

**From:** [Amanda` Baker](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Amanda Baker  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:01:31 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Amanda Baker  
6009 St Hwy T  
Branson, MO 65616  
4176992958  
acbaker@kw.com

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the publics access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Amanda Baker

**From:** [Anne` Symington](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Anne Symington  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2020 10:09:04 AM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Anne Symington  
339 Scenic Drive  
Hollister, MO 65672  
417-332-7581  
[flashgordon2663@gmail.com](mailto:flashgordon2663@gmail.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Anne Symington

**From:** [Brent `Sager](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Brent Sager  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 6:22:51 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Brent Sager  
115 W. Hensley  
Branson, MO 65616  
4175934062  
[Brent@GerkenAndAssociates.com](mailto:Brent@GerkenAndAssociates.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Brent Sager

**From:** [Cole`Currier](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Cole Currier  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 4:03:02 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Cole Currier  
167 Jacks Hollow Road  
Walnut Shade, MO 65771  
417-230-0344  
[cole@colecurrier.com](mailto:cole@colecurrier.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

In my opinion, the vegetation changes have the potential for a huge negative impact. It is the most important issue to me!

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Cole Currier



**From:** [Dave` Dove](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Dave Dove  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:02:14 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Dave Dove  
500 W Main Street  
Branson, MO 65616  
4175930336  
[dave@gerkenandassociates.com](mailto:dave@gerkenandassociates.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Dave Dove

**From:** [Gene` Clark](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Gene Clark  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2020 8:33:47 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Gene Clark  
21551 Q rd  
Holton, KS 66436  
7853640329  
[geneatdoughrichert@gmail.com](mailto:geneatdoughrichert@gmail.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the publics access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Gene Clark

**From:** [Jeff `Wait](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Jeff Wait  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2020 3:14:37 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Jeff Wait  
818 Wilshire Drive  
Branson, MO 65616  
4172302480  
[jeff@foggyriver.com](mailto:jeff@foggyriver.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Jeff Wait

**From:** [Jon`Holloway](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Jon Holloway  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:06:46 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Jon Holloway  
130 Bull Run Road  
Branson, MO 65616  
417-294-1629  
[Jon@GerkenandAssociates.com](mailto:Jon@GerkenandAssociates.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

I grew up on Table Rock Lake and have enjoyed it's clean and clear water for over 35 years now. I don't want to see that change, but at the same token I hate to see over-regulation keep people from being able to enjoy it as I have for years to come.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Jon Holloway



**From:** [Jon`Hulsizer](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Jon Hulsizer  
**Date:** Saturday, April 4, 2020 6:19:28 AM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Jon Hulsizer  
417 Dalton Dr  
Branson , MO 65616  
4172309628  
c21jonh@gmail.com

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the publics access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Jon Hulsizer

**From:** [Karla` Pankovits](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Karla Pankovits  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2020 8:32:56 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Karla Pankovits  
123 Chinkapin Ln  
Kimberling City, MO 65686  
(417) 294-7680  
[karlatablerocklake@gmail.com](mailto:karlatablerocklake@gmail.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Karla Pankovits

**From:** [Katie`Roebuck](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Katie Roebuck  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:03:40 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Katie Roebuck  
405 Meadow Lane  
Branson, MO 65616  
4175597294  
[katie.roebuck@gmail.com](mailto:katie.roebuck@gmail.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Katie Roebuck

**From:** [Macy` Nuckolls](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Macy Nuckolls  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 7, 2020 8:41:47 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Macy Nuckolls  
435 Holt's Lake Drive  
Branson, MO 65616  
4175272079  
[macy@stepaboverealty.com](mailto:macy@stepaboverealty.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Macy Nuckolls



**From:** [Matthew Brock](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Matthew Brock  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2020 2:16:36 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Matthew Brock  
2714 State Highway OO  
Cedarcreek, MO 65627  
4178499759  
[Matthew@GerkenandAssociates.com](mailto:Matthew@GerkenandAssociates.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Matthew Brock

**From:** [Nichole` Lawrence](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Nichole Lawrence  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:15:36 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Nichole Lawrence  
1030 Sleepy Hollow Rd  
MERRIAM VLG, MO 65740  
41735211110  
[nichole@goodlifebranson.com](mailto:nichole@goodlifebranson.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the publics access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Nichole Lawrence

**From:** [Nicole`Griesenauer](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Nicole Griesenauer  
**Date:** Friday, April 3, 2020 12:54:47 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Nicole Griesenauer  
#5 Downing Street  
Hollister, MO 65672  
417-334-5433  
[nicole@foggyriver.com](mailto:nicole@foggyriver.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Nicole Griesenauer

**From:** [Rachel Gerken](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Rachel Gerken  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 7, 2020 1:27:48 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Rachel Gerken  
634 Meadow Lane  
Branson, MO 65616  
4175278234  
[rachel@gerkenandassociates.com](mailto:rachel@gerkenandassociates.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type of vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Rachel Gerken



**From:** [Shelly`Bergland](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Shelly Bergland  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 8:28:08 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Shelly Bergland  
303 Heritage Estates  
Branson, MO 65616  
417-294-8964  
[shelly@foggyriver.com](mailto:shelly@foggyriver.com)

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

**Carrying Capacity-** The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

**Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks)** is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the public's access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

**Vegetation Permits-** Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Shelly Bergland

**From:** [Thayne`Robertson](#)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#); [savetablerock@gmail.com](mailto:savetablerock@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] Comments for the Oversight Committee from Thayne Robertson  
**Date:** Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:02:15 PM

---

TO: Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee  
FROM: Thayne Robertson  
186 ECHO VALLEY CIR  
REEDS SPRING, MO 65737-8984  
417-294-0998  
kskstump@gmail.com

RE: Table Rock Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan

Dear Committee,

I am writing to add input to your public comment process. There are a few areas of particular concern that I want to bring to your attention:

Carrying Capacity- The Corps of Engineers is proposing in the new plan a maximum total number of access opportunities on Table Rock Lake. In 2009 the number was 19,254 and the proposed cap would be 30,806. This includes private docks, commercial marinas, and launch ramp parking. This cap would mean property owners who have acquired lakefront property with dock zoning and had not used it by this time would no longer be able to put in a new dock. This would greatly reduce the value of these properties. This would effectively shut down the lake without public input. I think the same committee structure that is overseeing this process should be re-convened to help oversee this process after the next carrying capacity study is performed as called for in the proposed Shoreline Management Plan and before the Corp can adjust the number of boat slips and ramp parking spaces or cease development on the lake.

Remote Service Dock Program (Satellite Docks) is a program where the Corp allows Marina Operators to install "Satellite Docks" within the marina buffer zone and lease slips within those docks to the public. The Corp is looking to eliminate this program and not replace this with Limited Development Area and red line zoning (dock zoning). By eliminating the program, it would limit and restrict the publics access to the lake. I am in favor of keeping this program for the following reasons:

- \* Public access to the lake
- \* The Corp claims they have received "increasing objections" regarding traffic increases into the areas where these docks are located. The majority of slips in these docks are leased by members in that area. The public was also under the impression that if the CRSD program was sun-stetted those areas would revert to LDA with red line zoning.
- \* Most of the slips leased are to residents in the area of the satellite dock, who would not have the availability to a boat slip due to the marina buffer zone.
- \* Marina owners maintain their docks at a high standard.
- \* I also recommend the restrictions placed on this program be eased. Currently the restrictions and studies which are required by the Corp make this program cost prohibitive on a marina owner.

Vegetation Permits- Allows owners of property which adjoin Corp property to mow and clear property from the foundation of their home 200' onto the Corp property if they obtain a permit. Property owners are allowed to remove vegetative growth which is less than 2" in diameter (restrictions based on the type vegetation applies) at shoulder height (approx. 4.5' high). The Corps wants to change this for most vegetation to 2" in diameter at ground level and 3" in diameter at ground level for cedar trees, there are restrictions based on the type of vegetation. The reason for this change is so the Corp can tell how big the vegetation was when it was removed. The 200' distance

would also be limited if it would cross a road, creek, stream, or other natural changes in the topography.

I recommend the cutting of vegetation to be changed to ground level and the diameters to be 3" for most vegetation and 4" for cedar trees. This would allow the Corp to tell the size of vegetation removed and would also allow for the approximately same size vegetation to be removed as the current regulation. I also recommend that no changes be made to the 200' distance. The current regulation for vegetation permits has helped keep our lake beautiful and clean, the only issue appears to be the Corps ability to determine the size of vegetation removed and my recommendation accomplishes this.

Thank you for listening. I am encouraged by the work the committee is doing to give the Corps guidance. Please continue to help us protect our rights to use and enjoy our beautiful lake.

Sincerely,

Thayne Robertson

**From:** [noreply@dma.mil](mailto:noreply@dma.mil)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#)  
**Subject:** Table Rock SMP Online Comment Form  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 1, 2020 9:22:06 AM

---

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization Javan Wright  
Address  
502 Anchor Point  
Kimberling City MO US 65686

Phone 316-218-7894  
E-Mail javanwright251@gmail.com

#### Comments

---

Please keep this program.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: ff18d8f6-63df-41b8-a2dc-4f3dcdf864dd  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 206.217.19.171

**From:** [noreply@dma.mil](mailto:noreply@dma.mil)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#)  
**Subject:** Table Rock SMP Online Comment Form  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 7, 2020 5:04:41 PM

---

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization Kenneh Pekarek  
Address  
15458 W 163rd Ter, --  
Olathe KS US 66062

Phone 9136264456  
E-Mail [kentusm@aol.com](mailto:kentusm@aol.com)

#### Comments

---

Continued documentation why Cedar Trees have to be removed. Our proposal is to remove all Cedar Trees regardless of size or location. All Cedar Trees should be removed within 200 feet from the base of permanent habitable structure. Cedar Trees can simply be replaced by native grasses as recommended by the Missouri Department of Conservation. If safety and/or hazardous vegetation permit is denied by the USACE the appeal can be forwarded to an established Appeal Process.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Controlling Eastern Red-cedar, a Common Noxious Weed

By Steven Smith  
Wildlife and Fisheries Consultant

Posted Feb. 1, 2009

Eastern Red-cedar trees (*Juniperus virginiana*) have become more abundant in many fencerows and pastures. This now very common tree was once limited to rocky bluffs, deep canyons and other areas where fire did not historically occur. Since the beginning of European settlement in North America, fire has been suppressed enabling Eastern Red-cedar (cedar) to expand its range outside of these protected areas.

Many people have the misconception that trees equal wildlife habitat. Unfortunately, when we are talking about cedars in southern Oklahoma and northern Texas, this is not always the case. In 1950 (Bidwell 1993), cedars covered approximately 1.5 million acres in Oklahoma. By 1985 this had risen to an estimated 3.5 million acres and by 1996 an estimated 6 million acres (Engle et al., 1996).

Cedars are native, but have become invasive and, when left unmanaged, have the ability to form dense stands. These stands can be viewed as monocultures - plant communities dominated by one species. Native rangelands, however are composed of a diversity of many native species of grasses, forbs, shrubs and trees. Once this diversity is lost, forage production can decrease and wildlife habitat quality declines.

Bidwell (1993) looked at the loss of herbaceous production after cedars were mechanically cut down. Cutting cedars below their lowest growing limbs kills them, but a dead tree lying on the ground still occupies about 70 percent of the area that it did when standing. Leaving cut trees where they fall can reduce access to forage for cattle, bison or horses, but can offer escape cover for many wildlife species.

There are three methods to control or kill cedars: fire, mechanical and chemical.

Fire originally controlled cedars. With adequate fuel and under safe prescribed burning conditions, fire will control most cedars less than 6 feet tall. Unfortunately, many cedars have grown so large that prescribed fire is no longer an effective management tool. Prescribed fire is now viewed as a maintenance tool to control new and young cedars, but not the best choice to kill larger, established trees. For larger trees, chemical or mechanical control methods are usually best.

Common chemical recommendations include Velpar®, Tordon® and Pronone® Power Pellets. Velpar® and Tordon® are liquid chemicals that can be applied to the soil under cedars. Tordon® can also be applied to the foliage of an individual tree to reduce exposure to desirable plants. Labels for Velpar® and Tordon® do not recommend use on cedar trees larger than 15 feet tall. Pronone® Power Pellets have the same active ingredient that is in Velpar®, but in a pellet form. Pellets are placed under a tree (one to two per inch of stem diameter) and require ¼ to ½ inch of rainfall to dissolve into the soil. All of the above chemicals can kill other woody plants in the immediate area. These chemicals are best used when only the target species will be exposed to the herbicide. When using herbicides, always read and follow the label instructions. In the Ozark area alone, there are 250 cedar trees per square mile. In fact the Missouri University will provide direction and guidance on how to use chemical on how to kill Cedar Trees.

Mechanical methods include chain saws, bow saws, lopping shears, axes, dozers and skid loaders with shears or saws. Hand tools are very selective, but are

labor intensive. Dozers can be effective; however, they can cause a great deal of soil disturbance. Skid loaders with shears or saws are selective and very effective.

Regardless of the control method, try targeting "the women and children first" to maximize efficiency. One female cedar tree can produce thousands of seeds and younger trees are easier to control. Cedar has its place, but it has started to take more than its fair share.

#### REFERENCES

Bidwell, T. G. 1993. Eastern Redcedar Ecology and Management. OSU Extension Facts 2868. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service.

Engle, D.M., T.G. Bidwell, and M.E. Moseley. 1996. Invasion of Oklahoma Rangelands and Forests by Eastern Redcedar and Ashe Juniper. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service. Circular E-947.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### RED CEDAR INVASION

OCTOBER 14, 2014 HSOTR

Red Cedar Invasion What are those pesky evergreen trees popping up in large numbers all over your pasture?

Most likely they are eastern red cedar trees, the only evergreen native to Kansas.

Is the Eastern Red Cedar Invasive?

You may be wondering how a native tree can be invasive. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service provides the following definition of an invasive species:

An "invasive species" is defined as a species that is

non-native (or alien) to the ecosystem under consideration and whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health.

First we must consider the nonnative aspect. Although the eastern red cedar is native to Kansas, its range has expanded to include ecosystems where it is not native. Cedar trees were formerly restricted to steep, rocky places where fires were uncommon. Now they have expanded across the prairies of the Flint Hills and Red Hills, and have even crept into the Cross Timbers of the Chautauqua Hills. In Riley county alone, cedar coverage increased by 382% in 21 years!

The second criterion was "causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health." The eastern red cedar definitely fits this description in a number of ways.

#### Red Cedar Invasion

Crab apple infected by cedar apple rust

Economic Harm:

Costs millions of dollars in forage production loss annually.  
Draws countless gallons of water annually from nearby streams.  
Intercepts 40% to 79% of the rainfall that passes by.  
Reduces soil fertility by depleting nitrogen and altering soil pH.  
Spreads apple cedar rust, a disease that affects apple trees.  
May cause abortions and low birth weights in sheep and cattle.

Environmental Harm:

Produces toxic oils that kill other native plants.  
Destroys the habitat of birds native to open prairie ecosystems.  
Harm to Human Health:

Increases risk of dangerous fires in populated areas.  
Causes seasonal allergies.

#### How Cedar Gets a Foothold

So how did the eastern red cedar get so out of control? Cedar trees are opportunists—ecologists call them pioneer species. Pioneer plants are the first species to move into disturbed or damaged soil, quickly putting down roots and shading the ground to prevent further erosion. Obviously, then, pioneer species such as red cedars serve a useful purpose in nature.

But something seems to have changed in the last couple hundred years. Nature must have managed the eastern red cedar a little differently than we do now.

#### Red Cedar Invasion Historical Eastern Red Cedar Management

Historically, there were two tools used to manage the native prairies:

Fire.

Bison herds.

The bison trampled baby cedars and rubbed their horns on the larger trees, keeping them in check. Furthermore, the bison also aided the health of the soil and native grasses by providing fertilizer. Thus grazing was both a proactive and a reactive strategy.

But since some erosion is bound to happen every now and again, fires occasionally swept the prairies clean so that the bison could start over.

#### Modern Eastern Red Cedar Management

Today, ranchers have access to four tools for controlling invasions:

Fire.

Cutting.

Chemicals.

Livestock.

Fire is a very familiar tool to those who live in the Flint Hills. Many ranchers rely exclusively on prescribed burns to keep their pastures free of trees.

Cutting is now an option with modern equipment, and is sometimes the best bet for larger trees. Unfortunately, cutting cedar trees can sometimes disturb the soil, which will invite more pioneers onto the scene.

A variety of chemicals are available that work on eastern red cedar trees. Needless to say, these herbicides often pose a risk to the surrounding non-cedar plants.

One tool that is all too frequently forgotten is livestock. Grazing pressure still works well on eastern red cedars. Of course, overgrazing will erode the land and create a new invasion problem, but skillfully managed grazing has a very beneficial impact on pastures.

So even though the eastern red cedar problem has exploded in recent years, there is still hope. With a little care, the beautiful native prairies of Kansas can remain intact.

#### Helpful Resources

Eastern Red-cedar: Positives, Negatives and Management

Excellent 8-page PDF download that explores the history of cedar expansion, the pros and cons of cedar trees, and different management techniques.

#### Lessons from the Bison

In case you wanted to learn more about nature's way of managing tall-grass prairie.

#### What is Management-Intensive Grazing?

A starting point for further research on using animals to manage pastures.

[Click to email this to a friend \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to print \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to share on Facebook \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to share on Pinterest \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to share on Twitter \(Opens in new window\)](#)

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: b57645d4-e073-40e3-9196-7e00da758672  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2601:300:8101:e830:b960:1354:5b66:5124



**From:** [noreply@dma.mil](mailto:noreply@dma.mil)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#)  
**Subject:** Table Rock SMP Online Comment Form  
**Date:** Sunday, April 12, 2020 6:17:34 PM

---

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization Kenneth PeKarek  
Address  
15458 W 163rd Ter  
Olathe KS US 66062  
  
Phone 9136264456  
E-Mail [kentusm@aol.com](mailto:kentusm@aol.com)

#### Comments

---

DUE TO FIRE, ICE, WIND AND THUNDERSTORM HAZARDS, CEDAR TREES AND OTHER HAZARDOUS VEGETATION GROWING WITHIN 200 FEET OF THE BASE OF A PERMANENT HABITABLE STRUCTURE SHOULD BE REMOVED. THERE WERE HABITABLE STRUCTURES BUILT ADJACENT TO THE USACE CORP LINE. THERE ARE NOW ONLY A FEW FEET BETWEEN THE GLASS BACK OF THESE STRUCTURES AND THE HAZARDOUS TREES AND SHRUBS. WITH THE PERFECT WEATHER AND FIRE ANOMALIES THESE TREES COULD FALL INTO THESE HABITABLE STRUCTURES. AS THE USACE HAVE DENIES PERMITS TO ELIMINATE THE VEGETATION HAZARDS, THE MUST BE A PERMIT APPEAL SYSTEM PROCESS.

Unfortunately for several decades permanent habitable structures were built adjacent to the USACE property lines on Table Rock Lake. When these buildings were built, there was no or very little vegetation between the USACE property line and the shoreline. Over the decades Cedar Trees, shrubs and debris have flourished right next to these habitable structures. At some points, the trees, and other vegetation have grown into a jungle like environment and have created an extremely hazardous and safety environment for those living in these structures. These structures also have FULL GLASS SUNROOMS just a few feet from these vegetation hazards. The MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION HAS A BRILLIANT SOLUTION, AND THAT IS TO REMOVE THE CEDAR TREES TO BE REPLACE BY NATIVE GRASSES. THE GRASSES WHICH MANY EXPERTS AGREE WILL PROVIDE A MUCH BETTER ECOLOGICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ELIMINATE SOIL EROSION MUCH MORE EFFICIENT THAN TREES, INCLUDING CEDAR TREES.

TREE and Brush HAZARDS Trees and brush should not be permitted on embankment surfaces or in Vegetated earth spillways. Extensive root systems can provide seepage paths for water. Trees that blow down or fall over can leave large holes in the embankment surface that will weaken the embankment and can lead to increased erosion, as is the case in the failed earth embankment dam shown here. Brush obscures the surface limiting visual inspection, providing a haven for burrowing animals, and inhibiting the growth of grass vegetation. Tree and brush growth adjacent to concrete walls and structures may eventually cause damage to the concrete and should be removed.

Trees and Storm Safety  
Storm events such as tornadoes, severe thunderstorms, hurricanes, and ice can considerably impact trees. Below are

some of the impacts caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, or storm events and information to assist homeowners and community officials to prepare and respond quickly and safely before and after storm events. Courtesy: Georgia Forestry Commission

#### Wind

Wind is often the first sign of a hurricane approaching. Leaves and branches may be stripped off and entire trees may be twisted, broken or uprooted altogether. Some trees are more susceptible to wind damage than others. Trees with healthy root systems have better chances of survival. However, if remaining trees survive one storm, and another hurricane encompasses the same area in a short period of time, those remaining trees are considered stressed and may not make it through subsequent storms. Hurricanes can also produce tornadoes with winds measuring more than 200 mph. Trees may be completely debarked by small, flying debris or downed altogether. In either case, these trees will need to be removed.

#### Lightning

Hurricanes also are typically accompanied by thunderstorms and lightning.. Because of their height, trees are a prime target for lightning. However, damage caused by lightning varies greatly. The damage may be minimal if the electricity is conducted along the outside of the tree. In this case, blown off bark and scarring will be apparent. The damage may extend to a more serious condition known as trunk shatter. In this event, lightning charge penetrates into the tree's trunk, turning moisture into steam and causing the tree to explode. The most commonly struck trees are oaks, elms, poplars and pines. These trees typically are found in most yards.

#### Flooding

After hurricanes strike, many low-lying communities are impacted by short-term flooding. Flooding has been known to damage trees by loosening and/or removing the soil that supports root systems. In areas that have been flooded for extended periods of time, trees can suffer from the accumulation of organic toxins in the soil and the reduced flow of oxygen to the roots. Various characteristics of a tree, including height, age and species, along with environmental factors like season, temperature and flood water duration, affect a tree's flood tolerance. The typical warning sign of flood damage in trees is curling and wilting of the leaves, followed by chlorosis (pale-colored leaves that have lost chlorophyll). Chlorosis is generally followed by leaf browning and ultimately, leaf loss.

#### Ice

Ice storms are caused by rain that supercools or freezes as it passes through below-freezing air. These ice coatings can grow to be several inches thick in various places. The weight of the ice, combined with any wind or outside forces, breaks the trees' branches. Normally, the taller and older a tree, the more susceptible it is to ice damage because older trees have larger crowns, more internal decay, and less limb and trunk flexibility. The severity of the ice damage depends on ice load and resistance of the trees determined by their physical characteristics - wood strength, elasticity and growth form, and on condition of the growing environment. In general, trees with brittle and weak wood, fine branches, and greater canopy surface, such as pine trees which retain their needles, are more likely to suffer ice damage. And, may fall into habitable buildings.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 03c9694c-1866-4257-a4d6-75764e8e4c1f  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2601:300:8101:e830:c402:85d5:b86c:61c2

**From:** [noreply@dma.mil](mailto:noreply@dma.mil)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#)  
**Subject:** Table Rock SMP Online Comment Form  
**Date:** Saturday, March 28, 2020 3:35:18 PM

---

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization Kenneth PeKarek  
Address  
15458 W 163rd Ter, --  
Olathe KS US 66062  
  
Phone 9136264456  
E-Mail [kentusm@aol.com](mailto:kentusm@aol.com)

#### Comments

---

CEDAR FEVER - For some of you living in condominiums and homes on the shoreline of Table Rock Lake, this might explain why some of you experience allergies and pollen related health issues:

#### Cedar Allergy Symptoms

Eye Symptoms

Nose Symptoms

Throat Symptoms

Facial and Sleep Symptoms

Written by

Nancy Clarke

05 December, 2018

Cedar allergy, or cedar fever, is a form of seasonal allergic rhinitis that shares the usual hay fever symptoms. Some types of cedar trees produce especially prolific amounts of allergenic pollen; Japanese cedar, mountain cedar, and Eastern and Western red cedars actually belong to the juniper and cypress families but are commonly classed as cedars in the United States. Although most cedars pollinate and cause allergy symptoms in the spring, the mountain cedar of the south central U.S. states reproduces in the winter and may cause severe allergic rhinitis.

#### Eye Symptoms

Winter or spring symptoms in hay fever patients may be caused by cedar or another airborne tree pollen, which affects the mucous membranes of the body. Itchy, red, teary eyes may result, as well as inflammation of the eyelids. Eyelids may swell, and under-eye areas may darken.

These allergy symptoms are triggered by histamine, a substance produced in abnormal reaction to the ingestion of cedar pollen, the Cleveland Clinic reports 1 ★

★

This is a verified and trusted source

Cleveland Clinic: Hay Fever

Goto Source

. Tiny cedar pollen granules can travel through the breeze and stick to unprotected eyes, inducing further irritation. Because of this tree pollen's long-distance mobility, cedar allergy symptoms can occur in areas outside the growing range.

#### Nose Symptoms

Nasal symptoms and breathing problems constitute the most disturbing effects of allergic rhinitis. According to the Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Clinic of Georgetown, Texas, these effects create a domino effect, setting off other health problems that can combine to significantly disable patients.

A runny nose develops when hay fever histamine sends fluid into the mucous membranes. Excess mucus in the nasal passages can drain into the sinus cavities and the throat. Inflammation causes mucus to accumulate in and congest the airways, creating a stuffy nose. Sneezing may become forceful in an attempt to clear the nasal passages of mucus and cedar pollen.

#### Throat Symptoms

Histamine-induced itching also affects the mouth and throat, states the University of Maryland Medical Center (UMMC) 2 \*

★

This is a verified and trusted source

University of Maryland Medical Center: Allergic Rhinitis

Goto Source

. People with allergic rhinitis may clear their throats frequently, irritating and inflaming the membranes. As the mucus from postnasal drip contacts this tissue, a sore throat and cough may develop.

#### Facial and Sleep Symptoms

The stress of coughing and sneezing plus the pressure from sinus inflammation can lead to facial tenderness accompanied by headaches. Some hay fever discomforts make sleep difficult, and the sneeze reflex, in particular, interrupts deep sleep. The UMMC states that fatigue and facial pain may arise from the combined stress of other cedar allergy symptoms.

#### The Wrap Up

Cedar allergy, or cedar fever, is a form of seasonal allergic rhinitis that shares the usual hay fever symptoms. These allergy symptoms are triggered by histamine, a substance produced in abnormal reaction to the ingestion of cedar pollen, the Cleveland Clinic reports. A runny nose develops when hay fever histamine sends fluid into the mucous membranes. The stress of coughing and sneezing plus the pressure from sinus inflammation can lead to facial tenderness accompanied by headaches. Some hay fever discomforts make sleep difficult, and the sneeze reflex, in particular, interrupts deep sleep.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 25f8b90a-90f3-4ba0-9a4f-c39e36c0df54  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2601:300:8101:e830:6dfe:c2f8:b7f1:468

**From:** [noreply@dma.mil](mailto:noreply@dma.mil)  
**To:** [CESWL-TableRockSMP\\_FAC](#)  
**Subject:** Table Rock SMP Online Comment Form  
**Date:** Saturday, April 4, 2020 2:07:37 PM

---

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization scott gullede  
Address  
24481 San Souci  
Shell Knob MO US 65747  
  
Phone 913-485-5164  
E-Mail [scott.gullede@pivotalhc.com](mailto:scott.gullede@pivotalhc.com)

#### Comments

---

3/4/2020

Hello, my name is Scott Gullede, and we own a house on Table Rock Lake. We attended the 2017 meeting in Branson and submitted paperwork for a request and never heard back. When I was working with Malcolm Fortson Jr on a dock renewal, I asked him if I would have heard back on my previous submitted request. Malcolm said yes, so I decided to reach out once again before the extension expired.

My request was asking the corp if they would approve taking the approved 294.5 section and moving it from its current location to the southeastern area of the cove (if I have my directions correct) where there would be plenty of depth and room for a two boat dock. My home east of there would meet to 200 ft' requirement from the corp property to the new dock if approved. The current location of 294.5 would never support a dock.

I was told when this original marking and location was done, it was done in the early '50s by hand vs. GPS and most likely why this spot was originally selected.

If I can be of further assistance, or more information is needed, please let me know.

Scott Gullede  
[scott.gullede@pivotalhc.com](mailto:scott.gullede@pivotalhc.com)  
913-485-5164

---

-----

HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 9a91b8a2-c89c-43dc-9f4d-43373bca79b2  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Unavailable  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 67.53.65.126

Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Kenneh Pekarek

Address

15458 W 163rd Ter, --  
Olathe KS US 66062

Phone 9136264456

E-Mail kentusm@aol.com

Comments

---

Continued documentation why Cedar Trees have to be removed. Our proposal is to remove all Cedar Trees regardless of size or location. All Cedar Trees should be removed within 200 feet from the base of permanent habitable structure. Cedar Trees can simply be replaced by native grasses as recommended by the Missouri Department of Conservation. If safety and/or hazardous vegetation permit is denied by the USACE the appeal can be forwarded to an established Appeal Process.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Controlling Eastern Red-cedar, a Common Noxious Weed

By Steven Smith

Wildlife and Fisheries Consultant

Posted Feb. 1, 2009

Eastern Red-cedar trees (*Juniperus virginiana*) have become more abundant in many fencerows and pastures. This now very common tree was once limited to rocky bluffs, deep canyons and other areas where fire did not historically occur. Since the beginning of European settlement in North America, fire has been suppressed enabling Eastern Red-cedar (cedar) to expand its range outside of these protected areas.

Many people have the misconception that trees equal wildlife habitat. Unfortunately, when we are talking about cedars in southern Oklahoma and northern Texas, this is not always the case. In 1950

(Bidwell 1993), cedars covered approximately 1.5 million acres in Oklahoma. By 1985 this had risen to an estimated 3.5 million acres and by 1996 an estimated 6 million acres (Engle et al., 1996).

Cedars are native, but have become invasive and, when left unmanaged, have the ability to form dense stands. These stands can be viewed as monocultures - plant communities dominated by one species. Native rangelands, however are composed of a diversity of many native species of grasses, forbs, shrubs and trees. Once this diversity is lost, forage production can decrease and wildlife habitat quality declines.

Bidwell (1993) looked at the loss of herbaceous production after cedars were mechanically cut down. Cutting cedars below their lowest growing limbs kills them, but a dead tree lying on the ground still occupies about 70 percent of the area that it did when standing. Leaving cut trees where they fall can reduce access to forage for cattle, bison or horses, but can offer escape cover for many wildlife species.

There are three methods to control or kill cedars: fire, mechanical and chemical.

Fire originally controlled cedars. With adequate fuel and under safe prescribed burning conditions, fire will control most cedars less than 6 feet tall. Unfortunately, many cedars have grown so large that prescribed fire is no longer an effective management tool. Prescribed fire is now viewed as a maintenance tool to control new and young cedars, but not the best choice to kill larger, established trees. For larger trees, chemical or mechanical control methods are usually best.

Common chemical recommendations include Velpar®, Tordon® and Pronone® Power Pellets. Velpar® and Tordon® are liquid chemicals that can be applied to the soil under cedars. Tordon® can also be applied to the foliage of an individual tree to reduce exposure to desirable plants. Labels for Velpar® and Tordon® do not recommend use on cedar trees larger than 15 feet tall. Pronone® Power Pellets have the same active ingredient that is in Velpar®, but in a pellet form. Pellets are placed under a tree (one to two per inch of stem diameter) and require ¼ to ½ inch of rainfall to dissolve into the soil. All of the above chemicals can kill other woody plants in the immediate area. These chemicals are best used when only the target species will be exposed to the herbicide. When using herbicides, always read and follow the label instructions. In the Ozark area alone, there are 250 cedar trees per square mile. In fact the Missouri University will provide direction and guidance on how to use chemical on how to kill Cedar Trees.

Mechanical methods include chain saws, bow saws, lopping shears, axes, dozers and skid loaders with shears or saws. Hand tools are very selective, but are labor intensive. Dozers can be effective; however, they can cause a great deal of soil disturbance. Skid loaders with shears or saws are selective and very effective.

Regardless of the control method, try targeting "the women and children first" to maximize efficiency. One female cedar tree can produce thousands of seeds and younger trees are easier to control. Cedar has its place, but it has started to take more than its fair share.

#### REFERENCES

Bidwell, T. G. 1993. Eastern Redcedar Ecology and Management. OSU Extension Facts 2868. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service.



Engle, D.M., T.G. Bidwell, and M.E. Moseley. 1996. Invasion of Oklahoma Rangelands and Forests by Eastern Redcedar and Ashe Juniper. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service. Circular E-947.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## RED CEDAR INVASION

OCTOBER 14, 2014 HSOTR

Red Cedar Invasion What are those pesky evergreen trees popping up in large numbers all over your pasture?

Most likely they are eastern red cedar trees, the only evergreen native to Kansas.

Is the Eastern Red Cedar Invasive?

You may be wondering how a native tree can be invasive. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service provides the following definition of an invasive species:

An “invasive species” is defined as a species that is

non-native (or alien) to the ecosystem under consideration and whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health.

First we must consider the nonnative aspect. Although the eastern red cedar is native to Kansas, its range has expanded to include ecosystems where it is not native. Cedar trees were formerly restricted to steep, rocky places where fires were uncommon. Now they have expanded across the prairies of the Flint Hills and Red Hills, and have even crept into the Cross Timbers of the Chautauqua Hills. In Riley county alone, cedar coverage increased by 382% in 21 years!

The second criterion was “causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health.” The eastern red cedar definitely fits this description in a number of ways.

### Red Cedar Invasion

Crab apple infected by cedar apple rust Economic Harm:

Costs millions of dollars in forage production loss annually.  
Draws countless gallons of water annually from nearby streams.  
Intercepts 40% to 79% of the rainfall that passes by.  
Reduces soil fertility by depleting nitrogen and altering soil pH.  
Spreads apple cedar rust, a disease that affects apple trees.  
May cause abortions and low birth weights in sheep and cattle.  
Environmental Harm:

Produces toxic oils that kill other native plants.  
Destroys the habitat of birds native to open prairie ecosystems.  
Harm to Human Health:

Increases risk of dangerous fires in populated areas.  
Causes seasonal allergies.  
How Cedar Gets a Foothold

So how did the eastern red cedar get so out of control? Cedar trees are opportunists—ecologists call them pioneer species. Pioneer plants are the first species to move into disturbed or damaged soil, quickly putting down roots and shading the ground to prevent further erosion. Obviously, then, pioneer species such as red cedars serve a useful purpose in nature.

But something seems to have changed in the last couple hundred years. Nature must have managed the eastern red cedar a little differently than we do now.

Red Cedar Invasion Historical Eastern Red Cedar Management Historically, there were two tools used to manage the native prairies:

Fire.

Bison herds.

The bison trampled baby cedars and rubbed their horns on the larger trees, keeping them in check. Furthermore, the bison also aided the health of the soil and native grasses by providing fertilizer. Thus grazing was both a proactive and a reactive strategy.

But since some erosion is bound to happen every now and again, fires occasionally swept the prairies clean so that the bison could start over.

Modern Eastern Red Cedar Management

Today, ranchers have access to four tools for controlling invasions:

Fire.

Cutting.

Chemicals.

Livestock.

Fire is a very familiar tool to those who live in the Flint Hills. Many ranchers rely exclusively on prescribed burns to keep their pastures free of trees.

Cutting is now an option with modern equipment, and is sometimes the best bet for larger trees. Unfortunately, cutting cedar trees can sometimes disturb the soil, which will invite more pioneers onto the scene.

A variety of chemicals are available that work on eastern red cedar trees. Needless to say, these herbicides often pose a risk to the surrounding non-cedar plants.

One tool that is all too frequently forgotten is livestock. Grazing pressure still works well on eastern red cedars. Of course, overgrazing will erode the land and create a new invasion problem, but skillfully managed grazing has a very beneficial impact on pastures.

So even though the eastern red cedar problem has exploded in recent years, there is still hope. With a little care, the beautiful native prairies of Kansas can remain intact.

Helpful Resources

Eastern Red-cedar: Positives, Negatives and Management Excellent 8-page PDF download that explores the history of cedar expansion, the pros and cons of cedar trees, and different management techniques.

## Lessons from the Bison

In case you wanted to learn more about nature's way of managing tall-grass prairie.

### What is Management-Intensive Grazing?

A starting point for further research on using animals to manage pastures.

[Click to email this to a friend \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to print \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to share on Facebook \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to share on Pinterest \(Opens in new window\)](#)[Click to share on Twitter \(Opens in new window\)](#)

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: b57645d4-e073-40e3-9196-7e00da758672  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2601:300:8101:e830:b960:1354:5b66:5124

### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Kenneth PeKarek  
Address  
15458 W 163rd Ter  
Olathe KS US 66062  
  
Phone 9136264456  
E-Mail kentusm@aol.com

### Comments

---

DUE TO FIRE, ICE, WIND AND THUNDERSTORM HAZARDS, CEDAR TREES AND OTHER HAZARDOUS VEGETATION GROWING WITHIN 200 FEET OF THE BASE OF A PERMANENT HABITABLE STRUCTURE SHOULD BE REMOVED. THERE WERE HABITABLE STRUCTURES BUILT ADJACENT TO THE USACE CORP LINE. THERE ARE NOW ONLY A FEW FEET BETWEEN THE GLASS BACK OF THESE

STRUCTURES AND THE HAZARDOUS TREES AND SHRUBS. WITH THE PERFECT WEATHER AND FIRE ANOMALIES THESE TREES COULD FALL INTO THESE HABITABLE STRUCTURES. AS THE USACE HAVE DENIES PERMITS TO ELIMINATE THE VEGETATION HAZARDS, THERE MUST BE A PERMIT APPEAL SYSTEM PROCESS.

Unfortunately for several decades permanent habitable structures were built adjacent to the USACE property lines on Table Rock Lake. When these buildings were built, there was no or very little vegetation between the USACE property line and the shoreline. Over the decades Cedar Trees, shrubs and debris have flourished right next to these habitable structures. At some points, the trees, and other vegetation have grown into a jungle like environment and have created an extremely hazardous and safety environment for those living in these structures. These structures also have FULL GLASS SUNROOMS just a few feet from these vegetation hazards. The MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION HAS A BRILLIANT SOLUTION, AND THAT IS TO REMOVE THE CEDAR TREES TO BE REPLACED BY NATIVE GRASSES. THE GRASSES WHICH MANY EXPERTS AGREE WILL PROVIDE A MUCH BETTER ECOLOGICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ELIMINATE SOIL EROSION MUCH MORE EFFICIENT THAN TREES, INCLUDING CEDAR TREES.

TREE and Brush HAZARDS Trees and brush should not be permitted on embankment surfaces or in Vegetated earth spillways. Extensive root systems can provide seepage paths for water. Trees that blow down or fall over can leave large holes in the embankment surface that will weaken the embankment and can lead to increased erosion, as is the case in the failed earth embankment dam shown here. Brush obscures the surface limiting visual inspection, providing a haven for burrowing animals, and inhibiting the growth of grass vegetation. Tree and brush growth adjacent to concrete walls and structures may eventually cause damage to the concrete and should be removed.

#### Trees and Storm Safety

Storm events such as tornadoes, severe thunderstorms, hurricanes, and ice can considerably impact trees. Below are some of the impacts caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, or storm events and information to assist homeowners and community officials to prepare and respond quickly and safely before and after storm events. Courtesy: Georgia Forestry Commission Wind is often the first sign of a hurricane approaching. Leaves and branches may be stripped off and entire trees may be twisted, broken or uprooted altogether. Some trees are more susceptible to wind damage than others. Trees with healthy root systems have better chances of survival. However, if remaining trees survive one storm, and another hurricane encompasses the same area in a short period of time, those remaining trees are considered stressed and may not make it through subsequent storms. Hurricanes can also produce tornadoes with winds measuring more than 200 mph. Trees may be completely debarked by small, flying debris or downed altogether. In either case, these trees will need to be removed.

#### Lightning

Hurricanes also are typically accompanied by thunderstorms and lightning. Because of their height, trees are a prime target for lightning. However, damage caused by lightning varies greatly. The damage may be minimal if the electricity is conducted along the outside of the tree. In this case, blown off bark and scarring will be apparent. The damage may extend to a more serious condition known as trunk shatter. In this event, lightning charge penetrates into the tree's trunk, turning moisture into steam and causing the tree to explode. The most commonly struck trees are oaks, elms, poplars and pines. These trees typically are found in most yards.

#### Flooding

After hurricanes strike, many low-lying communities are impacted by short-term flooding. Flooding has been known to damage trees by loosening and/or removing the soil that supports root systems. In areas that have been flooded for extended periods of time, trees can suffer from the accumulation of organic

toxins in the soil and the reduced flow of oxygen to the roots. Various characteristics of a tree, including height, age and species, along with environmental factors like season, temperature and flood water duration, affect a tree's flood tolerance. The typical warning sign of flood damage in trees is curling and wilting of the leaves, followed by chlorosis (pale-colored leaves that have lost chlorophyll). Chlorosis is generally followed by leaf browning and ultimately, leaf loss.

#### Ice

Ice storms are caused by rain that supercools or freezes as it passes through below-freezing air. These ice coatings can grow to be several inches thick in various places. The weight of the ice, combined with any wind or outside forces, breaks the trees' branches. Normally, the taller and older a tree, the more susceptible it is to ice damage because older trees have larger crowns, more internal decay, and less limb and trunk flexibility. The severity of the ice damage depends on ice load and resistance of the trees determined by their physical characteristics - wood strength, elasticity and growth form, and on condition of the growing environment. In general, trees with brittle and weak wood, fine branches, and greater canopy surface, such as pine trees which retain their needles, are more likely to suffer ice damage. And, may fall into habitable buildings.

---

-----

HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 03c9694c-1866-4257-a4d6-75764e8e4c1f  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2601:300:8101:e830:c402:85d5:b86c:61c2

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Kenneth PeKarek  
Address  
15458 W 163rd Ter  
Olathe KS US 66062  
  
Phone 9136264456  
E-Mail kentusm@aol.com

#### Comments

---

DUE TO FIRE, ICE, WIND AND THUNDERSTORM HAZARDS, CEDAR TREES AND OTHER HAZARDOUS VEGETATION GROWING WITHIN 200 FEET OF THE BASE OF A PERMANENT HABITABLE STRUCTURE SHOULD BE REMOVED. THERE WERE HABITABLE STRUCTURES BUILT ADJACENT TO THE USACE CORP LINE. THERE ARE NOW ONLY A FEW FEET BETWEEN THE GLASS BACK OF THESE STRUCTURES AND THE HAZARDOUS TREES AND SHRUBS. WITH THE PERFECT WEATHER AND FIRE ANOMALIES THESE TREES COULD FALL INTO THESE HABITABLE STRUCTURES. AS THE USACE HAVE DENIES PERMITS TO ELIMINATE THE VEGETATION HAZARDS, THERE MUST BE A PERMIT APPEAL SYSTEM PROCESS.

Unfortunately for several decades permanent habitable structures were built adjacent to the USACE property lines on Table Rock Lake. When these buildings were built, there was no or very little vegetation between the USACE property line and the shoreline. Over the decades Cedar Trees, shrubs and debris have flourished right next to these habitable structures. At some points, the trees, and other vegetation have grown into a jungle like environment and have created an extremely hazardous and safety environment for those living in these structures. These structures also have FULL GLASS SUNROOMS just a few feet from these vegetation hazards. The MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION HAS A BRILLIANT SOLUTION, AND THAT IS TO REMOVE THE CEDAR TREES TO BE REPLACED BY NATIVE GRASSES. THE GRASSES WHICH MANY EXPERTS AGREE WILL PROVIDE A MUCH BETTER ECOLOGICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ELIMINATE SOIL EROSION MUCH MORE EFFICIENT THAN TREES, INCLUDING CEDAR TREES.

TREE and Brush HAZARDS Trees and brush should not be permitted on embankment surfaces or in Vegetated earth spillways. Extensive root systems can provide seepage paths for water. Trees that blow down or fall over can leave large holes in the embankment surface that will weaken the embankment and can lead to increased erosion, as is the case in the failed earth embankment dam shown here. Brush obscures the surface limiting visual inspection, providing a haven for burrowing animals, and inhibiting the growth of grass vegetation. Tree and brush growth adjacent to concrete walls and structures may eventually cause damage to the concrete and should be removed.

#### Trees and Storm Safety

Storm events such as tornadoes, severe thunderstorms, hurricanes, and ice can considerably impact trees. Below are some of the impacts caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, or storm events and information to assist homeowners and community officials to prepare and respond quickly and safely before and after storm events. Courtesy: Georgia Forestry Commission Wind is often the first sign of a hurricane approaching. Leaves and branches may be stripped off and entire trees may be twisted, broken or uprooted altogether. Some trees are more susceptible to wind damage than others. Trees with healthy root systems have better chances of survival. However, if remaining trees survive one storm, and another hurricane encompasses the same area in a short period of time, those remaining trees are considered stressed and may not make it through subsequent storms. Hurricanes can also produce tornadoes with winds measuring more than 200 mph. Trees may be completely debarked by small, flying debris or downed altogether. In either case, these trees will need to be removed.

#### Lightning

Hurricanes also are typically accompanied by thunderstorms and lightning. Because of their height, trees are a prime target for lightning. However, damage caused by lightning varies greatly. The damage may be minimal if the electricity is conducted along the outside of the tree. In this case, blown off bark and scarring will be apparent. The damage may extend to a more serious condition known as trunk

shatter. In this event, lightning charge penetrates into the tree's trunk, turning moisture into steam and causing the tree to explode. The most commonly struck trees are oaks, elms, poplars and pines. These trees typically are found in most yards.

#### Flooding

After hurricanes strike, many low-lying communities are impacted by short-term flooding. Flooding has been known to damage trees by loosening and/or removing the soil that supports root systems. In areas that have been flooded for extended periods of time, trees can suffer from the accumulation of organic toxins in the soil and the reduced flow of oxygen to the roots. Various characteristics of a tree, including height, age and species, along with environmental factors like season, temperature and flood water duration, affect a tree's flood tolerance. The typical warning sign of flood damage in trees is curling and wilting of the leaves, followed by chlorosis (pale-colored leaves that have lost chlorophyll). Chlorosis is generally followed by leaf browning and ultimately, leaf loss.

#### Ice

Ice storms are caused by rain that supercools or freezes as it passes through below-freezing air. These ice coatings can grow to be several inches thick in various places. The weight of the ice, combined with any wind or outside forces, breaks the trees' branches. Normally, the taller and older a tree, the more susceptible it is to ice damage because older trees have larger crowns, more internal decay, and less limb and trunk flexibility. The severity of the ice damage depends on ice load and resistance of the trees determined by their physical characteristics - wood strength, elasticity and growth form, and on condition of the growing environment. In general, trees with brittle and weak wood, fine branches, and greater canopy surface, such as pine trees which retain their needles, are more likely to suffer ice damage. And, may fall into habitable buildings.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 03c9694c-1866-4257-a4d6-75764e8e4c1f  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2601:300:8101:e830:c402:85d5:b86c:61c2

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Lou Danner  
Address  
770 Hummingbird Lane  
Branson AL US 65616

Phone 4173371627  
E-Mail lou@loudanner.com

#### Comments

---

Wow so glad that you are looking out after this great resource and gift of Table Rock Lake. It is meant for human consumption. I love this lake and the recreation and beauty that it brings to our area. Balance of human interaction and the welfare of the lake is a delicate issue. If a limit is necessary, I do not know why you would propose to take away some of the current access, such as courtesy docks or currently proposed red line areas. Changes in those items would greatly effect the values of those properties and the communities they serve as would shore line management changes. The mow perm its or vegetation permits should remain as they stand. I think the shoreline is beautiful. It has a nice balance currently. I believe the public understands that limits are or may become necessary in the future. Setting those limits now will define the future, but changing the rules on those currently using the resource is not necessary in my opinion. Thanks Lou Danner

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 583f2dd2-b308-4941-a9d3-1848b9fbab6a  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 66.76.216.140

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization James Lucas  
Address  
132 Royal Road  
Capefair MO US 65624

Phone 309/231-5778  
E-Mail deerslayer1957@gmail.com



## Comments

---

I object to new docks period!

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: d81751de-a1f9-4be2-a143-add3e85c5cf7  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2001:5b0:4bd4:82fc:d0a2:6d27:89bc:3274

## Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Douglas Holtzmann  
Address  
410 Crescent Vista LN  
Eureka MO US 63025  
  
Phone 314-378-1363  
E-Mail douglauraholtz@yahoo.com

## Comments

---

Please do not dramatically increase the number of boat docks on Table Rock Lake. Our family sold their place at Lake of the Ozarks and bought a place on TRL because it was getting so dangerous there. We don't even have a slip currently. Paying for store our boat and launch each time.

During peak times, parts of TRL are a bit rough.  
Thank you for considering my opinion.  
God Bless,  
Doug

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 1fc16e1f-0e31-4e74-8a3c-54b7b7136534  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 172.221.231.26

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Nancy Leahy  
Address  
179 lakeshore drive  
Blue eye MO US 65611

Phone 3143134548  
E-Mail Nleahy17@gmail.com

#### Comments

---

Ok so what gives!!! 2 years ago, I approached Malcolm (corps) re upgrading our little dock. According to him, there were not enough spaces for parking, which I showed him numerous pictures of an empty parking lot! Letters to Congress, just came back, saying they would not interfere! Now all of a sudden there is discussion about adding, adding, adding. After being here for 48 years, I resent the huge boats that stir up our waterways! This lake should remain available for the small fishermen who are totally ignored by the bigger boats, and the family vacation boaters. It would also be nice to listen to long term residents, not who don't condone improvement, but want to maintain pristine sparkly lake water. Whomever allowed Emerald Point to be built, should have their head examined! It does not fit on that hill and will all the foliage removed stands out like a soar thumb! I

appreciate Johnny Morris, andhis building and hiring. But I do not appreciate trying to add 8 more slips to our dock, and he gets permission for multiple docks, and no boats sitting in them! If the realtors are behind this, shame on them, and their greed! This is happening all over the country- there is some available land and some money hungry land robbers steal it away. If any body can explain to this 68 year old woman, the rationale behind this, please call me!

Nancy Leahy

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 1dfeae47-8745-4e4c-be63-5edef6cf5dc5  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 67.6.232.103

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization Nancy Leahy

Address

179 lakeshore drive  
Blue eye MO US 65611

Phone 3143134548

E-Mail Nleahy17@gmail.com

#### Comments

---

Ok so what gives!!! 2 years ago, I approached Malcolm (corps) re upgrading our little dock. According to him, there were not enough spaces for parking, which I showed him numerous pictures of an empty parking lot! Letters to Congress, just came back, saying they would not interfere! Now all of a sudden there is discussion about adding, adding, adding. After being here for 48 years, I resent the huge boats that stir up our waterways! This lake should remain available for the small fishermen who are totally ignored by the bigger boats, and the family vacation boaters. It would also be nice to listen to long term residents, not who don't condone improvement, but want to maintain

pristine sparkly lake water. Whomever allowed Emerald Point to be built, should have their head examined! It does not fit on that hill and will all the foliage removed stands out like a soar thumb! I appreciate Johnny Morris, andhis building and hiring. But I do not appreciate trying to add 8 more slips to our dock, and he gets permission for multiple docks, and no boats sitting in them! If the realtors are behind this, shame on them, and their greed! This is happening all over the country- there is some available land and some money hungry land robbers steal it away. If any body can explain to this 68 year old woman, the rationale behind this, please call me!  
Nancy Leahy

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 2701bba5-3cfc-42be-8aa6-e71524b96961  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 67.6.232.103

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Darrell Hornick  
Address  
12352 S. 73rd Ave.  
Papillion NE US 68046  
  
Phone 8168305479  
E-Mail dwhornick@gmail.com

#### Comments

---

We started coming to TRL in 1985 for recreation and also the fact that family had just purchased a "mom and pop" resort to run. I know the lake and and I know the rules.

Fast forward 35 years and throw in retirement. We've now purchased water front/cliffside property to build our forever after house. With the lot came the option to also purchase a slip at our community

dock (which we did) and the slip had a lift already in it (bonus). We just also purchased a new pontoon to place in the slip on the lift.

We are now very heavily invested in the lake. Let's talk about Shoreline Vegetative Management.

First off, let me be perfectly clear and to say that I also know the monstrosity known as Lake of the Ozarks. I do not want that in any shape, form or fashion.

I do however believe there is a happy median that can be reached. For those of us that own lake front property, I believe we should be allowed a certain latitude in clearing brush/trees that impede a view. A view in which we paid for.

I believe that something like a 70/30 rule should apply. Having to leave as much as 70% of the Vegetation in place but you would also then be allowed to remove as much as 30%. The fact that you now can not even touch a twig that is on Corp property is absurd. The vegetation is often rather unsightly in its own right.

Also, the fact that you can no longer park on Corp property is not right. Dock owners (subdivisions) should be able to have a place to park (golf carts, atv's, etc...) at the dock. Many home owners are retired and elder and simply can not make the trek up and down these steep and often long Ozark hills from the road to the dock.

Just my thoughts.....

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 412ebbce-1397-4baa-800a-419446200a43  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2600:8804:1a81:3100:f1cf:161f:f7e:b679

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Ashley Huls  
Address  
23378 Farm Rd 1255  
Shell Knob MO US 63376

Phone 618-530-1572  
E-Mail Becketta87@yahoo.com

## Comments

---

As a patron of TRL for the last 25 years, and recently a new homeowner on the lake, I am against the addition of boat slips and parking. Part of what makes TRL so beautiful is the fact that it isn't as heavily crowded as other nearby lakes. The amount of untouched shoreline is something I would think is a top reason most of the lakes patrons choose TRL over others. We take pride on not being like Lake of the Ozarks and have been grateful the Corps has worked so hard to maintain our lake and make it a step above the rest. Please vote no to adding to the water traffic and taking away from our beautiful shorelines with the addition of boat slips. Thank you!

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 585aaead-2c1a-4a21-aa95-b6addf04af7e  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2600:6c40:7e7f:e942:b9c7:dee8:9984:b274

## Required Information

---

Name / Organization Ashley Huls  
Address  
23378 Farm Rd 1255  
Shell Knob MO US 63376

Phone 618-530-1572  
E-Mail Becketta87@yahoo.com

## Comments

---

As a patron of TRL for the last 25 years, and recently a new homeowner on the lake, I am against the addition of boat slips and parking. Part of what makes TRL so beautiful is the fact that it isn't as heavily crowded as other nearby lakes. The amount of untouched shoreline is something I would think is a top reason most of the lakes patrons choose TRL over others. We take pride on not being like Lake of the Ozarks and have been grateful the Corps has worked so hard to maintain our lake and make it a step above the rest. Please vote no to adding to the water traffic and taking away from our beautiful shorelines with the addition of boat slips. Thank you!

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: a64d5e9c-35c3-4b72-be4d-cb893d75ce46  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2600:6c40:7e7f:e942:b9c7:dee8:9984:b274

## Required Information

---

Name / Organization Alisa Phillips  
Address  
129 Magnolia Ln  
Shell Knob MO US 65747  
  
Phone 3162535177  
E-Mail arctsgirl@sbcglobal.net

## Comments

---

Please do not increase number of allowable docks/slips. LOTO has suffered greatly from the vast number of boats on that body of water. I would hate to see that happen at Tablerock. It just isn't safe.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: 9b24d981-f07f-4c45-9981-1c38c9d8041e  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 184.157.27.223

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization Carla Dickerson

Address

10391-A No. Cherry Dr. #4D

Kansas City MO US 64155

Phone 816-299-0403

E-Mail carladickerson1@gmail.com

#### Comments

---

I am not currently a homeowner or dock owner at Tablerock Lake. However, my family has been coming to Tablerock since 1970. We have seen major changes in the area over time. I feel justified in saying that I don't want to see Tablerock turned into another Lake of the Ozarks. The lake is home to locals and families who enjoy the lake, it's shoreline and coves and not be overrun with more docks, slips and bigger boats that will ruin what has already been created. Please take into consideration what you are doing.

---



-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: e9d7ba5d-0604-4e27-9f5f-4baeb85eda5e  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 174.255.17.157

Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Micah DeFazio  
Address  
95 Friday Dr  
Reeds Spring MO US 65737  
  
Phone 4172313227  
E-Mail Jayandhisgals@yahoo.com

Comments

---

I am writing as a citizen of the Table Rock Lake community to express my concern for the proposed Shoreline management plane. Specifically the addition of boat ramps and parking. I oppose any and all new additions as I believe it will be a safety hazard and increase pollution on our lake.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: d7d9920a-0b84-4f86-9969-66ff8b57a799  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 107.77.173.63

Required Information

---

Name / Organization Janet Bezzerides

Address

267 Ho Hum Trail  
Hollister MO US 65672

Phone 417-337-4598

E-Mail janetbezz@gmail.com

Comments

---

First I want to thank all of you for your professionalism day-to-day and especially during the plan revision process. Everyone I know appreciates this beautiful lake and understands that it is a Corp-Public partnership that makes this unique opportunity possible.

My concerns about the plan revision are mainly about the Park Buffer Zone, which is discriminatory and outmoded, AND the rules regarding the Veggie Modification permits. In my life as a lakefront-adjacent property owner and as a residential Realtor, these are the areas that most affect the segment of the public that seeks to lead a life of quiet enjoyment on and around Table Rock Lake.

I don't agree with reducing the size of vegetation allowed to be removed...I should think that 3-4 " at the ground will both allow the ranger to know for sure what was removed and restrict the adjacent owner from removing anything resembling a full-grown tree. And I strongly recommend the complete removal of the Park Buffer zoning. Please. Allow these few lakefront-adjacent owners the same privilege as others on the lake, to apply for a permit and live within the rules.

Thank you.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:

HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: d35ecfac-3c65-4c47-b47c-4041f13e366c

HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil

HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 173.218.29.17

Required Information

---

Name / Organization Steven Long  
Address  
60 Harborview Drive  
Branson West MO US 65737  
  
Phone 704-604-6376  
E-Mail Klong1@carolina.rr.com

Comments

---

Completely opposed to adding another 5,000 boat slips to the Lake. The lake is busy enough and there are vacant slips nobody is using.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: a3fff99d-87b1-4aab-a4e9-09850ef2bf5d  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2600:100a:b11a:d239:b4ff:3752:9e12:c35b

Required Information

---

Name / Organization Keith Gimlin  
Address  
206 Rockridge Road  
Sparta MO US 65753  
  
Phone 4174961897  
E-Mail Kgimlin@mtdproducts.com

## Comments

---

As a lake user as a fisherman and recreational boater since 1986 I find it troubling and dangerous due to vercrowding during during periods from Memorial Day through Labor Day with insane boat traffic and large wake throwing boats that can possibly damage docks, shoreline and other vessels as well as individuals using the lake. I feel this movement is being accelerated by big money developers, investors and real estate professionals that are looking to profit from a federal government entity. I understand the purpose of the white River chai. And often send the CORP in times of flood. I get it while others don't. I know that for the general public nothing positive will come from this proposed SMP. Thank you

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: a0c50ce3-069b-408d-928f-f1f7499d35a7  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 67.6.34.118

## Required Information

---

Name / Organization Steven Long  
Address  
60 Harborview Drive  
Branson West MO US 65737  
  
Phone 704-604-6376  
E-Mail Klong1@carolina.rr.com

## Comments

---

Completely opposed to adding another 5,000 boat slips to the Lake. The lake is busy enough and there are vacant slips nobody is using.

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: a3fff99d-87b1-4aab-a4e9-09850ef2bf5d  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 2600:100a:b11a:d239:b4ff:3752:9e12:c35b

#### Required Information

---

Name / Organization    Keith Gimlin  
Address  
206 Rockridge Road  
Sparta MO US 65753  
  
Phone 4174961897  
E-Mail Kgimlin@mtdproducts.com

#### Comments

---

As a lake user as a fisherman and recreational boater since 1986 I find it troubling and dangerous due to vercrowding during during periods from Memorial Day through Labor Day with insane boat traffic and large wake throwing boats that can possibly damage docks, shoreline and other vessels as well as individuals using the lake. I feel this movement is being accelerated by big money developers, investors and real estate professionals that are looking to profit from a federal government entity. I understand the purpose of the white River chai. And often send the CORP in times of flood. I get it while others don't. I know that for the general public nothing positive will come from this proposed SMP.  
Thank you

---

-----  
HTTP\_CMS\_CLIENT\_IP:  
HTTP\_X\_ARR\_LOG\_ID: a0c50ce3-069b-408d-928f-f1f7499d35a7  
HTTP\_ORIGIN: Blockedhttps://www.swl.usace.army.mil  
HTTP\_TRUE\_CLIENT\_IP: 67.6.34.118