local cost to maintain?	The GRR considers describes the recommended plan, how it was selected, and the costs, including the estimated maintenance costs.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
257	William (Bill) Brudi	I am a West Islip resident and home owner. I have grown up here in West Islip and plan to stay here for the rest of my life. In my time, I have seen the decay of our waters' ecosystem due to rising ocean temperatures and increased water pollution. Since Superstorm Sandy, these problems have been remedied somewhat by the increased size and number of inlets from the Atlantic Ocean into the Great South Bay. The oceanic life is booming and each and every day we are seeing species that we've all but forgotten to have inhabited our local waters. Puffer fish, King fish and even weakfish in addition to the greater numbers of shellfish. Not to mention sharks, dolphins and seals. I take pride living on Long Island knowing we have some of the worlds best seafood right in our own backyard. The inlets formed after Sandy have proven to bring life back into our Bays. The very same life that many individuals use to earn a living, or what brings tourists here to visit areas such as Fire Island and the Hamptons. Congressman Zeldin and the Army Core of Engineers may believe it is a good idea to close the inlets for the safety of shoreline communities, but many others disagree. Doing so would waste hundreds of millions of tax payer dollars and government funding that could be used elsewhere. In addition, I do not believe it is justified because closing the inlets means destroying homes and lives of many indigenous species. What right do we have to do so, just so that people can still live in their multi-million dollar waterfront homes? Long Island is just that...an island, that is made of sand. Having homes in an area that is susceptible to flooding, erosion and high winds is never a smart idea and myself as well as thousands of individuals from Facebook (Save The Great South Bay group) feel the same way. In short, I DO NOT agree with the plans to close the inlets/breaches in our backyard. The ocean is a powerful beast and this proposal is simply a waste of time, money and resources all while chasing a temporary solution. Say NO to closing the breaches! Say YES to a thriving oceanic ecosystem!	Thank you for your comments.
258	Enrico Nardone	1. Given the lessons of new "Old Inlet" does the FIMP represent a departure in any way from the "close - all breaches" approach of the NY Breach Contingency Plan? 2. Poster titled "Long-Term Barrier Island Processes" says "interruption of these processes (breaches, overwash, etc.) will destabilize the carrier over time." Doesn't the FIMP interrupt these processes by design?	The Inlet management component of the project includes inlet dredging and sand bypassing, or placement of dredged sand on downdrift beaches.
259	Joseph Jannsen - The Nature Conservancy	The Nature Conservancy owns multiple ocean-facing properties, properties w/in the bayside flood zones, as well as 13,423 acres of submerged lands in GSB. We have a lot at stake in how the FIMP plans are written and implemented. It is critical that landowners and local govt's carefully consider the implications and liabilities of all options and carefully consider how current and future land use policies might compliment/interfere with the intended goals. We requested an extension of the comment period and although granted to mid Oct more time may be needed. Specifically, revisions to the BCP with the release of the FI Wilderness Inlet EIS imminent. Therefore we request an additional extension. Thank you.	An extension to submit comments was given.
260	Jessica Price The Nature Conservancy	On August 30, The Nature Conservancy submitted a request to extend the comment period deadline. Although the deadline has been extended to mid-October, more time may still be needed for stakeholders and cost share partners to fully evaluate the social economic and environmental ramifications of this proposed project. In particular we find it out of sequence to discuss revisions to the Breach Contingency Plan in the absence of the imminent release to the Environmental Impact Studies on the Wilderness Inlet. We thus recommend further extending the FIMP comment period. This should have an impact on the extensive 100% federally funded efforts that are already in the works to move more sand and berms along ocean facing structures over the next two years as part of the Fire Island to Moriches Inlet (FIMI) plan. Thanks again for your time and effort.	Comment acknowledged.
261	Brigid Vele	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
262	Paul Fiodella	Your NAVD88 chart shows a sea level rise for 2100 of between 1.2 and 5.5 feet. The latest science as published in Nature (March 2016) shows a model of sea level rise by 2100 of at least 6.5 feet. This would put much of Montauk under water. How can reinforced dunes even begin to protect Montauk from this inevitable disaster? Shouldn't you have told the people of Montauk the truth, that they are going to lose their homes, businesses and livelihoods if they do not raise Montauk infrastructure to higher ground?	The GRR considers three SLR scenarios as required by USACE guidance.
263	Thomas B. Muse	1. Why are we not seeing fee acquisition, buy-outs or private and public assets relocation in Montauk? 2. How do we fuse together any future federal beach fill projects with an executable local real estate plan focused on storm and sea level rise vulnerable structures. 3. Coastal features migrate landward, true or not?	Responses to comments are as follows: 1) Buy outs and private and public asset relocations within Montauk are not economically justified; 2) The Recommended Plan provides for sediment management in Montauk, in which approximately 450,000 CY of sand will be placed approximately every 4 years in Montauk as a feeder beach to help restore the natural longshore sediment transport coastal processes. While evaluated, buy-outs and private and public assets relocations in Montauk were not economically justified. 3) The coastal environment is dynamic and responds to many different factors.
264	Andrew Brosman	Why was there not a more robust analysis of sea level rise using less conservative models? "Historic Sea Level Rise" use is commonly acknowledged as conservative for planning purposes? How will the buyback program work? Who will receive? How long can buyback funds be kept available? How does NY Buyback program "NY Rising" play into the p0lan? TSP relies heavily on beach fill and lacks specific cost and maintenance sharing with local entities. Can you explain what those cost/maintenance sharing be?	USACE guidance requires that potential relative sea level change must be evaluated for a range of possible sea level rise rates: In addition to the historical rate ("low") which is a 0.7 ft. increase over the period of analysis, the project must also be evaluated using "intermediate" and "high" rates derived from modified NRC Curves I and III, which for this Interim Study are estimated to be 1.1 ft. and 2.6 ft. increases, respectively over the fifty year period-of-analysis. Analyses was conducted with the three anticipated rates of sea level change for the 100-yr, 250-yr, and 500-yr storm events for the recommended plan to ensure that the project is adaptable to future sea level rise. USACE utilized the most current available data for sea level rise analysis. Further, adaptation features take into account intermediate and high future sea level rise predictions. The specific project features, maintenance costs and project cost sharing are explained in the Final GRR.

**Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS**

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
265	Kevin McAllister	Army Corps responses to my questions regarding sea level rise and how the projected rates of rise (L, M H) are applied with project design have left me bewildered. At the Patchogue meeting, it was represented that the low, medium and high rates of SLR are all considered and field adjustments will made as necessary. While this approach may work with beach fill and structural responses, the failure to factor-in at least the medium-range projection as identified by NY State for tidewater/groundwater inundated areas (i.e. Mastic Beach, Dune Rd west of Shinnecock, motel row Montauk) dismisses coastal retreat as the appropriate alternative. Huge dollar investments (~\$630M) to elevate homes and raise roads is a waste of tax dollars which only delays relocation and at much higher cost later. Can you please explain why SLR is not featured prominently in the plan and retreat is not treated as an appropriate option?	The recommended plan is based on a detailed analysis of the costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of various alternatives, as well as taking into account sea level rise.
266	Carol Winklevoss	Rising sea levels: NY Times - sunny day flooding. Will there be an agreement reached amongst scientists + DEC + Army Corps as well as local officials on the current rate of sea level rise e.g. proposal to raise Dune Road planning for next 30 years.	The raising of Dune Road is not a component on the Recommended Plan
267	Andrew Brosnan	Concerned about using historic SLR - trend is this a low estimate. Impact on plans? Why remove a portion of a groin and not the whole thing? To restore natural processes. Breach - water to back bay - more? Increase water flush = good. 30 yr renourishment - then what? Need more retreat.	Comments acknowledged.
268	Harald de Ropp	I am a resident of Quogue and attended the Corps' Southampton presentation in late September on the FIMP project and have a few questions or concerns. 1. I was struck by how large the designated Borrow Area is off Quogue Beach. It is far larger than any other such designated areas, yet Quogue would appear to require relatively little in the way of such sand for the protection of its beaches and dunes, given their present profile. It would be very much appreciated if you could provide the elements that led to this decision. 2. Is subsidence an issue at all for the area of the proposed project? I understand from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute on Cape Cod that the land mass there is subsiding at the rate of about 4 inches over a 40 year period and that this rate has been remarkable stable for a long period of time.3. I understand that the sandbar near the Quogue shoreline has been present, in one form or another, since at least the 1938 hurricane. Its existence would appear to mitigate at least some damage to the beach and dunes which would otherwise occur. I therefore suggest that a determination be made as to how much protection this sandbar provides so that the parameters for determining the appropriate protection for our beach and dunes can be elevated to compensate for the sandbar's possible disappearance. 4. Would you explain how much protection to our beaches and dunes will be provided by your proposed program in terms of Storm Categories 1,2,3 or 4? These are terms that the broader public can readily understand. Thank you for your consideration of these matters.	Responses to comment are as follows: 1) The borrow site selection process is discussed in Appendix B - Borrow sites; 2) Subsidence is not considered to be a significant issue for the project area relative to potential sea level rise over the 50 year period of analysis; 3) There are no plans to remove the sandbar near the Quogue shoreline; 4) The project provides storm risk management as described in the GRR, with a certain amount of residual risk remaining.
269	Kevin McAllister	Having made brief statements at three of the four public meetings convened on the above referenced matter, I'm assuming my remarks are included in the record. Please consider the following written comments in conjunction with my public remarks. 1. Sand Bypassing at the inlets is an essential component of the FIMP plan which we support. Inlet currents remove a significant volume of sand from the sand transport system each year. Maintaining sand flow by inlet bypassing (dredging and redepositing sand) should be implemented to the greatest extent possible. 2. Beach Nourishment is environmentally and economically unsustainable. The Army Corps acknowledges this in their disclosure that they're going out of the business of pumping sand in 30 years. The Corps FIMP team has said in a public meeting that the prescribed actions (pumping sand and structural manipulations) are "bandaids." Coastal planning decisions must be science-based and forthright. 3. Sea Level Rise (SLR) is a major factor effecting coastal living. Yet, the Army Corps is treating SLR as a mathematical equation which can be addressed by field measurements. For some locations (i.e. Mastic Beach), coastal retreat is imperative because of increasing groundwater inundation resulting from SLR. The proposed \$603 million budget to elevate homes and raise roads should also consider the need to move some homes back. A home buyout program that facilitates coastal retreat for flood-prone neighborhoods is the more responsible and environmentally sustainable management action. 4. Borrow Sites need to be moved further offshore to deeper waters than located in the FIMP plan. The adverse impact to near shore fisheries habitat is more significant than acknowledged by the sponsors of dredging projects. 5. Downtown Montauk - It's misleading to call the geotextile revetment a "reinforced dune." The structure is not a dune and does not function as a dune. The beach and dune comprise a system and beach equilibrium will only be realized when the system is functioning. - Geotextiles kill beaches and the bags must bge removed. - The Corps is cavalier about sea level rise, prescribing sand and structures when retreat is the appropriate option. We urge property buyout because delaying the inevitable will only cost more later. - While we support beach nourishment for the effected reach, it's a stop-gap measure that is neither environmentally or economically sustainable. - The front row has to go. Oceanfront properties on South Emerson Ave. must be acquired, buildings razed and replaced with a substantial primary dune. 6. FIMP is a 30-year project plan, it isn't a long-term coastal management plan. The Corps is dismissing SLR and fails to identify coastal retreat as an appropriate action. Natural Processes are the viable and effective approach. Thank you for your consideration to both my verbal and written comments.	Comments acknowledged.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
270	Peggy Danzinger	I am, offering comment regarding the FIMP project both as an individual who has lived year round in Seaview on Fire Island for 32 years and as Vice President of the Fire Island Year Round Residents Association for the last three years. In my position as a teacher at the Fire Island School(16 years), I focused attention on environmental issues whenever possible and encouraged my students to take an active role in the maintenance and care of the precious and special environment in which we live. I applaud the effort to identify a long-term solution to manage and minimize coastal storm damage. My family and I were personally affected by Super Storm Sandy. We were displaced for a year and a half, living in a hotel and then a small rental property until our home could be rebuilt. As there is a long history of damaging storms along the south shore of Long Island, as well as many less than successful efforts to mitigate the damages, an updated plan that responds to changing conditions is more important than ever before. However, the plan needs to be adaptive allowing flexibility to adjust to any damage that changing sea levels and global warming may cause. I support the inclusion of a 30 year commitment for periodic renourishment but would like to see the addition of specific detail about how often this would occur, by what agency and at whose expense. In addition, as our beach is a unique environment, a plan specific to Fire Island renourishment that would allow implementation independently of other segments of FIMP is warranted. That implementation should include authorization for immediate recovery activity after severe storms including the closure of breaches in community areas without condition. This is especially important in order to provide access to the mainland by emergency vehicles, essential services and school buses transporting our children. In conclusion, I would like to see structured involvement and integration of local communities and stakeholders in all future planning. I have always considered it a privilege to call Fire Island my home. I have been, and will continue to be, a responsible steward of this unique island.	Comments acknowledged.
271	Kevin McAllister	Question/commentary on the Mastic Beach segment of the Plan.	The Recommended Plan includes retrofitting or buyouts of homes that are within the 10 years floodplain.
272	Richard Westhoff	On raising of the roads	1) A specific breach response will be undertaken in accordance with overall Beach Response Plan as identified in the Recommended Plan. 2) "Road raising" of Dune Road is not provided by the authorized project and would require a separate authorization.
273	Colleen Perino	I would like to know what 4 areas and will I get help to raise (save) my home in Mastic Beach. I live by Section 5	The Recommended Plan includes retrofitting or buyouts of homes that are within the 10 years floodplain, as identified in the GRR.
274	Anne Snyder	There is no doubt that MB has flooding of roads issues. We need to make sure that SOMETHING is done because status quo is unacceptable.	Comments acknowledged.
275	Alan Chasinor	Mastic Beach. Don't abandon community - elevate roads and houses	Comments acknowledged.
276	Nick	Mastic Beach being affected by a breach with flooding	Comments acknowledged.
277	Peggy Conneely	For funding purposes, if the Town of Brookhaven will not participate as a local sponsor what is there no possibility of. The homes or roads in Mastic Beach being raised? Or is there another option of a local sponsor? Thank you	The State of New York has designated the NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation (DEC) to be the local sponsor for the project; Suffolk County will be a sub-sponsor to the DEC.
278	David Tyers	My name is David Tyers, I am a 40 year resident of Mastic Beach, NY. Lee M. Zeldin has advised that we can reach out to you as part of the public comment period regarding the FIMP. My Family and friends, and thousands of other families have had the opportunity and privilege to enjoy Smith Point Beach for generations. Growing up in Mastic Beach has afforded us the opportunity to frequent this beach every year and during every season, allowing us to enjoy all it has to offer. Once the groins/jetties were put in place east of Smith Point Beach in the Westhampton Beach area, there has been a steady pattern of erosion here. As someone who was on the beach all year long each and every year, it was quite obvious that once they were put in place that Smith Point Beach was losing sand at its shoreline. I am assuming the modification of these groins and jetties will help, or maybe installing groins and jetties at Smith Point Beach makes the most sense. The replenishment of this beach will allow all residents of Long Island to enjoy this beautiful shoreline again. It will also make more room for the Piping Plover population so we can coexist. Mastic Beach is made up of many hard working people just like all communities of Long Island and we also deserve the attention needed in our area to allow us to live and play here for years to come. Since this project will help protect all South Shore communities including Mastic Beach, please do everything in your power to advise all elected officials to fight for what you believe is the best plan to fix our problem for the long term. We are in need of the expertise and we are relying on this to help us keep our homes and areas of recreation. On behalf of myself and thousands of other residents, thank you to you and your teams for taking on this project. Please know that your efforts are appreciated and that they do not go unnoticed.	Acknowledged; thank you.
279	Colleen Henn	1. As part of the floodplain, for the houses that are being raised, do you have a plan for the underground sanitary systems? 2. We saw in downtown Montauk that manmade structures haven't proven to reduce risk from storm surge. Why are you placing more emphasis on restoring dune habitat as root structures provide a natural barrier and increase our resilience systems?	1) Under the FIMP project there are no plans to upgrades to the underground sanitary systems. 2) The recommended plan provides for dunes along the barrier island system.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
280	Martin G. Vasak	My name is Martin Vasak I live at 60 Price St., Patchogue, NY 11772. I am sending this correspondence to advocate that Price Street, in Patchogue, N.Y. remain a part of the home elevating project associated with the Draft HAGRR and DEIS. I have lived at 60 Price Street for 19 yrs. and the homes on Price street have not only damaged, but repeatedly threatened years after year due to constant flooding on our streets from the impacts of storms on the Great South Bay. Super Storm Hurricane Sandy has created a new breach in the barrier island of Fire Island that has added a new entry point for storm seas to enter the Great South Bay thus providing the Atlantic Ocean waters a quicker and more damaging storm surge to all those living near the beaches in Patchogue, particularly, Price St. And Sunset Lane as we have the Great South Bay no more than 400 feet from my house to the south, Patchogue River, 200 feet to my east and Tuthills Creek less than a quarter of a mile to my west. I am literally surrounded by water, except to the north, where an apartment/condominium complex actually is lower elevation than my house, creates a flooding hazard from the north when the Bay enters through the apartment's parking lot drainage system. Believe me, sir, there is nothing more fun than to watch the water backing up from the bay through the lot's drainage system like several geysers. This cuts off our escape route in the event of these storms. This issue will only worsen with time with the continued global warming, sea level change and most importantly the new breach in Fire Island right across the bay from Patchogue. While some of the homes in my area were able to receive funding to raise their homes through the NY Rising Program, not all of us were as fortunate to receive assistance from this Program. As a result, some of the homes on my street have been raised, and regrettably some have not. It is clear. It is clear that raising our homes will soon be a necessity rather than an option. For myself and many others on my street, raising our homes will not be possible without the assistance of outside funding. While we understand that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have been working diligently to improve the barrier protection and integrity of our shoreline, our homes will continue the barrier protection and integrity of the shoreline, our homes will continue to be at risk due to our street location which is on the peninsula that I said earlier, that protrudes into the Great South Bay. We ask that Price street and Sunset Lane remain a part of this remedial program because as you are aware, the problems on our streets have only begun and will continue to worsen over time. Thank you for the time to read my concerns and we appreciate the consideration for this project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly. Thank you.	Comment acknowledged.
281	Bruce Armour	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
282	Bruce McLaughlin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
283	C Zawadzki	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
284	C. MacDonald Grout	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
285	Cal Mendelsohn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
286	Candace Klein-Loetterle	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
287	Candace Smith	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
288	Candis Allen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
289	Carl Morales	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
290	Carla C Waldron	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
291	Carol Christensen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
292	Frank Fugarius	Many residents have raised their homes with the help of N.Y. Rising. Is the NYS and Federal gov't on the same page as to how high to elevate? I would want to avoid NY and Federal plans not owe the same measurement. Do they exceed the 100 yr level of protection?	The homes proposed for retrofitting would be raised to the level of the FEMA 100 year floodplain.
293	Maura Spey	Can ACOE please make sure that any elevation program includes/requires septic upgrades to the new alternative septic systems?	Upgrades to septic systems is a local issue and responsibility
294	Catherine Kobasink	Is the projects seriously about removing people (inhabitants) from the most vulnerable flood prone areas?	The Recommended Plan provides a level of coastal storm risk management as described in the GRR, but provides no guarantees with regard to protecting existing homes from a future storm event.
295	Marshall Brown	4400 homes are to be raised via this plan. What happens to the cesspools for these homes? Since they'd be sitting near the water table?	Upgrades to septic systems is a local issue and responsibility
296	Matt Gove - Surfrider	How much funding would be available for buybacks and who would run that program? And if there is an amount about how many single family homes would that purchase?	The recommended plan provides for the buyout of approximately 16 homes in the Mastic Beach area, with the exact number subject to change during the design. The NY State Department of Conservation would be responsible for acquiring the properties.
297	Vita Reinoso	I have lived on the ocean in Quogue for 38 years. I have attached photographs taken of our beach since Sandy, it's recovery without beach nourishment and its recent erosion since the existence of a dredge that was off the Quogue beach from approximately February 2015 and into January 2016, transporting sand to Smith's Point. The first photo is post Sandy, the second is June, 2015, the 3rd & 4th photos after the October 2nd 2015 storm, the 5th, December 25, 2015, and the 6th, after the January 26th, 2016 storm that decimated the western end of the Quogue beach, exposing staircases that had been buried for decades. The 7th photo was taken off the Quogue Beach Club in February 2015. It's distance offshore for the duration of time that it removed sand from the ocean floor to be transported west was constant. Coincidence???? Draw your own conclusions. I reject the proposal to elevate homes that are constantly inundated, and support the idea to buy out the homeowners to fortify the wetlands fronting those areas. Sea level rise is here, and the proposal is wasting precious funds trying to protect properties that inevitably will be washed away or condemned inhabitable. "Retreat" should be what the Corps proposes, not continuing to use Band-Aids to appease those in denial of those too selfish to see beyond their own properties, and see the broader picture. Thank you for your time.	Thank you for your comment
298	Anonymous	I recognize that it was stated the project would not be under construction during the breeding season for endangered and threatened species that nest on our beaches. 1. Have you assessed the effects of the project construction on the migratory birds that breed on our shorelines and their ability to continue breeding here in the future? 2. How does the management of the project construction plan to address the fact that there are also endangered and threatened plant species present on our beaches such as Seabeach Amaranth and Seabeach Knotweed? What efforts will be taken to ensure their success?	See EIS for discussion of migratory bird and endangered plant species and what is being done to minimize impacts

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
299	Michael Ong	Has any planning consideration included point source pollution locations such as agricultural runoff?	The authorized project does not provide for addressing point source pollution.
300	Michael Ong	Storm H2O runoff, sewage planning and agricultural runoff all drain into TGSB. Nitrogen levels are high already. Wouldn't closing the inlet raise nitrogen levels and cause more environmental harm to the biota?	There are no plans to close any currently existing inlets.
301	Catherine Kobasink	Will the project or how will the project protect, improve and maintain the wetlands on the North side of the Bay?	The recommended plan provides for placement of approximately 4.2 million cy of sand at 17 Coastal Process Feature (CPF) sites over the 50 year project life to offset the loss of sand that would have resulted from more frequent breaches and overwash. In addition restoration of the existing flood plain and wetlands in proposed for two areas in the Mastic Beach area.
302	Michael Ong	What steps if any have we Long Island (Suffolk, Nassau) taken to join the Billion Oyster Project 'save the shells' campaign? If not, could we create a simple survey and distribute to restaurants to consider if they would join the effort?	While outside the scope of the FIMP project, you are more than welcome to undertake the survey that you propose.
303	Michael Ong	Has any thought towards industry revival considered? 1. Working with TGSB Gardening Program, or NY Harbor School/Foundation. 2. Training Vets oyster skills, creating an available labor force?	While laudable, initiatives such as the comment suggests pertaining to industry revival is outside the scope of the FIMP project.
304	Carol Jackson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
305	Carol Kessler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
306	Carol Pettit	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
307	Carol Winklevoss	Supports plan to use sand bypass. Discuss further sea level rise. Will comments be part of review and planning? Does not believe in beach nourishment.	Thank you for your comments which have been considered in the development of the Recommended plan. As presented in the GRR, the project was evaluated under three different scenarios of sea level change. In addition to the historical rate ("low") which is a 0.7 ft. increase over the period of analysis, the project was also evaluated using "intermediate" and "high" rates derived from modified NRC Curves I and III, which for this Interim Study are estimated to be 1.1 ft. and 2.6 ft. increases, respectively over the fifty year period-of-analysis.
308	Carolina Valenti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
309	Caroline Mislove	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
310	Caroline R. Helmuth	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
311	Caroline Sevilla	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
312	Carolyn Clark Pierson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
313	Carolyn McLaughlin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
314	Carolyn Ragan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
315	Carson Conaway	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
316	Cary Fassler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
317	Cassandra Treppeda	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
318	Catherine Nettesheim	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
319	Catherine Schutte	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
320	Cathy Goldbas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
321	Cathy Weiner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
322	Cave Man	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
323	Charlene Henley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
324	Charlene Russert	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
325	Charles Ruas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
326	Chris Drumright	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
327	Chris Noto	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
328	Christina Di Marco	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
329	Christina Gorman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
330	Christina Schlitt	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
331	Christine Bogdanowicz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
332	Christine Harvey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
333	Christine Rafalska	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
334	Christine Viscuso	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
335	Christopher Comparetta	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
336	Christopher Dunworth	Supports project. USACE should consider removing Ocean Beach jetties, larger dunes (20 ft), longer berm (90 ft), more immediately emergency action post-storm. Examine erosions on Bayfront/Northern side of Fire Island.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders.
337	Christopher Grill	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
338	Christopher Witting	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
339	Christy Carosella	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
340	Chuck Donegan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
341	Cindy Schultz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
342	Cindy Vitale	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
343	CJ Bedzyk	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
344	Clare Armstrong-Seward	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
345	Claudette Preisinger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
346	Claudia Bernstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
347	Claudia Correia	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
348	Clifford Provost	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
349	Cori Ellison	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
350	Colin MacDonald	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
351	Colleen Lobel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
352	Colonel Meyer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
353	Connie Laccone	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
354	Coree Spencer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
355	Courtney Stefano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
356	Craig Newman - Fire Island Summer Club	Supports project. The natural littoral movement of sand from east to west is clearly disrupted by the groins in Ocean Beach. Easterly waves are refracted as well, causing a swirl in the area to their immediate west that scoops out sand and shortens the width of the beach. This can be seen during any prolonged easterly wave action. The deleterious effect of such structures is well documented. Since the water supply in Ocean Beach no longer requires that area to be protected, removing those groins would eliminate the artificial and excessive erosion in Corneille Estates, Summer Club, Robbins Rest and the adjacent National Seashore area.	Comment acknowledged.
357	Craig Sherman	Supports project. 1) Hopes local communities can take immediate damage after storm so no further damage happens. 2) And local communities and orgs will have a say in future planning. And 3) Prefers dunes be higher by about 2 feet.	The standard easement language and the OMRR&R manual (which will be finalized during construction), will specify beach/dune maintenance or restoration activities that local interests municipalities would be allowed to undertake on the beach with their own resources. Modifications can be requested post construction and would be considered as part of the normal regulatory permit process. For all future planning on Fire Island shore management USACE will coordinate directly with the non-federal sponsor, NY State DEC, who will be the primary contact with the local stakeholders to obtain input with regard to future planning with regard to Fire Island shore management. Before construction of any Corps project for coastal storm risk management (CSRM), the non-federal sponsor must agree to participate in and comply with federal floodplain management.
358	Cristina Payne	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
359	Cynthia and Abraham Ofer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
360	Cynthia Franceus	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
361	Cynthia Lamb	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
362	Cynthia Liss	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
363	Cynthia Marie Lippman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
364	Cynthia Raha	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
365	Cynthia Spoto	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
366	D. Remicci	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
367	Dale Solo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
368	Cynthia Dorizas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
369	Damyanti Radheshwar FIIA AIA LEED AP	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
370	Damyanti Radheshwar FIIA AIA LEED AP	Consider resiliency in design, did not see in draft. FEMA Citizen Corp and UNICEF Build it Back Better - take into account. Not adequate time to read draft.	Thank you for your comments. Resiliency in design was considered in the development of the recommended plan.
371	Dana Ivey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
372	Daniel Klein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
373	Danielle Hadfield	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
374	Dave Weissbard	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
375	David Itzhak	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
376	David Lipsky, Ph.D., Q.E.P.	Strong support for Tentatively Selected Plan. 1) P18 S 2.1.5 add info about rate of change and causes of subsidence, 2) P19 clearly identify critical infrastructure such as Ocean Beach WTP, Suffolk Co Water Authority, 3) P22 Will USACE be doing further work to further Shoreline Undulations. 4) P107... (cut off)	Thank you for your comment. Subsidence is not considered to be a significant issue for the project area relative to potential sea level rise over the 50 year period of analysis. Sand placement at the CPF sites will be performed in coordination with renourishment cycles of the beach fill features.
377	David Nutter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
378	David Prystal	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
379	David Sorensen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
380	David Wasserman	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
381	Dawn & Jay Lippert	Supports project. Would like to see structured involvement and integration of local communities for future planning.	For all future planning on Fire Island shore management USACE will coordinate directly with the non-federal sponsor, NY State DEC, who will be the primary contact with the local stakeholders to obtain input with regard to future planning with regard to Fire Island shore management. Before construction of any Corps project for coastal storm risk management (CSRM), the non-federal sponsor must agree to participate in and comply with federal floodplain management.
382	Dawn Lippert, President - Fire Island Year Round Residents Association	Supports inlet management and plan to increase sand bypassing. Suggestions: Increase dune elevation to 17-20 ft; many NY Rising elevation program homeowners missed out; Will breach be closed immediately? Need immediate action; Cannot support cross-island sediment transport. Dune breaching, overwash and cross-island transport not suitable.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders.
383	Dawn O'Donnell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
384	Dawn Schmitz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
385	Dean Speir	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
386	Deb Beck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
387	Debbi Kanzler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
388	Debbie Williamson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
389	Deborah Allen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
390	Deborah Bol	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
391	Deborah Boomhower	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
392	Deborah Dall	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
393	Deborah D'Arcangelis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
394	Deborah Hoffmann	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
395	Deborah Lancman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
396	Deborah Rivel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
397	Deborah Stewart	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
398	Debra Myers	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
399	Debra Naumovitz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
400	Debra Plishka	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
401	Del Ericson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
402	Dena Steele	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
403	Denise Ferrari	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
404	Denise Jennings	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
405	Denise Shapiro	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
406	Denise Stathatos	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
407	Derek Gendvil	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
408	Derinda Nilsson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
409	Detlef Joerss	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
410	Diana Garcia	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
411	Diane Aliperti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
412	Diane Casey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
413	Diane Foley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
414	Diane Graszik	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
415	Diane Groarke	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
416	Diane Hedley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
417	Diane Hughes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
418	Diane Romano, President - Cherry Grove Community Association, Inc.	CGPOA backs their property owners' comments. (which are...Supports FIMP re stabilizing the ocean and bay shorelines, 30-yr commitment, but suggest extend to 50 years. Support adaptive management (SLR and climate change). Need hurricane protection. Suggest elevations be 17-20 ft dune and berm. Include local stakeholders in planning efforts.)	The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years.
419	Dianne Douglas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
420	Dina Williams	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

**Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS**

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
421	Dixon R. Brown, President - Point O' Woods Association	Supports FIMP. Grateful for current FIMI project. Suggested changes: 1) Recognize that gov't disrupted natural processes. 2) info on inlet bypassing 3) 15' dunes, 90' berm and less Advance fill 4) object to conditional breach response, rather Reactive Breach Response 5) O&M plan needs to be clearer 6) emergency services Responses, 6) not enough time to understand OMRRRP manual	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life. The standard easement language and the OMRRR manual (which will be finalized during construction), will specify beach/dune maintenance or restoration activities that local interests municipalities would be allowed to undertake on the beach with their own resources. Modifications can be requested post construction and would be considered as part of the normal regulatory permit process.
422	Don Wiltsie	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
423	Dona Pereira	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
424	Donald J. Shaw	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
425	Donald Sussman, Erosion Control District Commissioner - Fire Island Summer Club and Corneille Estates	Supports project. Most important component is maintenance, 30 years plan. Groins are of concern and should be removed. In support of reestablishing bay shoreline.	Comments acknowledged.
426	Donna Balzano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
427	Donna Certelli	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
428	Donna George	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
429	Donna Hreha	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
430	Donna Lassiter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
431	Donna Lazarus	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
432	Donna Rose	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
433	Donna Stoddard	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
434	Donna Ursprung	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
435	Doreen Tuzza	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
436	Dorene Gray	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
437	Dorothy Hanning	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
438	Dorothy Pressgrove	Supports project. Supports the Village of Ocean Beach Mayor, Mr. Mallot. (who supports project)	Comments acknowledged.
439	Doug Krause	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
440	Douglas Cooke	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
441	Douglas Langenau	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
442	Douglas Morse	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
443	Ed Miller	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
444	Edith Frank	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
445	Edith Ogella	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
446	Edna Litten	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
447	Edward Butler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
448	Edward Colburn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
449	Edward Goldberg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
450	Edward Mitchell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
451	Town Supervisor Larry Cantwell - Town of East Hampton	sediment management plan = sufficient. USACE must consider breach of dune into Fort Pond Bay. Significant changes post-Sandy. Implores USACE to reconsider draft recco for Downtown Montauk. Supplemental sand every 4 years in inadequate. Expand project to full-scale beach nourishment. (Other, very long document also provided here with other matters.)	Thank you for your comments.
452	Edward Rengers	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
453	Edythe Ann Quinn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
454	Eileen Roberts	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
455	Elaine Becker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
456	Elaine Donovan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
457	Elaine Siebenaler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
458	Elaine Zielin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
459	Elana C	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
460	Elana Perez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
461	Elise Adibi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
462	Elizabeth Ashby	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
463	Elizabeth Bonaventura	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
464	Elizabeth Deloma	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

**Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS**

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
465	Elizabeth McFarland	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
466	Elizabeth McGuire	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
467	Elizabeth Mostov	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
468	Elizabeth Poreba	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
469	Elizabeth Root	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
470	Elizabeth Ungar	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
471	Ellen Fleishman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
472	Ellen Frankel	Too many inconsistencies in plan, separate for each community is not going to stabilize beach. Beach has been suffering from no natural sand flow. The Pine Beachfront method works- plantings right after beach sand filling and fencing - has worked.	Comments acknowledged.
473	Ellen O'Neill	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
474	Ellen Valle	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
475	Ellen Wolfe	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
476	Emily Castner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
477	Emily Harting	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
478	Emily Karafil	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
479	Emma Lou Sailors	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
480	Emma Schwarz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
481	Enzo Barrios	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
482	Eric J. Arroyo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
483	Eric Luding	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
484	Erica Mootz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
485	Erin Crotty	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
486	Erin Crotty, Executive Director - Audubon New York (sent from Jillian Liner)	Many detailed comments: Piping Plover, Saltmarsh Sparrow and other habitat encroachment. Creation of overwash habitat. Needs updated sea level rise. Address beach recover. Inlet issue. Sand transport. Disappointed no strategy for buyouts, retreat, habitat restoration. (Refer to letter for the rest)	USACE response similar to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
487	Erma Lewis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
488	Ernest Lee	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
489	Ethan Weinstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
490	Eva Whatley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
491	Eva Zucker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
492	Evan Robinson	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
493	Evelyn Malone	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
494	Evelyn Tully Costa	Does not support project. Selling home after 35 years, lists various reasons why including climate change. Feels pressure should be put on all homeowners to move. Dunes not helping. Living in flood zone and everyone should go.	Opposition acknowledged.
495	Evette Garcia	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
496	F. Robert Wesley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
497	Faith Straley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
498	Fannie Lee	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
499	Fay Forman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
500	Fay Taylor	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
501	Felice & Shelley Bergman	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
502	Felix and Judi Fusco	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
503	Florence Falk	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
504	Frances Saykaly	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
505	Francine Thun	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
506	Frank Adamick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
507	Frank Fiore	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
508	Fred Galka	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
509	Fred W. Thiele, Jr., Member of Assembly & Kenneth P. Lavalle, Member of Senate - New York State Legislature	We are writing today in reference to the downtown Montauk portion of Army Corps of Engineers Fire Island to Montauk Point Coastal Storm risk Management Project. We are concerned that the current proposal is not sufficient to protect the downtown Montauk area, leaving it vulnerable to future coastal storms. The proposed placement of 120,000 cubic yards of sand every four years along a 3,300 foot stretch of downtown Montauk shoreline is inadequate in both volume and length. We echo the concerns identified by the Town of East Hampton and would like to take this opportunity to reiterate their request for a full-scale beach re-nourishment, with an initial placement of 759,000 cubic yards of sand distributed over 6,000 feet of shoreline, with an additional 414,000 cubic yards every four years. This proposed modification would create a larger project with a longer life expectancy that would significantly increase the protection of the vulnerable downtown Montauk area. We look forward to your cooperation in addressing this matter in the finalized Army Corps of Engineers Fire Island to Montauk Point Coastal Storm Risk Management Project.	The Recommended Plan only provides for sediment management in Montauk, in which approximately 450,000 CY of sand will be placed approximately every 4 years in Montauk as a feeder beach to help restore the natural longshore sediment transport coastal processes. While evaluated, buy-outs and private and public assets relocations in Montauk were not economically justified.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
510	Fred Wick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
511	G. Paxton	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
512	Gabriel Abate	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
513	Gail Clark	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
514	Gail Delsavio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
515	Gail Jurgens	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
516	Gail Lebeck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
517	Gail Padalino	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
518	Gail Roberts	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
519	Gary Hayes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
520	Gaye Georges	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
521	Gaye Ruttura	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
522	Gene Mackay	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
523	Gene Mills	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
524	George Buseck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
525	George Held	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
526	Gerald Walsh	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
527	Gilbert Anderson, PE, Commissioner - County of Suffolk Department of Public Works	Local partnership error - no agreement. Timelines are unattainable. Road raising must address stormwater runoff. Report lacks analysis concerning sewers (sanitary, individual). Extend sewers in Mastic peninsula.	The current plan does not include buyouts of developed parcels, but does include acquisition of easements to prevent development of low lying open space necessary to store stormwater runoff. When flood gates are closed due to high storm surges the ponds and natural areas will hold a large portion of the stormwater runoff.
528	Gilda Carrington	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
529	Gina A Megay	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
530	Gina Mikkelsen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
531	Ginger Comstock	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
532	Ginny Siciliano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
533	Giuliana Mazzeo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
534	Glenda Lilling	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
535	Glenn Hufnagel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
536	Glenn Shattuck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
537	Glenn Staub	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
538	Gloria Benedetto	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
539	Gloria Picchetti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
540	Grace Neff	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
541	Gracie Booth	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
542	Richard Schaffer	Support FIMP. In favor of inlet dredging with inclusions of ebb shoal area as source of additional sand for bypassing to western Gilgo beach. Sore Thumb USACE project should be considered in evaluation. Request USACE consider minimum beach width in specs for sand bypassing. Request removal of Gilgo Coast Guard station remaining structures. Disappointed USACE rejected residential buy out aits.	The Recommended Plan does not provide for constructing any new hard structures. The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life.
543	Gudrun Dennis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
544	Harold First, President - The Sandpiper at Westhampton Beach, Inc.	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
545	Harriet Cohen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
546	Harriet Shalat	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
547	Harriette Klepper	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
548	Harvey Spears	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
549	Heidi Cleven	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
550	Heidi Maseduca	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
551	Heidi Tyler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
552	Helen Goodspeed	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
553	Hella Steurbaut	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
554	Herbert Rosenblum	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
555	Herman Villamizar	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
556	Hilarie Louis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
557	Honey Friedman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
558	Hope Carr	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
559	Howard Barker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
560	Howard Epstein & Sandra Hartog	Believes they should consider Formulation of re-nourishment plan so it could be implemented independently of other parts of FIMP, Provide mechanism to authorize immediate recovery post storm.	The standard easement language and the OMRR&R manual (which will be finalized during construction), will specify beach/dune maintenance or restoration activities that local interests municipalities would be allowed to undertake on the beach with their own resources. Modifications can be requested post construction and would be considered as part of the normal regulatory permit process.
561	Howard Lepzelter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
562	Hugh Eng	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
563	Ibn-Umar Abbasparker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
564	Irene Miller	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
565	Irina Rutenburg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
566	Isabelle Kanz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
567	Isabelle Rossi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
568	J Caicco	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
569	Jackie Bocchino	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
570	Jackie Demarais	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
571	Jackie Stolfi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
572	Jai Parekh	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
573	James DiMunno	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
574	James Fishgold	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
575	James Hoffmann	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
576	James Peloquen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
577	James T. B. Tripp, Senior Counsel - Environmental Defense Fund	Attached please find comments of Environmental Defense Fund on FIMP. Design and maintain berm dune. Support moving alignment for berm/dune north so it is no longer along beach where it could do harm. Benefit of refraining from artificial closure of Bellport Inlet for water quality and biological resources. Buyouts- do regulations mean land appraisals should not take into account increasing probability of flooding in response to SLR, erosion, storm?	Comments acknowledged.
578	Jane A. Campbell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
579	Jane Dzubak	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
580	Jane Edsall	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
581	Jane Fallis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
582	Jane Gengo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
583	Jane Murphy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
584	Jane Poklemba	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
585	Jane Zimmerman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
586	Janet Allen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
587	Janet Forman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
588	Janet Harwell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
589	Janet Moser	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
590	Janet Zimmerman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
591	Janine Vinton	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
592	Jann Quigley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
593	Javier Rivera	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
594	Jay Holmes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
595	Jay Johnson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
596	Jay Scheiderman, Supervisor - Town of Southampton	Support FIMP re to promote proactive breach response, inlet management, sand bypassing, sediment management, house elevation as strategies key to managing coastal storm impacts. Preservation of barrier island and flood damage reduction are top priorities. 1) cost burdens on municipalities are enormous 2)essential USACE include temporary haul road to access emergency sand stockpile 3) mobilizing dredging equipment for spot breaches is cost prohibitive. 4) existing network of roads is enough to comply with public access - confirm 5) research shortening of groins more 6) need more detail about voluntary structural elevation assistance program 7) role of trustees as partner is essential to plan implementation 8) Georgica Pond contingencies.... Sediment critical to maintain Water Mill area 9) Need parameters for parking and permit fees 10) Need to be sure sand taken from borrow areas has no effect on fishing.	Among the selection criteria for the borrow sites was little or no impact to active commercial fishing areas. The NYS DEC maintains sand stockpiles in Gilgo Beach and may provide other stockpile areas as they see fit.
597	Jayne Silverman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
598	Jean McNeill	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

**Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS**

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
599	Jean Naples	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
600	Jean Palladino	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
601	Jean Young	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
602	Jeanne Friedman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
603	Jeannette Allan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
604	Jeannine Guerri	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
605	Jeff McKibben	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
606	Jeffrey Hemenez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
607	Jeffrey Marciano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
608	Jeffrey McAdoo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
609	Jeffrey Ward	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
610	Jen Scibetta	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
611	Jenn Spirakis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
612	Jennifer Faulkner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
613	Jennifer Hagens	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
614	Jennifer Harper	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
615	Jennifer Josephy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
616	Jennifer Lynn Jankesh	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
617	Jennifer Marinilli	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
618	Jennifer Maurizio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
619	Jenny Heinz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
620	Jeri Stokes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
621	Jerry Rivers	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
622	Jessica Bader	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
623	Jessica Denis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
624	Jessica Howard	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
625	Jessica Miracola	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
626	Jessica Rodriguez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
627	Jillian Mulvihill	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
628	Jim Hall	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
629	Jim Schmitt	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
630	Jo De George	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
631	Jo Pa	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
632	Joan Barret	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
633	Joan Calazzo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
634	Joan Gingersky	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
635	Joan Ragland	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
636	Joan Rashid	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
637	Joan Svenson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
638	Joan Victor	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
639	Joann Konski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
640	Joanna Kapner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
641	Joe Karr	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
642	Joel Destefano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
643	Joel Finley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
644	Johann Schumacher	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
645	Johannes Sayre	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
646	John and Martha Stollenberg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
647	John Day	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
648	John Dedy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
649	John Draves	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
650	John Gluth	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
651	John Heyneman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
652	John Hunter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
653	John Lucas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
654	John McGarrell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
655	John Nelson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
656	John Pasqua	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
657	John Prybylski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
658	John Schatz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
659	John Sutkowski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
660	John Turano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
661	John W. Lund	Supports Fire Island Assoc. and Davis Park Assoc. letters. (Letter cut off)	Recommended plan provides for a 15 ft dune and 90 ft berm in the vicinity of Davis Park
662	John White	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
663	Jon Fisher	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
664	Jon Singleton	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
665	Jonathan McVey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
666	Josef Asteizna	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
667	Joseph Alfano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
668	Joseph Guzman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
669	Joseph M. Varon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
670	Joslyn Pine	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
671	Joy Swenson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
672	Joyann Murphy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
673	Joyce Conklin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
674	Juan Contreras	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
675	Juanita Dawson-Rhodes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
676	Judi Bird	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
677	Judith Embry	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
678	Judith Felsten	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
679	Judith M. Fitzgerald	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
680	Judith Nelson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
681	Judith Rhodes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
682	Judith Roytos	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
683	Judith Schneider	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
684	Judith Simonsen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
685	Judith Steinman	Strongly supports project. Long overdue.	Acknowledged; thank you.
686	Judy Connick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
687	Judy Hoppe	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
688	Judy Moran	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
689	Julia Parr	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
690	Juliana Salvetti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
691	Julie Aitchison	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
692	Julie Kim	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
693	Julie Kligfeld	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
694	Julie Sasoka	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
695	Julio Rodriguez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
696	June Fait	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
697	June Hurst	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
698	Justin Larrabee	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
699	Justin Leclair	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
700	Justin Shaw	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
701	Justin Tobias	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
702	K N	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
703	Karen Guigliano	In favor of maintaining and repairing the dunes. They worked during Superstorm Sandy.	In accordance with the Recommended Plan USACE will participate in periodic nourishment of the barrier island which includes restoring the dune and berm as needed.
704	Karen Krause	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
705	Karen Lyons Kalmenson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
706	Karen M. Kee	Offers 5 suggestions to draft: 1) Modify Ocean beach groins to a level that the down drift erosion immediately west of groins is stopped. 2) Close the breach, close the old inlet. 3) Build a dune network- not protective bumps. Tapers are a bad idea. #4 and #5 cut off!	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.
707	Karen Mott	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
708	Karen Rubenstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
709	Karen Slote	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
710	Karen Zielen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
711	Karena Wells	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
712	Karl Nilsen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
713	Karlene Gunter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
714	Karyn Fellion	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
715	Karyn Pilgrim	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
716	Kate Sherwood	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
717	Kate Skolnick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
718	Katerina Grinko on behalf of Twomey, Latham, Shea, Kelley, Dubin & Quartararo LLP Law Firm	Opposes project. Very long letter stating reasons including: Historical significance. Not cost effective. Resultant negative environmental changes.	Opposition acknowledged.
719	Katerina Grinko	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
720	Katerina Naumenko	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
721	Katherine Barnhart	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
722	Katherine Feldi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
723	Katherine Peaslee	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
724	Katherine Rusnak	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
725	Katherine Vailakis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
726	Kathleen Amato	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
727	Kathleen Jacobsen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
728	Kathleen Keske	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
729	Kathleen Sorce	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
730	Kathryn Mets	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
731	Kathy Barrier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
732	Kathy Deblasio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
733	Kathy Defruscio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
734	Kathy Haverkamp	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
735	Katie Garton	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
736	Kelley Scanlon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
737	Ken Epstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
738	Kerry Rose	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
739	Kim Buell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
740	Kim McKeon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
741	Kimberly Gunther	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
742	Kitty Savage	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
743	Kris Berner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
744	Kristen Pinsent	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
745	Kyle Gage	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
746	Kyle Jones	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
747	L. Peterson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
748	Laraine Lebron	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
749	Larry Bosket	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
750	Laur Dame	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
751	Laura Anastasio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
752	Laura Ann K Bernstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
753	Laura Desmond	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
754	Laura Guttridge	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
755	Laura J. Peskin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
756	Laura Revilla	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
757	Laura Rudd	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
758	Laura Tartaglia	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
759	Laura Wurzel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
760	Laurel Absolon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
761	Lauren MacLise	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
762	Laurie Storm	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
763	Lawrence D'Arco	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
764	Lawrence Etri	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
765	Lee Schwartzapfel	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
766	Lenore Reeves	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
767	Leo Tobin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
768	Leone Sousa	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
769	Leslie Armstrong	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
770	Leslie Cassidy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
771	Leslie Just	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
772	Lewis Ward	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
773	Lillian Santana	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
774	Lily Bushman-Copp	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
775	Lily Rocco	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
776	Lina Gingold	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
777	Linda Aprile	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
778	Linda Beach	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
779	Linda Gazzola	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
780	Linda Haake	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
781	Linda Henningsen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
782	Linda Hildebrandt	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
783	Linda Lemke	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
784	Linda Lionetti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
785	Linda Macy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
786	Linda Marble	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
787	Linda Paleias	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
788	Linda Pistoletti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
789	Linda Rudman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
790	Lindsay Addison	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
791	Lisa Dandrea	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
792	Lisa Fox	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
793	Lisa Kagan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
794	Lisa Lowe	Supports project. Tentatively selected plan.	Acknowledged; thank you.
795	Lisa Neste	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
796	Lisa Pilosi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
797	Lisa Simms	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
798	Lisa Stern	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
799	Lisa Welch	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
800	Lise Susi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
801	Liz Garratt	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
802	Liz Sabagh	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
803	Logan Welde	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
804	Lois Rappaport	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
805	Lora Smith	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
806	Lorraine Sherman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
807	Lorelei Stierlen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
808	Lorena Owens	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
809	Loretta M. Ferraro, Superintendent - Fire Island Free School District	Fire Island Union Free School District is affected by dune system and sustainability year round. Supports these aspects of plan: Renourishment of beach, Continuation of emergency nourishment plan, Objective to modify groin at Ocean Beach, Construction of viable beach/dunes, Inlet mgmt and plan for Sand bypassing. Believes they should consider Formulation of re-nourishment plan so it could be implemented independently of other parts of FIMP. Provide mechanism to authorize immediate recovery post storm.	Comments acknowledged.
810	Lori Arkin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
811	Lori Pastore	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
812	Lorraine Daly	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
813	Lorraine Grasso	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
814	Lorraine Kelly	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
815	Lorraine Klein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
816	Lorraine Rowe	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
817	Lorraine Sannicandro	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
818	Lourdes Cornier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
819	Lucille Poleshuck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
820	Lucy Bovasso	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
821	Luke Kaufman	With Sandy, dune crests greater than 20 ft suffered minimal damage. Please consider sea level rise when designing the dune and make sure the crest is at least 20 ft to reduce the damage and costs.	Recommended plan was based on a detailed analysis of costs, benefits, environmental impacts and meeting project objectives, that included considerations of sea level change.
822	Lynn Harrington	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
823	Lynn Loiacono	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
824	Lynn Pacifico	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
825	Lynn Rosenfield	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
826	Lynn Slonaker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
827	M Piere	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
828	M Reibscheld	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
829	M. Aronson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
830	M. Gelfer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
831	Mac Frazer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
832	Madeline Nack	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
833	Madelyn Roesch	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
834	Maggie Frazier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
835	Malcolm Elgut	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
836	Manfred Zanger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
837	Manna Cali	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
838	Marc Beschler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
839	Marcia Cooper	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
840	Marda De Wet	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
841	Margaret Chin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
842	Margaret Franceschini	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
843	Margaret Surgeary	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
844	Margaret Vernon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
845	Margarita Luque	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
846	Margery Groten	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
847	Maria Kordes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
848	Maria Millar	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
849	Maria Palmer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
850	Maria Silva	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
851	Marianne Dreizler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
852	Maria Z. Moore, Mayor - Village of Westhampton Beach	Support for elevation of eligible home in 10 yr floodplain. Need more details of municipal cost implications. Oppose shortening of groins Westhampton Beach. It is functioning as designed. BCR less than required 1.0	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
853	Marianne Gonta	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
854	Maribel Acevedo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
855	Marie Ciaccio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
856	Marie Cimaglia	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
857	Marie Garescher	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
858	Marietta Scaltrito	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
859	Marilyn Campolettano	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
860	Marilyn Flynn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
861	Mario Posillico, Village Administrator - Inc. Village of Saltaire	Village of Saltaire supports GRR with modifications recommended by Fire Island Association report that was submitted (by Suze Goldhirsch). Need solution to mitigate flooding bayfront. Village of Saltaire conducted engineering studies to study bay flooding. Erosion identified as reason for bayside flooding. Solution is restoration of northern border Clam Pond Cove.	Comments acknowledged.
862	Marion Wright	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
863	Maritza Corona	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
864	Marjorie Borden	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
865	Marjorie Kuhn	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
866	Marjorie Wilner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
867	Mark Caponigro	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
868	Mark Davis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
869	Mark Keegan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
870	Mark Lotito	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
871	Mark Molloy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
872	Marlena Lange	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
873	Marlene Phelan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
874	Marsha Hunter, President - The Kismet Community Association	Supports project. Supports 30 yr commitment for renourishment. Supports modifying/removing Ocean Beach jetties, proactive responder plan, adaptive mgmt, etc	The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years.
875	Marsha Wiseltier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
876	Martha D. Perlmutter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
877	Martin Anisman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
878	Mary Boyle	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
879	Mary Dingley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
880	Mary Heller	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
881	Mary Kareckas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
882	Mary Keane	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
883	Mary Koski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
884	Mary Lester	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
885	Mary McGeary	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
886	Mary Rogan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
887	Mary Tanoury	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
888	MaryAnn Burch	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
889	Maryanne Brown	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
890	MaryAnne Lieberman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
891	Maryanne Muller	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
892	Marybeth Diss	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
893	Marybeth Mikalsen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
894	Marylaura Lamont	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
895	Marypat Klein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
896	Matt Stedman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
897	Maud LaDue	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
898	Maud McLaughlin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
899	Maude Bunn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
900	Maureen & Samuel Mann	Supports project. Except: The dimensions of dune & berm systems (currently the plan includes 15ft dune elevation and 90 ft berm). We strongly suggest dune elevation should be 17-20 ft to provide protection for Hurricane Sandy type storm. We also ask you to consider formulating a plan for the FI re-nourishment project so it could be implemented independently of the other segments of FIMP. Also, we see the need to provide a mechanism to authorize immediate recovery after severe storms, allowing local entities to take emergency action if there is delay of USACE response. And, most importantly we ask that you include local stakeholders (towns, villages, hamlets) as active participants in future planning for Fire Island shore management.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. The standard easement language and the OMRR&R manual (which will be finalized during construction), will specify beach/dune maintenance or restoration activities that local interests municipalities would be allowed to undertake on the beach with their own resources. Modifications can be requested post construction and would be considered as part of the normal regulatory permit process. For all future planning on Fire Island shore management USACE will coordinate directly with the non-federal sponsor, NY State DEC, who will be the primary contact with the local stakeholders to obtain input with regard to future planning with regard to Fire Island shore management. Before construction of any Corps project for coastal storm risk management (CSRM), the non-federal sponsor must agree to participate in and comply with federal floodplain management.
901	Maureen Brady, Manager - Yardarm Beach Condominiums	Opposes project reducing ocean groin length in Westhampton Beach. Intentionally cause erosion, but no study to assess damage? Shift high costs of dunes onto residents? No study of Westhampton Beach, Yardarm Beach? No economic impact study? No Safety study? No Jardem Bridge erosion study?	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
902	Maureen Ebner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
903	Maureen Hayes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
904	Maureen Loughlin Jones	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
905	Maureen Lynch	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
906	Maureen North	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
907	Mauricio Goncalves	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
908	Mauricio Ramirez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
909	Maxine Bernstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
910	Meagan Fastuca	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
911	Melanie Mahoney Stopyra	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
912	Melissa Barbella	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
913	Melisa Castro	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
914	Melissa Galarza	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
915	Melissa Russell	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
916	Melissa Waters	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
917	Merryl Rothman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
918	Michael Barbato	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
919	Michael Burger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
920	Michael C. Nobiletti	Opposes groins in Westhampton Beach. Very detailed letter from Michael Nobiletti, former NYS Code Enforcement Officer, bldg inspector, administered FEMA and Coastal Erosion code. Talks about Costs, Laws , Groin Cell Sand Capacity, loss of storm protection, loss of sand reserves and dry beach.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
921	Michael Cynamon	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
922	Michael Darby	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
923	Michael Fergot	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
924	Michael Gutleber	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
925	Michael Harlan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
926	Michael Hirschorn	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
927	Michael Kelly	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
928	Michael Murphy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
929	Michael Perez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
930	Michael Richman, President - Board of Managers, High Dune Condominium	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost. 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
931	Michael Rostagno-Lasky	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
932	Michael Scarola	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
933	Michele Birnbaum	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
934	Michele Johnson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
935	Michele Ledesky	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
936	Michele Meli	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
937	Michelle Ognjanovic	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
938	Miguel A Formosa	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
939	Mika Stickford	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
940	Mike Hlat	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
941	Mildred Huffmire	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
942	Miriam and Paul Rice	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
943	Mitchell Rechler	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
944	Monika Bronhen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
945	Monroe Head	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
946	June Monteleone	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
947	Myra Erario	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
948	Myrna O. Leger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
949	Nadine Henderson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
950	Nancy Chapellier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
951	Nancy Chismar	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
952	Nancy Dies	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
953	Nancy Gertler	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
954	Nancy Neimeth	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
955	Nancy Parker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
956	Nancy Perkins	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
957	Nancy Sorenson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
958	Nancy Ward	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
959	Naomi Zimmerman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
960	Natascha Tarmann	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
961	Nathalie Camus	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
962	Neil Farbstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
963	Neill Clenaghan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
964	Nelson Baker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
965	Netania Steiner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
966	Nick Spano	Issues from meetings: 1) Will not retreat. 2) Flooding is serious - cannot leave driveway. 3) Drainage ditches - why do they exist if not maintained- just for mosquitos? 4) Access to bay - critical for community. Build a bulkhead on Riviera between Whittier and Beaver? CLoSe the road and create public walkway? 5) Dredging- consider dredging bay to provide for sand lost. It is "same type" of sand.	Thank you for your comments.
967	Nicole Capogna	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
968	Nicole Diodato	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
969	Nicole LaMontagne, LEED AP	(letter attached in Stephanie Caravolos letter) Include Price St and Sunset Lane. Not able to raise houses without funding.	Thank you for your comments.
970	Nicoleta Voian	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
971	Nikki Harkenrider	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
972	Nina Garfinkel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
973	Nina Knanishu	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
974	Noreen Mullan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
975	Norma Harris	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
976	Norma Khan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
977	Nyla Bissram	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
978	Ogulcan Safak	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
979	Pablo Fernandez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
980	Pallavi Moorthy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
981	Pamela Brocious	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
982	Pamela Colony	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
983	Pamela Ellison	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
984	Pamela Fauty-Flores	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
985	Pamela Oliva	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
986	Pat Bunte	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
987	Pat Thaxton	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
988	Patricia Black	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
989	Patricia Cardoso	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
990	Patricia Haq	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
991	Patricia Lennox	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
992	Patricia Milizio	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
993	Patricia Tesoriero	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
994	Patricia Vineski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
995	Patrick Browne	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
996	Patrick McCooley - LaRonde Beach Club	Opposes project. VP fo LaRone Beach Club. We were never invited to any meeting or informed of any meeting so we have not had any time to review these plans.	Opposition acknowledged.
997	Patrick Whalen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
998	Patti Packer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
999	Paul Clandorf	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1000	Paul Crespi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1001	Paula Gullo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1002	Paul Heloskie	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1003	Paul Hofheins	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1004	Paul Johnson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1005	Paul Pullini	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1006	Paul Rosenkamm	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1007	Paul Vignec	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1008	Paula Neville	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1009	Paulette C	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1010	Peggy Furringer-Haist	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1011	Peter Bailey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1012	Peter Cohen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1013	Peter Gradoni	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1014	Peter Katz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1015	Peter Keiser	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1016	Peter Muller	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1017	Peter Sartorius	1) Fill measurements were taken November 2012. A lot of sand movement has occurred since then. Please assess the area. Need updated beach surveys for locations and volumes of fill in Village of Quogue. 2) Include a projected timeline of beach related construction activities. Which phase is Quogue in Appendix F? Edit cover of Appendix F (it says H) 3) A discussion or table of reduction in breach vulnerability if project is implemented and maintained would be helpful to know for each location. 4) Borrow Areas 5B and 5Bexp used for different beach models inconsistently.	Comments acknowledged.
1018	Peter Sepe	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1019	Peter Ziembra	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1020	Petter Corriqan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1021	Phil Fischer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1022	Phil Kneer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1023	Phil Kneer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1024	Phillip Connor	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1025	Phillip Weingord	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1026	Phillip Hope	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1027	Phyllis Brachman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1028	Phyllis Brault	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1029	Phyllis Glick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1030	Priscilla Mezrahi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1031	Qingqing Yang	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1032	R Fain	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1033	Rachel Berg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1034	Rachel Meyer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1035	Raymond Fell, Mayor - Village of Bellport	Village of Bellport interested in breach response and Old Inlet beach renourishment and road raising plans. Breach provided us with projected economic gains due to significant improvement to water quality in Bay from daily ebb and flood tides. See Village of Bellport Harbor Management Plan. Would like USACE to evaluate Coastal Process Measures for Plan 3 proposals at Bellport Beach.	Thank you for your comments. Potential Coastal process features were considered within the Village of Bellport.
1036	Renee Arnett	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1037	Renee Palladino	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1038	Renee Stein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1039	Rhoda Levine	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1040	Rhonda Hungerford	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1041	Rhonda Lieberman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1042	Rich Krulik	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1043	Rich N Eileen Heaning	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1044	Richard Furmeisen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1045	Richard Guier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1046	Richard Hahn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1047	Richard Kite	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1048	Richard Kurz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1049	Richard Slingerland	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1050	Richard Stern	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1051	Richard Tidd	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1052	Richard Weiss	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1053	Ricki Ravitts	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1054	Rita Babie	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1055	Rita Jaskowitz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1056	Robert and Jacqueline Sprotte	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1057	Robert Auger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1058	Robert Dietrich	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1059	Robert Ebinger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1060	Robert Fursich	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1061	Robert Goetz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1062	Robert H. Feuchter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1063	Robert Henry	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1064	Robert J. Hirsch	Opposes the shortening of the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. 1) Groins function well since '66 and are protective and stable. 2) BCR is less than 1.0% 3) On-going change outweighs one-time source of sand. 4) more compatible sand off-shore for lower risk/cost, 5) removing groins will shrink existing beach/dunes.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1065	Robert Puca	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1066	Robert Snyder	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1067	Robert Swift	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1068	Roberta Desalle	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1069	Roberta Young	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1070	Robin Bossert	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1071	Robin Perry	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1072	Robin Spiegelman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1073	Ron Sonnenberg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1074	Ronnie Gersten	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1075	Rosa Rodriguez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1076	Rosemary Pasquarello	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1077	Roslyn Bernstein	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1078	Roxanne Bohana	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1079	Roxanne Callen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1080	Ruth Kotecha	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1081	Ruth Quinones	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1082	Sandra and Peter Sweerman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1083	Sandra Costa	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1084	Sandra Couch	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1085	Sandra Kissam	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1086	Sandra Pesce	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1087	Sandra Sobanski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1088	Sandra Sofka	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1089	Sandy J.	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1090	Sandy Williams	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1091	Sarah Hamilton	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1092	Sarah Rose	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1093	Sarina Dayter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1094	Scott I. Klein	Supports project; Requests USACE expand Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant.	Not provided by the authorized project.
1095	Scott Sobel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1096	Seaghan Coleman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1097	Selyde Rodriguez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1098	Sharon Douglass	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1099	Sharon Kitter	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1100	Sharon Longyear	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1101	Sharon Rosseiland	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1102	Sharon Shelby	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1103	Shaun Walters	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1104	Shay Harrison	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1105	Sheila Ward Nicholas Brokaw	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1106	Shelby Heimbach	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1107	Shelly Katz-Biederman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1108	Sherita Wilson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1109	Sherry Howard	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1110	Shirley Sherman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1111	Sid and Sharon Braginsky	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1112	Silke Kueck	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1113	Silvia Luque	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1114	Sonya Grey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1115	Sophia Tarte	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1116	Soretta Rodack	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1117	Stacey Riccardi	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1118	Stacy Grenier	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1119	Stefanka Ilieva	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1120	Stephanie Caravolos	Wanted to confirm they received letters from homeowners on Sunset Lane Association in reference to GRR.	Comments acknowledged.
1121	Stephanie Christoff	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1122	Stephanie Cruz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1123	Stephanie Domain	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1124	Stephanie Lin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1125	Stephanie Bilodeau	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1126	Stephanie Nunez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1127	Stephanie Pignato	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1128	Stephen Appell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1129	Stephen Bellomo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1130	Stephen Mac Nish	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1131	Stephen Mitchell	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1132	Steve Kathcart	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1133	Steven Ercole	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1134	Steven Kostis	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1135	Steven Schellenger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1136	Sue and Iris Greidinger	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1137	Susan Cox	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1138	Susan Crane	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1139	Susan Cunningham	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1140	Susan Damato	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1141	Susan Downes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1142	Susan H Yule	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1143	Susan Messerschmitt	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1144	Susan Meyer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1145	Susan Peterson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1146	Susan Torres	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1147	Susan Zimmermann	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1148	Susannah Silvey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1149	Susanne Rash	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1150	Suzanne Esaine	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1151	Suzanne Kirby	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1152	Suzanne Ray	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1153	Suzanne Wallin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1154	Suzy Goldhirsch, President - Fire Island Association	Need sand nourishment in FINS area of Watch Hill, Robert Moses State Park, Point o'Woods. Communities are isolated and many ways to block nourishment efforts. Recommendations for additional storm protection methods.	Comments acknowledged.
1155	Sven Furberg	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1156	T Cho	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1157	Tawnya Shields	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1158	Ted Neumann	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1159	Teresa Beutel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1160	Terry Mansfield	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1161	Theresa Mercer	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1162	Therese Lucas	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1163	Thersa Meade	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1164	Thomas D. Herzog	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1165	Thomas Lynch	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1166	Thomas Santiago	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1167	Timothy Dunn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1168	Tina Martin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1169	Toby Stover	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1170	Todd Guthrie	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1171	Tom Clavin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1172	Tony Cimino	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1173	Tova Cohen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1174	Sheryll Jones	What is the threat to the "borrow areas" - benthic communities? How will "borrow areas" change the physical nature of storm surge, wave action, etc. on the shoreline? The groin field project that was never completed in the 1960's created the Westhampton breaches during 1992/1993. What assurances are in place that will prevent half-completed projects from causing catastrophic environmental damage in the future? Who determines which projects get completed as funds start to run out? What happens after local sponsor abandons project?	Comments acknowledged.
1175	Bonnie Brady	I have ?'s that pertain to the Borrow Areas used to supplement either Beach renourishment or Sand Sediment Mat. As it relates to fisheries and other forms of nourishment that begin off the shore. 81 8A Benthic Habitat Commercial Fishing more recent studies Letter to editor Sacrificial sand offshore berms lower costs	Among the selection criteria for the borrow sites was little or no impact to active commercial fishing areas.
1176	Vinny McGann	Question - Any groin construction? Comments - 1. Offshore dredging 2. Budget spent on temporary solutions	Providing additional groins along the barrier island was considered during Phase 1 of the Formulation process and rejected since it was not consistent with the project objective of restoring the natural coastal processes. The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life. The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders.
1177	Dick Gardner	Your borrow area 5 looks very much like the borrow area allocated by NYSDEC for the possible beach nourishment completed by the Village of Quogue. (Can't find locating dimensions for either area). Are they the same? If so, can both uses be supported? We understand that the DEC permit needs no further approvals - true?	Borrow Area 5 is not the the area allocated by NYSDEC for beach nourishment by the Village of Quogue.
1178	Peter Sartorias	Please describe the borrow area used for dredging. How far offshore? How deep? Does the dredging in that area affect wave energy reaching the shore and cause more erosion?	See Appendix B - Borrow sites for discussion of planned borrow sites
1179	Dick Gardner	Appx B - You use -37 ft NGDV are the depth at which borrowing sand will not affect wave attenuation - Please provide the basis for this - is there a paper which describes the work to establish this value?	Rosati et al (1999) provides the basis for the borrow area grade rule of thumb. Reference: Rosati, J.D.; Gravens, M.B., and Smith, W.G., 1999. Regional sediment budget for Fire Island to Montauk Point, New York, USA. Proceedings of Coastal Sediments '99 (New York, New York:ASCE), pp. 802-817.

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1180	Aram Teratunian	1. Breach fill 2. Non structural 3. Westhampton Groin modification	1) A specific breach response will be undertaken in accordance with overall Beach Response Plan as identified in the Recommended Plan. 2) 4) The Recommended Plan includes a non-structural component, including buy-outs, as coordinated with the non-federal sponsor. 3) The Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan.
1181	Nick Razzano	1. What is the seawall plan in Montauk going to entail? 2. Has there been data concerning groins and their proximity to bayside storm surges I.E. Long Beach Dune Road	The Recommended Plan only provides for sediment management in Montauk, in which approximately 450,000 CY of sand will be placed approximately every 4 years in Montauk as a feeder beach to help restore the natural longshore sediment transport coastal processes. While evaluated, buy-outs and private and public assets relocations in Montauk were not economically justified.
1182	Kurt Fuchs	How do you justify these large sand dredging projects when their life span is very short (Smith Point back tracked a half mile last winter after a storm)? The DNR recently found that 28 marine species in "borrow areas" didn't return for 8 years, which directly affect our protection in a major storm considering they are 1 to 2 miles off? (Borrow area 5B) In the mainland backbay area under "retrofits" why are cesspools not addressed considering the Bays Algae issue?	Comments acknowledged.
1183	Stefanie Sekich-Quinn	Like ideas of retrofitting home, raising roads, eliminating seawalls. Adaptive Mgmt Plan is critical. Must utilize living shorelines. Concerned managed retreat was not examined. Relies too heavily on beach replenishment. Conduct feasibility study of fully removing groins to increase sand transport first.	Comments acknowledged.
1184	Gregg Kelsey, Assistant Town Engineer, Town of Brookhaven	30 locations of potential projects for shoreline and or road end protection projects. (attached report)	Thank you for your comments.
1185	Glenn Walton	How will deepening the offshore waters and steepening of the shore slope ever help the coast recover to a scalloped condition that has been missing since the straight line construction performed after Superstorm Sandy? Will the take areas affect saltwater intrusion into the aquifer?	Among the goals of the recommended plan is to restore the natural coastal processes, which will occur with the sand renourishment. Project will not impact in any way salt water intrusion into the aquifer.
1186	Hermann Beck	I am writing to offer my opinion on the recent component of the FIMP project that would dramatically shorten the groin field in the Westhampton Beach area of Long Island. After learning much about the project I have come to the position that it is a poor idea that should not even be considered in the re-evaluation of FIMP. As it stands now, the groins are doing a more than excellent job of filling the containers between the groins and providing spillover for continued sand flow westward. The cost benefit ratio that has been presented is obviously not realistic because, in my estimate, it would not even begin cover the costs involved in purchasing the many easement rights necessary to initiate the project. The one time movement of 500,000 yards of sand for a one time nourishment in Westhampton Pines is at it's best a spurious estimate of its value. The estimated cost of this program is so low that every engineer I have spoken with feels it is modest by factors of 3 to 10. Shortening the groins will also place hundreds of homes at risk level that did not exist before. Numbers and averages are lovely but empirical data is the king here. The current data suggest that even if a storm as devastating as the "Yankee Express" of 1938 were to hit there would be no piercing of the dunes. Please, leave well enough alone, and withdraw this element from FIMP.	Comments acknowledged.
1187	Tracey Toth	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1188	Robert Abramson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1189	Tracy Griswold	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1190	Ryan King - Island East Management	I am from the management company for the BayMore club 274 Dune Road in Westhampton Beach. The owners and the board of directors are very concerned about the potential negative impacts that could be caused by making the existing jetties shorter. Their property is located on the bay side of dune road, but has deeded access to the ocean beaches. The ocean beaches are very important to the value of their units. If the ocean beach is smaller this will hurt the values of the units. also a smaller beach could create impacts from the ocean during a large storm. Please make sure these concerns are considered before any action is taken. Is possible please provide research that has been done to show no damage will be done to the beaches where the jetties are being shortened.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1191	Tracy Marrota	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1192	Trevor Southlea	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1193	Tricia van Oers	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1194	Trish Gardiner	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1195	John & Judy Demarino	Opposes plan to shorten the groins on our beaches in WHB. The groins are doing fine for over 20 years and a superior job for which they were designed. They fill the containers between the groins and provide spillover for continued sand flow. Shortening the groins will place hundreds of homes at higher level of risk during storms which does not exist now.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1196	Tyler Harrington	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1197	V Kreutz	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1198	Valerie Champagne	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1199	Valerie Levy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1200	Veronica Stork	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1201	Vicki Casarett	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1202	Vicki Shulof	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1203	Vicky Moraiti	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1204	Al & Joanne Tobin	I have read the proposal to reduce the length of the groins (or the jetties, as they are known to the residents). We are appalled at the proposal to reduce, or destroy, a portion of the protection to our homes and communities. We have purchased and maintained these homes, in part based upon an understanding of the level of protection provided by these groins. We are citizens and tax payers and there is no other community that should be deemed more important than ours. These groins were put in place for a reason and in a size and should not be altered. To pay an enormous amount of tax payers money to destroy a portion of them is unconscionable.	The Recommended Plan was developed following a rigorous analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives, as well as environmental impacts and also concerns of project partners and stakeholders. This analysis shows that the project benefits over the 50 year period of analysis exceeds the cost with a Benefit to Cost Ratio of (TBD)
1205	Victoria Canteles	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1206	Victoria Pawlick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1207	Lucinda E. Morrisey	I am a full-time resident of Quogue, Long Island and before that lived in Southampton. The health of our shoreline is a very important topic for me. I am against man-made beach nourishment because it is temporary and unsustainable. (While Quogue Village has been issued a permit for beach nourishment, I am not in favor of it being carried out.) Sea level rise is alarming and must be addressed with long-term coastal management and not short-term solutions. In my opinion, coastal retreat is the proper long-term answer. I believe that sand bypassing at our inlets is a proper action to maintain natural sand flow, but that "borrow sites" should be moved further offshore to avoid adverse impacts from wave energy on our beaches and to protect fishery habitats. I hope you consider this input in your long-term planning for our Long Island beaches.	The Inlet sand bypassing components of the Recommended Plan provides for maintenance dredging of the authorized federal navigation channels in Fire Island and Shinnecock Inlets every 2 years and Moriches Inlet every year with sand placement on the barrier island, which will be supplemented, as needed, by dredging from the adjacent ebb shoals of each inlet to obtain the required volume of sand needed for bypassing over the 50 year project life.
1208	Patricia Schaefer	On behalf of the Conservation Advisory Council of Westhampton Beach, I am writing to request that the US Army Corps of Engineers and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation drop its plan to shorten the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach as part of the FIMP plan. We have explored this proposed project and believe that the marginal benefit of modifying the groins is not sufficient to warrant the considerable work involved in moving forward with the plan. We believe the existing beach architecture is stable and environmentally sound, with a high degree of flood and erosion protection built into it as it currently stands. Our understanding is that the groins are filled to capacity and are no longer trapping sand and interrupting the transport of sand to the west. Moreover, the benefit cost ratio of moving ahead with the project is estimated to be less than 1.0 when one takes into account all of the costs involved with construction, rock disposal and easements for all of the 13 individual groins. Given that there is beach compatible sand located offshore that can be used - at lower environmental and economic costs - and that removing a portion of the groins will, in fact, shrink the existing beach and dune system and decrease coastal storm protection, our position is that the groin shortening in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach should be removed from consideration.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1209	Vincent Longo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1210	Virginia Tillotson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1211	Vivian Sciacca	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1212	Walter Murphy	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1213	Jan Burden	Quickly, please leave the groin fields as they are. Do not alter them from their present length.	Groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1214	Wanda Gaul	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1215	Wayne Carey	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1216	Wayne Johnson Ph.D.	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1217	Wendy Monaghan	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1218	Wendy Sands Sands	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1219	William A Haluska	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1220	William Corry	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1221	Thomas Watson	I am taken back by this meeting that I had to find out from the library. We should have been notified by letter during the summer when our residents were present. This is something the Town of WHB Village would do to pass legislation while residents were away. I didn't think the Federal gov't would operate this way too. But wow, that, we know and have to move so quickly by Oct 19, 2016, I will email this letter to you since mailing wouldn't matter at this point. I have been a resident in WHB Village on Dune Rd since 1973 and have seen the jetties save our beach from erosion all these years. While other areas have struggled or been neglected by the Army Corps of Engineers through the years, we have seen the devastation that could occur. The newly formed WH Dunes could have been saved if only they had jetties or the Army Corps of Engineers took the time to fill in sand to stop the erosion. This is not brain surgery work. Look at the results! Over the years down in Shinnecock on Dune Rd and in East Quogue was devastated because of Sandy. During the latest storms from the South we barely have any beach and we have none jetties. If there were none our dunes would be gone just like the WH Dunes. If you took 10 ft off our dunes it would be devastating. And where the Piping Plovers go, there would be no dunes for them to nest. I am vehemently against cutting back the jetties or taking them out. We have a great beach in Pond Point where 70 homes access the beach. It just about accommodates the residents now. I think flowing in sand as you did 10 years ago helped this area. I guess there is more politics to this than I could ever imagine. The commitment to the WH Dunes is probably coming due and now you need a solution. The solution isn't taking our jetties!!	The project sponsor, NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, requested that periodic nourishment be limited to 30 years, with a proactive beach response taking place in years 31-50. O&M responsibility by non-federal interests is also for 50 years.
1222	William Jayes	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1223	William (Bill) Weinberg	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1224	William (Bill) Zysblat	Supports project; Requests additional sand as "Advance Fill" and "road raising" of Dune Road.	USACE response to Advance Fill / Raising Dune Road in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1225	Winni Troha	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1226	Wynn Sasaki	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1227	Yadira Hernandez	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1228	Yvette Nabel	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).

Attachment P1
Complete List of Commenters, Comments and Responses
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point Final EIS

Item	Name	Comment	USACE Response
1229	Yvonne Pratt	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1230	Zoricka Henderson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1231	Jeremy C.	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1232	John Walker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1233	Katherine Babiak	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1234	Nancy Orons	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1235	Jack Lupo	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1236	Gloria Cameron	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1237	Christine Alicea	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1238	Seth Porterfield	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1239	Gretchen Bender	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1240	Eric Newman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1241	Katherine Dordick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1242	Lois Simson	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1243	Wm Griffiths	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1244	William Carmen	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1245	Kimberly Wiley	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1246	Cary Appenzeller	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1247	Yvonne Buoncora	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1248	Yvonne Lynn	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1249	Gail Glowczenski	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1250	Laura Nowad	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1251	Stacey Booker	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1252	Robert M. Reed	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1253	Patricia Harris	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1254	Julie Levin	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1255	Martin Anisman	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1256	Martin Kornbluh	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1257	Sophie Smith	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1258	Dick Gardner	FIMP Plate C-302 Proactive Breach Closures - incorrect? Only the design profile should be shown and note 3 should be deleted. Extension and note adapted from Place C-301? This figure appears as Figure 23 of Main report.	Comments acknowledged.
1259	Carl Irace	Representing Defend H20 Inc. Letter missing a page with II. Issue with Segmentation of project in geographical/regional terms. Corps is subject to NEPA's prohibition against Segmented Review.	Comments acknowledged.
1260	Susan D. McCormick	South Shore Audubon Society Supporter (Form Letter)	USACE response to form letter in Public Comments and Responses (Appendix P).
1261	Gary Ranftle	Concerned about groins not being removed. Obvious the ocean Beach groins causing erosion to west.	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.
1262	David Simpson	Supports project. Requests USAC uses authority over FIMP to control O&M of Ocean Beach Sewer Treatment Plant	Removal/modifications of the existing Ocean Beach groins is included in the Recommended Plan with the specific details to be developed during the Design phase.
1263	Hugh Lamle	Do not shorten the groins in Westhampton and Westhampton Beach. Drop from FIMP plan.	Westhampton groin modification is not part of the Recommended Plan
1264	Nancy Kelley, Exec.Dir.; The Nature Conservancy, Long Island Chapter		
1265	Stuart F. Gruskin, The Nature Conservancy of New York		