



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

Little Rock District

Appendix A

**Public Involvement Supporting Documents
2021 Public Review Period Comments
Cooperating Agency Letters
for
Beaver Lake
Proposed Land Acquisition Study**

February 2022

SUBMISSION RECORD

Submission Number	Date Submitted	Organization (Only if on Official Letterhead or submitted on behalf of Organization)	Form Letter	Submission Type	Duplicate
BLRELA-EA-S-001	5/4/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-002	5/5/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-003	5/10/2021	Arkansas State Parks, Recreation Grants Program	No	Phone	No
BLRELA-EA-S-004	5/11/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-005	5/11/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-006	5/11/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-007	5/12/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-008	5/12/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-009	5/12/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-010	5/12/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-011	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-012	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-013	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-014	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-015	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-016	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-017	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-018	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-019	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-020	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-021	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-022	5/13/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-023	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-024	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	Yes
BLRELA-EA-S-025	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-026	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-027	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-028	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-029	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-030	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-031	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-032	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-033	5/14/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-034	5/15/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-035	5/15/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-036	5/15/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-037	5/15/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-038	5/17/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-039	5/17/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-040	5/17/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-041	5/17/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-042	5/17/2021		No	E-Mail	No

BLRELA-EA-S-043	5/17/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-044	5/18/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-045	5/18/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-046	5/18/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-047	5/18/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-048	5/18/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-049	5/18/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-050	5/18/2021		No	Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-051	5/19/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-052	5/19/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-053	5/20/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-054	5/20/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-055	5/21/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-056	5/21/2021		No	Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-057	5/23/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-058	5/23/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-059					
BLRELA-EA-S-060	5/24/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-061	5/25/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-062	5/25/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-063	5/25/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-064	5/27/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-065	5/27/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-066	5/27/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-067	5/28/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-068	5/29/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-069	5/29/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-070	5/31/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-071	5/31/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-072	5/31/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-073	5/31/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-074	6/1/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-075	6/1/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-076	6/1/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-077	6/2/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-078	6/1/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-079	6/2/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-080	6/2/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-081	6/2/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-082	6/3/2021	Arkansas Energy & Environment, Division of Water Quality	No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-083	6/3/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-084	6/4/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-085	6/4/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-086	6/4/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-087	6/4/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-088	6/6/2021		No	E-Mail	No

BLRELA-EA-S-089	6/6/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-090	6/6/2021		No	Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-091	6/6/2021		No	Mail	Yes
BLRELA-EA-S-092	6/6/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-093	6/7/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-094	6/7/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-095	6/7/2021		No	E-Mail	Yes
BLRELA-EA-S-096	6/7/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-097	6/8/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-098	6/7/2021	Arkansas State Parks	No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-099	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
		Department of Energy, Southwestern			
BLRELA-EA-S-100	6/8/2021	Power Administration	No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-101	6/9/2021		No	Phone	Yes
BLRELA-EA-S-102	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-103	6/1/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-104	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-105	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-106	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-107	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-108	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-109	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-110	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-111	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-112	6/9/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-113	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-114	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-115	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-116	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	Yes
BLRELA-EA-S-117	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-118	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-119	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-120	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-121	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No
BLRELA-EA-S-122	6/10/2021		No	E-Mail	No

SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS			
Submission Number	Comment	Category	Area of Concern
BLRELA-EA-S-003	[Summary] If the action would affect Hobbs State Park that would involve full acquisition, consultation with the National Park Service would be required, since the park was acquired using Federal funds. An agreement between Arkansas State Parks and USACE (e.g. an easement) could avoid having to involve NPS.	Coordination	Agency Coordination
BLRELA-EA-S-006	I see no need for the Corp to acquire more land that is in the flood area. The Corp already has flood easements and the land owners are already aware that these areas could be flooded occasionally. Why spend more federal money that is not necessary.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-008	If the entrance to the [War Eagle] cavern is taken away by the Corps, the business will be forced to close. Long-time employees would lose their jobs, the Boyer family will lose income, the state of Arkansas will lose all sales tax generated by this business, and an irreplaceable natural phenomenon will be lost forever.	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-009	Please do not take this land from our family. We have worked for over 20 years to improve and beautify the land surrounding War Eagle Cavern. This is a family run business that employs many people. Taking away this land will make the cavern tour impossible. This will end the business entirely and put many people out of work. We have worked tirelessly to promote the beauty of the natural cavern entrance and the lake. We have done nothing but improve the cove and it's surrounding areas. We have made every effort to support the natural cavern opening and have never stopped the natural flow of water. We are promoting the beauty of the Arkansas area to the many people who come to visit the cavern each year. Please consider how this land acquisition will affect so many people. Each year the cavern gives many school tours to surrounding schools in field trips. We are constantly teaching a new generation of children about our beautiful lake and nature. Taking this away not only affects our family and employees now, but also future generations of kids that are being educated about their environment, and preserving our beautiful country.	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-011	Any action on the part of the USACE that would seek to take over, control, or limit access to the Cavern approach and entrance (This falls within the USACE expressed area of interest.) would easily do far more lasting and serious economic damage. The success of the War Eagle Cavern as a business depends completely on having free and unrestricted access to the Cavern via its one and only entrance. Any loss here would also lose our entire commercial area an enormous amount of tourism and its associated revenue. The maintenance standards at the War Eagle Cavern are extremely high. The property area that is under consideration is already being very well maintained, and this should be allowed to freely continue as under its present ownership. Lastly the commercial value of the War Eagle Cavern as a successful business would be totally devastated if there were any kind of an ownership gap between the main portion of the property and its physical access to the cavern.	Environmental	Socioeconomics

BLRELA-EA-S-011	I would respectfully submit that this War Eagle Cove area of Beaver Lake be exempted. The area here in question involves only one property and one property owner. Except for the short Cavern access walking path the shoreline in the Cove is completely natural and already conforms to USACE standards. Flooding of private property, which is here the expressed concern of the USACE, is in this instance here is not valid concern. And, the USACE would gain absolutely no added value or utility for the expenditure of the funds necessary to acquire this particular property.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-012	While we understand from the presentation materials that existing structures will not be affected, a position we strongly support and appreciate, we also wanted to comment that we feel it is important that the Corps also support the ability to maintain these structures. At times when the lake level is above 1128 msl, the rip rap protecting the retaining walls as well as the bottom portion of one of the retaining walls is in the water and subjected to wave action caused by wind and boat traffic. These waves at times move some of the rip rap which we subsequently simply put back in place to prevent erosion and/or undercutting. We would appreciate your consideration that we be able to maintain existing structures so they may be able to continue to fulfill the purpose for which they were designed.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-013	[War Eagle Cavern] has been my parent's business for 25 years now, and has been a part of local history for a century...This business is a favorite for locals and tourists alike. Why would you take away something so critical to tourism?	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-013	[War Eagle Cavern] provides homes for wildlife that would all be displaced without this cavern. What would happen to all of the bats?	Environmental	Biological Resources
BLRELA-EA-S-016	Closing War Eagle Caverns will prevent 30,000 visitors a year from visiting and enjoying the caverns and spending money in the community. Well over 500 school students will be denied field trips to the caverns annually.	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-017	[War Eagle Cavern] is a highly educational site for school children to learn about the many caverns located in the United States. There are not very many caves where this type of educational opportunities exist. If this acquisition is completed it is my understanding that the entrance to the cave will eliminate access to the entrance to the cave, not only making it impossible for students or others to be able to explore nature in the state where nature exploration is encouraged.	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-018	The news they delivered to me regarding the acquisition of shoreline lands would be devastating to War Eagle Caverns. As I'm sure you know, the proposal by the Army Corp of Engineers will split the the property and there would be no access to the cave. Therefore, this beautiful underground attraction will become isolated from 30,000 annual visitors. War Eagle Caverns will close and simply go out of business. This will be a major economic impact to the local community as well. Visitors who come to see the caverns also spend money at hotels, restaurants, gift shops, gas stations, etc. This taxable revenue will be gone. Think about the jobs that will be lost as well.	Environmental	Socioeconomics

BLRELA-EA-S-019	<p>I urge you not to acquire the land as proposed that would restrict or eliminate access to War Eagle Cavern. That site has is a great recreational and educational destination that provides the public with a better understanding of geology and the natural world. The land acquisition plan proposed would eliminate this important resource, as well as effectively shutter a long standing business in the area...Please work with War Eagle Caverns to ensure their business may continue.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-020	<p>I am writing to protest the acquisition of land along Beaver Lake near War Eagle Caverns. The owner of this property has invested years in the conservation of this important natural site. The economic and educational value of War Eagle Caverns must also be considered. Attracting approximately 30,000 visitors each year, War Eagle Caverns provides jobs for the local community and the funding to preserve this amazing natural wonder. It is imperative that War Eagle Caverns continues to have access to the board walk so that its conservation effort and educational outreach will continue to be funded.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-022	<p>If the COE owns the additional land, cleaning up becomes much more difficult. We have been instructed not to remove any plant dead or alive on COE land. We have also been told that we are allowed and even encouraged to pick up man made litter...I found it extremely difficult to navigate over the sticks, limbs, and dead trees that littered the banks to be able to collect any man made trash. Further acquisition of low lying areas will only exacerbate the problem. Also, if the COE acquires additional shoreline the current private property owners lose the right to clean up these areas. Therefore, that results in more drift and debris that is hazardous to recreational boaters and fishermen.</p>	Long-Term Operation	Trash and Debris
BLRELA-EA-S-026	<p>If you purchase additional land around War Eagle Cave area, you should exclude purchases that interfere with this also remarkable natural resource remaining open. War Eagle Cave gives visitors an opportunity to see up close our underground caves and be educated about the importance of protecting this resources, as the Corp protects Beaver lake. There are many other caves around the lake that need to be protected and the education, which War Eagle Cave provides to both adults and school children helps increase awareness of caves in general and the need to protect them and the water and other resources that are parts of an cave system. I applaud your desire to better protect Beaver Lake; but please don't do anything that would result in the closure of War Eagle Cave or their ability to share this valuable natural resource with the American public.</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-035	<p>As part of your land acquisition study where you intend to buy land that is sometimes flooded during high water levels, will you also consider SELLING Corp Land to adjacent landowners where the Corp Line is excessively high? ... It could also be a way to fund the Government's purchase of the property you are looking to acquire as a result of your study.</p>	Planning	Alternatives

BLRELA-EA-S-041	<p>Thank you for taking time to read our comments on how closure of War Eagle Cavern could effect YOUR LIABILITY if you do not take action to keep the property as it is. Just 2 of many issues: 1. "Attractive Nuisance" is a legal term for a known place of interest not adequately protected from injury by trespassers. Hundreds of thousands of people know War Eagle Cavern is an interesting place, they will continue to come, and finding it closed, some will try to get in anyway, leaving the land owner liable. But you can't just build a gate to keep people out... 2 Bat's and endangered species act could be used against you. It is unlikely that a gate could be constructed to keep out people, that is also not deadly to some or all of the bats. Results: You choose to either be in violation of the Endangered species act OR you have liability for an attractive nuisance. Not good choices.</p>	Environmental	Public Safety/Sensitive Resources
BLRELA-EA-S-043	<p>We would also like to state if the Corps continues with this ill advised plan it should swap the land the Corp wants to purchase for other land it already owns on those lots wherever possible.</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-043	<p>War Eagle Caverns has an excellent record of care, maintenance, conservation, and educational experiences that has been provided for years by the private owners of the Cavern. The operation generates jobs and pays taxes, while providing safe, educational access to a natural resource for the public. The resource has been managed and cared for very well at no expense to any state or federal agencies. This is a well managed natural resource; a success for the environment and economy. This private, family owned business is an asset to the the environment, the community, the state, and thousands of visitors.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-045	<p>Most land owners are very aware of the flooding that takes place in low lying areas. As landowners, we have a vested interest in the care and safety of the lake and its shores. Like many landowners adjoining the lake, my family and I spend a considerable amount of time and money throughout the year removing trash and debris [list of common items included] from the lake and the shoreline around our property. By taking our land, the USACE significantly inhibits our ability to help keep the lake and the shoreline cleaner and safer...At least once a year, we try to clean [coves with collected debris, trash, and logs]. Its a daunting task that require man-power and even some light machinery, but it helps remove tons of trash and logs that no longer float down the lake, which helps prevent problems for other land owners and boaters. Every year we see debris causing damage and injuries that can often be prevented or at least reduce teh chances by simply cleaning up what we can...Not once have we ever asked the USACE to help us in this effort. We do this on our own because we love our lake and we want it to be safe, clean, and accessible for those of us who enjoy it. If the USACE takes this land, it will remove our ability to keep these areas safe and clean. More harm will come to boats, boaters, skiers, Camp War Eagle campers, my family and all those who enjoy this area of our beautiful lake.</p>	Environmental	Public Safety/Water Quality
BLRELA-EA-S-045	<p>Additionally, the poisonous snake population (specifically cottonmouths) will drastically increase. We know. We witness it when we don't stay on top of keeping these areas clear.</p>	Environmental	Biological Resources

<p>BLRELA-EA-S-045</p>	<p>Even though these low lying areas are flood areas and can't be built upon, the USACE will drastically reduce our property values and our enjoyment and care for the lake. By taking this land, the USACE is actually hampering land owners' ability to help you fulfill the mission of providing for clean drinking water while simultaneously decreasing safety. So why now? Why are we spending more time and tax payer money on something that will actually work against us? Why not allocate the resources from the possible land acquisition to more critical areas to help complete the outstanding projects and needs? What we need is more cooperation from the USACE. The USACE should work with land owners as partners in caring for the lake. The animosity that's been built up over the years is sad and unnecessary. This latest land acquisition is not going to help the USACE further its mission and will only create more, unnecessary problems for those of us who enjoy, care for, and love Beaver Lake.</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>POOCs</p>
<p>BLRELA-EA-S-046</p>	<p>Lake front property owners that have low Corps of Engineers (corps) markers have some of the most expensive real estate on Beaver Lake. For the Corps to pursue some sort of infrastructure program that takes additional property from these landowners at some 500 locations is ill-advised. It should be assumed there will be legal challenges as this action does not fit the "public need/use prescription". Regardless, in most of these areas, there is simply nothing to do. As one example, I own property at one of the locations on the map released. There is a sea wall at this location and there is no erosion. Why the government would want to slice-off off another piece under the eminent domain process and then pay me for my property using my tax dollars is really a "head scratcher". As a business development leader, it is easy to recommend that the Corps of Engineers select future infrastructure projects that have recognized tangible benefits for BL and then work together with (not at) the effected landowners. As an example, the park shoreline erosion improvement projects have received great reviews. Campers, landowners and boaters can all see the benefits. In contrast, this eminent domain project currently under review will have the opposite effect. Winning support in lieu of division is always the best course.</p>	<p>Planning/ Project Management</p>	<p>POOCs/Public Involvement</p>
<p>BLRELA-EA-S-049</p>	<p>I don't believe leaving the purchasing timeframe open ended is consistent with the Federal Land acquisition Code which specifies Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition in the current real-estate climate. The value of lakefront property is rising on a monthly basis right now. This is by nature what you are after; actual shoreline property. One of the foundations of fair appraisal is the effective date for the appraisal. Landowners who happen to be first in line for acquisition are better served to delay the process as long as possible in this climate. Alternatively, if all projections are wrong and trends reverse, people who are not approached until the end are not treated as well as those who were evaluated early in the process. Freezing the values to the beginning of the project is unfair also. If I were to try to sell property considered in this acquisition before negotiations, It is not free to the market conditions for however long the USACE decides to take for this project since it is currently open ended.</p>	<p>Real Estate</p>	<p>Valuation</p>

BLRELA-EA-S-049	<p>I also don't care for the typical determination of highest and best use for the property. It is only restricted because of the right to flood the purchasing entity maintains. By definition this is not a fair consideration. It would be as if I were a City looking to expand and devalued a property because I forced an easement on a landowner. You can't devalue a piece of property by legislation/condemnation/rules & regulations and then buy it at a discounted price. It's only fair that portions to be bought are considered with the property before the purchase.</p>	Real Estate	Valuation
BLRELA-EA-S-049	<p>It is much more appropriate for an easement purchase to be made that allows the flood waters to continue to encroach on existing property and that no changes to storage volume may be initiated. This accomplishes the goal of lake operation, costs the taxpayer less, impacts the landowners less.</p>	Planning/ Real Estate	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-049	<p>If that [see comment BLRELA-EA-S-049-03] is not feasible, considering the original purchase plan and its issues the USACE is trying to resolve, the inverse problem is also true. Many of the tracts purchased are well above the needed project elevation. Rather than taking outright someone's property, a land exchange is authorized in the land acquisition code. Have the appraisers evaluate the adjoining federal property for feasibility of a land swap. It can be another tool for negotiation and potentially help the project move forward with less tax dollars expended.</p>	Planning/ Real Estate	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-049	<p>I think it is only fair to consider the minimally disruptive option for a project that has been working well since inception. I know the history very well of the federal government, fair, and land so I doubt it matters much. The flooding of public lands is covered under flowage right to flood around the project and is knowledge easily attained when considering a land purchase and certainly would be brought to light in a land survey. In all engineering decisions the "do nothing option" must be considered and I have no idea how this isn't the best option in this case.</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-050	<p>The ongoing land acquisition study addresses important concerns regarding shoreline management at many low-lying points around Beaver Lake and doubtless there several areas where such acquisitions will serve a public good. However, specifically with respect to the properties (addresses redacted for personal information protecton), it is apparent that any acquisition by the Corps of our land would serve no public good and, in view of the immense effort and funds just expended by us to address these very concerns, be deeply unfair to ourselves and our neighbors. With these repairs, all of the issues of public concern in this particular area have been successfully addressed. It appears spending limited Corps resources at this location is unnecessary to address any public good and will very significant negative effect my property value which we just have made a considerable investment into enhancing. [Comment continues and lists an additional 9 reasons the action is not needed at this location, some of which are repeats of the main comment]. Therefore, my public comment is leave well enough alone, use new financial resources on problem areas, we will finish what we have 90% already successfully completed once the lake level allows...We ask the US Army Corps of Engineers do not cause a problem, level or otherwise where one now does not exist or need to exist.</p>	Planning	Alternatives

BLRELA-EA-S-051	<p>On May 3 the USACE gave only 37 days for comments and questions regarding the possible forced sale "taking" of private property that is not for sale in many cases, if not all. I believe the notification of the affected properties was inadequate and the time period for review is grossly inadequate. I have requested the list of private property owners and I have been unable to secure it from the USACE. The fact that the USACE is refusing public meetings due to Covid is absurd. Wal Mart, Home Depot, Lowe's.... and most of Arkansas is functioning as normal with regard to personal contact and business operations. Surely if the elderly Wal Mart greeter can talk with you, the USACE should be able to hold a public meeting. Please postpone or extend this "study" to give the property owners time to truly assess the effect this land acquisition (taking) will have on their property as a whole.</p>	Project Management	Public Involvement
BLRELA-EA-S-052	<p>This proposal would essentially halt their business. These small businesses are the backbone of any community. Please consider them and hundreds more before you make this decision.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-055	<p>The acquisition of land to elevation 1128 would take in the bottom 2 steps of my stairs to my dock which would make access to my dock very difficult. For this reason I would not be in favor of this acquisition.</p>	Real Estate	Access
BLRELA-EA-S-056	<p>The elevations and Corp property lines are so uneven and unrealistic at this time due to previous errors in marking of the Corps property lines. Many properties are under water at the 1128 elevation while others are 100 or more yards away from the water at the 1128 elevation. To now purchase those that are under the 1128 mark is unrealistic and not a real fix. It is an inconsistent poor attempt to fix the overall issue of existing unrealistic and inconsistent Corps property lines. It results in an ongoing issue of varied Corps lines that make no sense and is unfair to landowners and property who were unjustly affected. I would suggest that a reasonable Corps property line at 1128 be established in all areas, not just those under water or subject to flooding. If the Corp property line was consistent and at the established elevation all around the lake, not just where it is convenient or allows easy access, the issue would be permanently resolved. However, this attempt to purchase properties is a worst fix that holds no merit and is poorly planned...Let us do an overall fix, not a unrealistic patch job.</p>		
BLRELA-EA-S-057	<p>Nowhere is stated a reasonable purpose or proposed benefits for this idea.</p>	Planning	POOCs
BLRELA-EA-S-058	<p>I am absolutely positive that the land owners of the lake front property in question are fully aware that the property can flood at times. I don't think any would willingly sell you the property. If this is about liability to the COE if flooding damages personal property, ask for a waiver or sell said property to COE.</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-060	<p>If a problem exists with a particular home owner and the flooding of property above the 1128 mean sea level, and that home owner has expressed concerns, by all means please work with that land owner to resolve the problem. To do a blanket assessment of what some same is up to 500 pieces of property, some of which I'm sure no one has expressed any concern about then please do not waste tax payer dollars to study or purchase that property.</p>	Planning	Alternatives

BLRELA-EA-S-064	Please ensure that you are working with the local floodplain administrator and obtaining all required local floodplain permits.	Environmental	Compliance
BLRELA-EA-S-065	Please do not take any land from War Eagle Caverns. The has major economic impact to the area - people who go to visit the cave also need motels, restaurants, shopping, etc. Most importantly, protection of the cave is important. People who visit learn about the fragile cave environment and how important they are to us. The cave is home to bats, which are in great danger from white nose syndrome. Aquiring the boardwalk to War Eagle Caverns would cause the cave to shut down, causing harm to the cave, people, and bats.	Environmental	Socioeconomics/ Biological Resources
BLRELA-EA-S-066	This seems to be unnecessary however if the Corp truly believes land owners would appreciate being compensated for their land that is occasionally under water than it should be optional and the Corp should not use eminent domain to take valuable land.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-067	The USACE has waited for 55 years since filling the lake, to find it crucial now to take private land and has not given a specific reason yet. I have read the list of general bureaucratic verbosity that doesn't specifically list any real issues.	Planning	POOCs
BLRELA-EA-S-067	[Summary] Commentor is concerned about the length of the comment period being too short and is concerned that the public comments won't be looked at by USACE until the EA study is complete. Additionally, there is concern that there was no "public discussion period" where teh public did not get to see or hear discussion about the study and that it won't occur until after the study. The commentor indicated that the lack of a public hearing was a problem "especially given that the CDC indicates it is okay to have public meetings and gathering and if the USACE is so worried about meeting in public because of COVID-19, then it should certainly delay this process until it feels it can open its doors like the rest of the country has done."	Project Management	Public Involvement
BLRELA-EA-S-068	Shutting down War Eagle Cave is wrong no matter how you do it. It is a tourist attraction for visitors from out of state AND local schools. It's a chance to teach kids not to fear bats and about their habitat. This whole plan deeply impacts not only land owners but business too. Please do not do this.	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-070	The erosion under cuts trees on the shoreline and they end up floating along with debris previously settled on the shoreline. I remove several truck loads of the debris each year to make the water near our land safe for boaters and swimmers. I don't think the corp has a plan for removing the debris from lands they confiscate so the safety issue will end up being worse. Also, the corp has no plans for erosion control. Any control installed by current land owners won't be maintained and will be allowed to fall into disrepair.	Operations	O&M

BLRELA-EA-S-069	<p>According to the current online USACE map, a small area at the SW corner of our property (about a 50'x90' triangle) may be subject to acquisition if approved. It appears that this small area lies between the Lake and our existing seawall, thus we would probably have no objection to an equitable taking of the land by the government. This assumes no part of our existing seawall is included in the currently marked red triangle as shown on the USACE map. Further, that an area equivalent in size to the area of our property to be taken by USACE would be added to the NW corner of our currently owned property, situated as necessary to assure that all of our seawall would be fully positioned within our redrawn property lines. Such an exchange of property would provide an adequate solution to several significant problems at the same time, without requiring transfer of any government funds.</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-071	<p>We were fully aware that a portion of our property was occasionally under water. We viewed this as a positive and was one of the primary reasons we purchased the property. I'm trying to envision a situation where this inundated land would be a detriment to a lake front property owner and not a benefit—I'm drawing a blank. If this land is taken from us, it will have a significant adverse effect on our property value.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-075	<p>As demand for usage of Beaver Lake and supply of the available land diverge, the value of what is colloquially referred to as the "Low Corps Line" continues to increase and this land therefore provides an enormous Property Value Contribution. Any reduction or compromise to these coveted and unique aspects of our current home and lot would have a significant negative effect on our investment, our ability to sell our home, and our overall property use experience. The potential loss of this land represents a significant concern for me and my family, even with proposed financial compensation to recoup some of the lost Property Value, as it contains our dock access point. This includes a concrete walking surface (constructed on our deeded property in consultation with and by approval of the COE) that provides tremendous safety, convenience, and utility (and therefore increased value) to our home and property. The dock access point has allowed elderly and disabled guests and family members to reach the dock with minimal risk. In fact, we consider the flooding of that land beneficial: as that portion of land is flooded, the distance from our home to our dock is reduced. Retaining private ownership of our land also allows us to keep the shoreline clear of debris and obstructions that can potentially damage watercraft, impact wildlife, and prevent us from safely moving our dock up and down as the water levels change.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics / Safety

BLRELA-EA-S-075	<p>The homeowner's association at Eden's Bluff, a.k.a., EDENS BLUFF LAKE ESTATES "PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION" (POA), owns common area land identified in PLAT Book 2008 Page 332 (06/04/2008) apparently subject to the land acquisition notice. (Copy enclosed - Highlighted in YELLOW is the POA common area that is privately owned and maintained, exclusively for the benefit, use, and recreation of POA members). When conceived, this Planned Unit Development (PUD) designated OPEN SPACE to comply with Benton County Subdivision regulations and requirements of the National Park and Recreation Association (NRPA). Benton County requires each PUD to "provide sufficient land" as "Active open space" or "Passive open space." If this common area is acquired by the Corps, our PUD will no longer be able to meet this obligation under the regulation. This common area should not be a part of fee acquisition and should be exempt because the PUD was approved with the required "OPEN SPACE" for the subdivision under Benton County Regulations for subdivisions. NOTE: Comment did not have a map enclosed.</p>	Real Estate/ Planning	
BLRELA-EA-S-075	<p>I do not feel that the May 3, 2021 press release with a deadline for public comments to end on June 10, 2021 is an adequate amount of time for the public to respond to such a major proposed action. Also, there should be public meetings regarding this potential land acquisition, and the process should be delayed until public meetings can be held. The COVID crisis has diminished for the most part and the rest of the country is returning to normal. Public meetings are occurring throughout the country and there is no reason to prevent the public from being able to discuss this proposed "study" in an open public workshop setting. I respectfully request that the comment period be extended and that public meetings be held to openly discuss this entire proposed acquisition "study".</p>	Project Management	Public Involvement
BLRELA-EA-S-079	<p>...we have absolutely no interest in selling any part of our property. With having just retired last year, we plan to use the cabin, lake & shoreline for family fun and recreation even more. We are trying hard to see both sides of this matter, yet is proving difficult. Our ownership of this property in no way impedes the Corps ability to manage the lake or water level of the lake, or any other part of necessary lake operations. Today the Corps essentially is able to raise the water level for flood mitigation and we have no issue with this nor have we ever. We've never complained, nor do we plan to do so in the future. If you would like us to grant the Corps a legal easement to continue to inundate our shoreline up to the cited 1128' mark, we'd be happy to discuss, with the understanding that we maintain full access and right to use the property and to keep it clear of debris as mentioned above. Our recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep managing the water level and inundating our property as needed. - There is no need to purchase our land up to the 1128' elevation, as doing so would provide taxpayer money absolutely no return on investment. - We would be open to negotiating a full Corps flow easement up to the 1128' elevation of our property, in order to make what has occurred since 1966 a more formal/legal agreement. 	Planning	Alternatives

BLRELA-EA-S-81	<p>I am concerned by the potential acquisition of much of the land around Beaver Lake and the fate of subterranean ecosystems that might be impacted as a result. It is unclear to me what the USACE intends to do with this land, but any alteration of the land adjacent to caves or openings into the aquifers can have a cascading effect to the stability of the underground ecosystem. Just a few threats may include 1) pollution in the form of runoff (not just chemicals, but also sediment) if any surface construction may occur, which could easily wipe out subterranean animals 2) groundwater recharge: where removal of water from the aquifer could reduce survival for aquatic cave fauna including the Federally listed Ozark Cavefish (<i>Amblyopsis rosae</i>) and the State Listed Southern Grotto Salamander. 3) Access to the cave for animals: bats are a crucial component of many cave ecosystems. In your region, there are Grey Bats (<i>Myotis grisescens</i>) with potential for Northern long-eared bats (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>). Bats are facing threats across the US, which is cause for concern for those of us in the field of cave biology. Furthermore, cave-associated salamanders like the Cave Salamander (<i>Eurycea lucifuga</i>) and Dark-sided Salamander (<i>Eurycea lonigcauda melanopleura</i>) and cave crickets (<i>Rhaphidophoridae</i> spp.) regularly interact with the surface habitat, and impeding this ability could impact both the stability and function of their populations, but (similar to the bats) have a downstream effect with the cave/aquifer ecosystems.</p>	Environmental	Sensitive Resources
BLRELA-EA-S-081	<p>In sum, it is very unclear for the information provided what exactly the USACE plans to do with these lands. If the goal is simply to compensate local land owners for losses due to flooding, I understand the motivation to do this, but would push for the USACE to have a moratorium on development in this area. Quite honestly, if the USACE is simply trying to fulfill its obligations to prevent losses to private landowners it would make sense to me if they were to donate the purchased land to the adjacent Hobbs State Park. Then these ecosystems could remain protected from potential threats, while still remaining accessible to the general public who wish to respectfully enjoy the excellence of the Arkansas Ozarks.</p>	Planning / Environmental	Alternatives / Sensitive Resources
BLRELA-EA-S-082	<p>All construction projects are subject to Construction Stormwater rules and permits if they disturb one acre of land or more. The applicable permit must be active before any work can begin. Information on Construction Stormwater rules and permits can be found on DEQ's website, https://www.adeg.state.ar.us/water/permits/npdes/stormwater/, or by contacting DEQ's Office of Water Quality, Construction Stormwater Section, at 501.682.0620. Best Management Practices must be implemented regardless of the project's size.</p> <p>The Construction Stormwater General permit does not authorize any activity to be conducted in Waters of the State or Waters of the United States. Work in Waters of the State requires a short-term activity authorization (STAA) from DEQ prior to working in the wetted area of a stream or water body. For more information and forms, see DEQ's website, https://www.adeg.state.ar.us/water/planning/instream/, or call 501.682.0040.</p>	Environmental	Compliance

BLRELA-EA-S-086	<p>At this time it is my opinion that a valid purpose for initiating the current proposed land acquisition has not yet been given. In "Why Conduct the Study" at https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/ it is insinuated that the flood control purpose of the lake is the rationale for the proposed land acquisition. My guess is that the "flood control" purpose of the lake is related to land below the dam because prior to placing the dam on the river land above the current fee boundary was not likely subject to flooding by the river. Flooding land by placing a dam to create the lake (and flood land) surely wasn't a significant aspect of the lake's flood control purpose, was it? If the land acquisition does not significantly enhance the flood control purpose of the lake, then I would like to understand how a change in ownership of land above the current fee boundary would meaningfully enhance the "flood control" purpose of the lake. If the periodic "flooding" of land above the current fee boundary is a cause of concern for the Corps, they should make those concerns known. Do they believe they are in any way liable for this flooding and that this liability could be removed through the acquisition? If that's not the case, have land owners been complaining of the flooding? If that's the case, wouldn't action targeted at these instances make the most sense? If that is not the case either, what is the purpose of a potentially forced sale of this land? Maybe the time for providing a meaningful explanation of the purpose of the land acquisition has not yet come. I do hope one is coming and am waiting to understand.</p>	Planning	POOCs
BLRELA-EA-S-087	<p>As a show cave owner and operator, I am surprised that the acquisition of land adjacent to War Eagle Caverns, or the purchase of the caverns itself, is being considered by any government body; Such land acquisition would very likely significantly impact on the caverns' ability to operate. Show caves are a very important component of local economies and tourism. In 2019, the county of Benton, where the caverns is located, showed that travel generated over \$173 million in payroll, over \$63 million in state taxes, over \$26 million in local taxes and employment for over 18,000 people. The caverns is an important contributor to these figures and Ecotourism. Additionally, the caverns serves by educating the public about caves and the ecological importance of caves. Besides the recreational contribution the caverns makes, it also provides protection to the fauna and endangered species found within the caverns. It is of concern, should the caverns be acquired, that the same level of protection for the caverns and its inhabitants will be sustained. Please consider all these factors before acquisition of any properties adjacent to the caverns or the caverns themselves.</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics / Sensitive Resouces
BLRELA-EA-S-088	<p>Increasing the size of Beaver Lake would bury the few cliffs that remained above the water. The beauty that is still visible needs to be protected. Horseshoe Bend where the White River curved along the bluffs would no longer be visible. The islands in the middle that form the horseshoe would be buried under the water forever. Every landowner along the shoreline would be impacted. Please stop this project!</p>	Environmental	Aesthetics

BLRELA-EA-S-089	<p>I am opposed to the planned Acquisition of our private land as we do not want to be burdened by restrictions the Corps would likely place on this land. We are particularly concerned about being able to keep and maintain steps with handrail that we constructed a few years ago. Between elevation 1128 and 1120 there is a pretty significant steep drop that made it unsafe for us (we are in our 80s) and our guests to walk to our dock. The eight steps and hand rail are very important to us and we do not in any way want the government to infringe on our rights to keep and maintain the steps and perhaps converting them to concrete. We would not be a willing seller unless the above was guaranteed in writing with no permit, permit restrictions or cost forever. Having the ability for this level of control of our property was an important factor to us when we bought the land and we do not want the government to infringe on that.</p>	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-089	<p>If the land acquisition was to proceed, it seems like the most feasible thing would be for the government to purchase private land from those willing sellers that are adversely impacted by high water and are complaining to the Corps about it....and leave the rest of the private landowners alone. This would seem to make everyone happy and save the tax payers a lot of money</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-090	<p>...we would rather put up with [flooding conditions that messes up our yard and requires days of cleanup when the water recedes] inconveniences un-compensated than have the exact same inconveniences, plus a yard we could not maintain in times of average water levels, under the absentee stewardship of the Corps of Engineers. No thank you.</p>	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-090	<p>Some other downsides to the Acquisition Project: Property values: my family's property would be severely impacted if we were to sell 2/3 of its lakefront to the Corps, especially if it becomes and overgrown mess due to the no-mow policy.</p>	Environmental/ Project Management	Socioeconomics / Operations
BLRELA-EA-S-090	<p>Some other downsides to the Acquisition Project: Tax Revenues: How will Benton, Madison, Washington and Carroll County like to have property tax revenues taken from their coffers when taxable property is reduced dramatically? Will the Corps compensate the Counties? Tourism Revenues: Air BnB's on the lake are a reality. Will tourists appreciate having an impassable stretch between their rental and the shoreline? Lost tourism dollars cause a ripple effect. Is the Corps of Engineers willing to compensate municipalities for lost revenue?</p>	Environmental	Socioeconomics

BLRELA-EA-S-090	<p>I'd also like to enumerate some of the ways in which the Corps could better use the money required to acquire the land to 1128 ft m.s.l: ...</p> <p>3) If the Corps feels overwhelming guilt for flooding private property nearly-annually, then they could grant money to compensate, which would help people do something with their yards to plant ground cover or fill in areas with rocks and sand. We could also relocate legally built structures above the and landscaping above a more realistic high water line, now that the lake floods above spillway heighth...4) The Corps could send cleanup crews in times of flooding to deal with the debris and trash on public and private land. 5) Raise Highway 12 Bridge so boats can pass under it during high water. 6) Build a dam somewhere else in the White River watershed for flood prevention. Part of teh goal of the Beaver Lake Project was flood prevention. It obviously hasn't entirely solved the problem. 7) Alternatively -- well or give all Corps of Engineers property around the lake to the State of Arkansas. Was managing a complex recreation area part of the original mission?</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-091	<p>I completely understand why the USACE would want property that floods frequently which is accessible by foot traffic. But, the property we have at (address redacted for personal information protecton) is not accessible via foot traffic. My proposed property inclusion all lies at the bottom of a 30 foot bluff. I see absolutely no benefit in the corp acquiring the property for flood assistance or shoreline management. I do understand that if the government wants this land it will get our land but I do not see any benefit in our tax dollars being spent to purchase land that has absolutely no benefit.</p>	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-096	<p>We own lake front property on Beaver Lake, and are opposed to the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition. There is no way to prevent the flooding of Beaver Lake, unless you regulate the water releases through the dam. Letting the public have access to property right below us only creates theft issues with people coming up near our properties. Also it creates liability issues. If you let these people have access to these areas where there are bluffs - like our areas - who's going to be responsible when people get injured because they dove off a cliff onto the trees beneath the water line. Please do not vote in favor of this acquisition. It is just a fiasco for all property owners involved.</p>	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-097	<p>I have an existing metal building near the shore line and I must keep it there for my boat, tractors and trailer with access to the building with tractor and vehicles. We've had no flooding during the 33 years of owning the property so I don't see a need to change the corp line and add a flowage easement. My fear is that your project will limit my activity such as mowing and picking up dead branches and debris in the flowage area.</p>	General	Opposition

<p>BLRELA-EA-S-098</p>	<p>The Outdoor Recreation Grants Program (ORGP) within Arkansas State Parks helps fund public outdoor recreation sites throughout the state. Sites that have received such funds are often obligated to remain in outdoor recreation perpetuity. Based on our review of the information provided, it appears the only location on Beaver Lake that has received grant funding through ORGP is Hobbs State Park -- Conservation Area (HSPCA). At this location, there appear to be approximately 30 proposed acquisition sites. All appear to be quite small and are either permanently or frequently flooded by normal operation of Beaver Lake.</p> <p>Land and Water Conservation Fund grants were used to acquire and develop the land that comprises HSPCA. This land is obligated to remain in public outdoor recreation use in perpetuity. While conveyance of land so obligated from ASP to the USACE is possible, the National Park Service much approve such transactions. Since our plans for management and development of the identified tracts do not appear to conflict with normal operations of Beaver Lake, we respectfully suggest that the USACE consider alternatives to fee simple acquisition to include No Action or the acquisition of flowage easements if deemed necessary.</p>	<p>Planning/ Environmental</p>	<p>Alternatives / Compliance</p>
<p>BLRELA-EA-S-100</p>	<p>...while there does not appear to be any negative impact from the proposed land acquisition, it is imperative that any activities resulting from the proposed action do not negatively impact hydroelectric power operations at the Beaver project. The Public Notice correctly states that hydroelectric power is one of the original Congressionally authorized purposes of the project. Southwestern applies the power sales revenues collected each year to repaying the U.S. taxpayers' original investment and ongoing reinvestment, plus interest, as well as annual operation and maintenance costs for the Beaver hydroelectric power plant and for an allotted portion of the joint-use infrastructure and project facilities. Therefore, the Corps must ensure that the proposed land acquisition has no negative impact on hydroelectric power at Beaver...Southwestern supports the Corps' effort to acquire private lands that are impacted by the normal operation of the project with the understanding that normal water management and hydropower operations will not be impacted.</p>	<p>Environmental</p>	<p>Energy</p>
<p>BLRELA-EA-S-101</p>	<p>With the above facts in mind and the reconsideration of moving beyond the blocked-out survey methodology and now specifically dialing into contour elevations, which is very logical, we would like to have our lake boundary edge on our property follow this rationale. Just as the USACE is seeking to acquire additional land to control flooding, it seems logical to relinquish land that is far outside of the flood contour and was merely captured as part of the blocked-out methodology that is now deemed antiquated. The current boundary at our property is very far from the practical edge of the lake as indicated below. Specifically, we are requesting that land be allowed to be acquired by us and returned to our property to better follow the natural boundary of the lake and more closely align to the study's required contour of 1128'. [Maps included with comment]</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>Alternatives</p>

BLRELA-EA-S-103	<p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this study and potential subsequent land acquisition. I understand that the USACE is concerned about private property being flooded during period of high water; however, this is not a recent issue and property owners have adapted for decades and put great care into their land. Going forward, I would propose that the USACE and property owners work together toward conservation and beautification of lake properties. First and foremost, however, I hope the USACE will put its focus on taking care of simple matters [commentor indicates permit backlogs, lack of maintenance after flood events, and neglect as examples earlier in letter] before diving into additional projects that it is not equipped to handle. In our experience, we have never worked with a group, private or public, more adversarial to its adjacent property owners.</p>	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-109	<p>If the REDM-S stays in accordance with the original REDM intent of fee acquisition to 1128 and flowage acquisition to 1135, I can support the effort. If the REDM-S in any way changes the fee acquisition above 1128, or in any way changes the flowage acquisition above 1135, then I oppose the effort. I hope the REDM-S doesn't go against the Congressional approved REDM.</p>	General	Support/Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-109	<p>I think the USACE could have waited until the COVID protocols are lifted to begin this project. This is not a new "urgent" problem, the lake is 50+ years old. Watching a video is informational, but it was greatly lacking in detail. Involving the public through meetings with two-way dialog would have been much better received. This one-way format of information dissemination is sure to receive the maximum amount of negative feedback.</p>	Project Management	Public Involvement
BLRELA-EA-S-109	<p>Additionally, the video mentions "public complaint" as being a justification for this project. Addressing any "public complaint" by taking the rights of another "land owning private citizen" is certainly no way to achieve peace. Any "public complaint" should be handled on a case-by-case basis, not by subjecting 500 land owners to taking land ownership rights in a wholesale manner.</p>	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-110	<p>The flowage easement agreement that I have with the Corp of Engineers has served us very well with no problems at all even in very high water levels for more than 30 years. The acquisition of land to elevation 1128 would take in the bottom 2 steps of my stairs to my dock which would make access to my dock very difficult. For this reason I would not be in favor of this acquisition. Besides we don't need to be adding to the massive government debt that is already crippling our nation. Also, since we have an energy crisis in this nation let's use this money instead of buying property to build more hydroelectric plants. That seems like a lot better use of the money than what you are looking at doing</p>	General	Opposition

BLRELA-EA-S-112	I have looked over the map in my area and it looks like the property that you want to take does not have any structures that will be endangered by flooding. I cannot think of any other reason that would justify taking this land from people against their will. When people bought property on beaver lake they thought the Takeline boundary was set for good and when they bought it most people even have title insurance for the property above the take line. It seems very unfair to these people to take their land as it has been privately owned by them or their predecessors for many years. Probably back before the mid 1960's when the lake was first filled up...It seems like the best idea is to just reconsider this plan and for the Corps to drop the idea of taking these properties from the current owners against their will.	General/ Planning	Opposition/ Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-113	I do not support this for the following reasons. It takes away high value property that I paid for and maintain. Will the COE maintain the property if acquired? My understanding is that COE will not. How is that beneficial to my property or my neighbors? It will likely decrease my property value as well.	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-113	It is not a good use of tax dollars and takes property off the tax roll so that has a double effect with tax dollars. The lake levels are what they are (9-10 months of the year are well below 1128') and the COE acquiring the land does not change that, so it does not serve any purpose to acquire my property.	Planning	POOCs
BLRELA-EA-S-113	I understand the need for the "study" but the land acquisition should be elective. If I don't want to give up my property then I should not be required. Additionally, there are no issues with how things are with my property or neighbors.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-114	I have owned land on Beaver Lake for nearly 20 years, and there has never been a flooding issue that would require this government land-grab related to our property. The premise of this study seems a bit ridiculous, in that the government has waited some 70 years to address some issues that should've been taken care of before the project even started?!	Planning	POOCs
BLRELA-EA-S-114	I am completely opposed to this action, and those that are having flooding problems on private land should be dealing with you guys individually, as opposed to some sort of ridiculous manifest-destiny approach! ... My advice is to deal with affected land-owners that have concerns both individually and according to there needs, like any sensible entity would do.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-114	My specific concerns are that I already have limited space for the required area for a septic leach field, as well as limited space to build on our lakefront property. We are planning to retire and build there, so this project puts our entire retirement plan at risk. This project may indeed result in my (now premium) property being rendered worthless,	Environmental	Socioeconomics
BLRELA-EA-S-115	While the Landowners object to all of the areas, the green area in particular would severely damage the value, use and enjoyment of the Landowners' home, which recently was constructed in that very spot due to its proximity to the water. The proposed taking also would severely impact the value of the residual, adjacent land.	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-115	There is no valid public purpose for attempting to condemn any portion of the Landowners' Property. The Landowners have owned the Property since the 80's, and there are no flooding or other issues caused up the lake at levels of 1130 and higher. The taking also is completely unnecessary for the Corps' lawful purposes in connection with Beaver Lake.	Planning	POOCs

BLRELA-EA-S-117	Perhaps there could be some kind of designation which would restrict building on flood prone areas as needed, but would still allow property owners to keep their land? As long as the owners understand certain areas may be flooded at times, why is it necessary to take the land?	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-118	Corps possible purchase of a portion of our property, I would like to address the substantial improvements that we have done to that portion of subject property. The improvements include: Drilling 27 thirty feet deep holes filled with rebar and concrete Constructed a 300 foot long ditch, 8 foot deep, filled with large rock and concrete. Trucked in 800 tons of rock to cover a ¼ inch mat covering the entire embankment Constructed curb and gutters to channel water down the embankment The cost of this construction exceeded \$100,000.00 I feel some compensation for this cost should be reimbursed if the Corps buys this portion of the property	Real Estate	Valuation
BLRELA-EA-S-119	...we looked at how this might impact my property. Basically, the 1135 setback (flooding easement) would negate the value of our property, as it would make it impossible to build and leach sewage systems. In fact, we had to buy 2 pieces of property to get enough viable area for sewage leach lines, which we would need to send downhill, which wouldn't be possible under the 1135 scenario. In short, this isn't just a discussion of the "slivers" of land you are proposing to purchase for a new property line and easement, as it defeats the entire reason I bought the property (and have paid taxes on for nearly 20 years). How about better water management??? Draw down the reservoir ahead of impending weather events, etc.	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-119	We would consider a flowage easement option if we are allowed to keep the property clean and free from debris.	Planning	Alternatives
BLRELA-EA-S-120	The property that the Corps plan to take away from me will prevent me from keeping our shoreline free from hudge amounts of trash and driftwood that occurs when the lake is allowed to flood on our property. The Corps does nothing to keep the shorelines from looking deplorable like so much of it is at present. If this land grab is allowed to happen our shoreline will become an eyesore as well as a snake infested hazard.	General	Opposition
BLRELA-EA-S-122	Please consider leaving War Eagle Caverns as a privately owned holding. My concern is that this cave and it's animals (Ozark Cavefish, a federally listed threatened species and Grey Bats, a federally threatened species) will be in jeopardy if the cave is taken by the government. War Eagle Caverns is an important natural area. Cave tours educate the general public about the unusual species that call the cave home as well as the unique and irreplaceable cave environment.	Environmental	Sensitive Resources

Out of Scope/Non-Substantive Submissions

Submission Number	Comment	Notes (Why out of Scope)
BLRELA-EA-S-099	I own property in an affected area and I do not want to sell any of my land or have it taken away.	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BRLELA-EA-S-032		Submission includes name and other personal information, but did not include any comments.
BLRELA-EA-S-048	It has come to my attention that if this Land Acquisition Study is completed that it could or would cause the flooding of the land around, near or including War Eagle Caverns. If the lake is causing flooding of privately owned land I do not see how acquiring more public or publicly concerned lands to flood is a solution. My daughter and I as well as countless other children have gone to the Cavern on field trips. It is historical and a tourist draw. It should be preserved and this proposal should not go forward as long as it will cost the sacrifice of this area or any others that are currently enjoyed and utilized by so many.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-104		Submission attachments were provided in a format that cannot be opened by the USACE.
BLRELA-EA-S-028	Please do not shut down War Eagle Caverns, it is such a great place to visit!! As a teacher and a mom, I ask you to reconsider. Thank you.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-054	I am concerned about the corps forcing property owners along the shore line forcing them to give up property that they have owned and maintained. War Eagle Cavern would be directly affected by this. Is this land acquisition really necessary or is it because there is a surplus of funds that need to be spent? Why not keep money in reserve for emergencies that could and at some point in time will occur? This seems like a waste of government money and could result in doing more harm then any good. Why spend the money? Why shut down or adversely affect a tour destination for the state of Arkansas? Why force property owners to sell land they dont want to? How many more times will this happen as the lake changes? Don't waste anymore of tax payer money on projects that we don't need or want. Tax payer money is our money, the people who pay their taxes. We should have a say on how it is spent. If there is a surplus of money then transfer our money to a department that needs it and not to just waste it on creating projects and problems.	Comments take the form of vauge, open-ended questions.
BLRELA-EA-S-072		Submission includes name and other personal information, but did not include any comments.
BLRELA-EA-S-062	Good evening, the purpose of this comment is to share that currently, I am not supportive of the potential land acquisition of our recently acquired property only a couple months ago. I would first like to better understand the amount of land I have potentially impacted and potentially some other options available as well. One of the main reasons we purchased this lot was that it gave us the benefit of owning land that goes into the land so we have unrestricted access through our own property. At this time, the vast majority of our lot area sits well above what I imagine would be the potential flood zone (e.g. ~200+ft above lake level towards the upper portions of the lot). Given this, we do not have any plans to add any structures at the lake level unless it were to be a floating dock which we currently understanding permits are no longer being accepted. I wish we had been informed of this initiative prior to our purchase recently as it may have influenced our decision. Again, we remain open to potential alternatives/options as this process unfolds but my hope is there will be a means where we can still enjoy the unique overall benefits of the land we've acquired.	Comments provide support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-015	What is the purpose of this action? What will the COE gain? What will land owners gain? What will lake users gain? How will it enhance flood control? There has been a dismal lack of communication from the COE. Some explanation of this seemingly random, pointless action would speed and smooth out the process.	Comments take the form of vauge, open-ended questions.
BLRELA-EA-S-036	We recently had the pleasure of going to War Eagle Cavern. In fact, it was last Friday, May 7, 2021, as we stopped in the Eureka Springs area on a trip from Omaha, NE to our home in Baton Rouge, LA. The tour was very educational and entertaining. The tour guide said it is visited by thousands each year, including many school groups who are getting to see the wonders of science up close. The business seems to be a small venture run by a family, but that is just my observation and feeling I got from being there. I learned today that War Eagle Cavern will have to cease business if you continue with the proposed Beaver Lake project in its current makeup. I wish there was a way you could devise an alternate plan to spare this historical landmark, which at one time was used by Jesse and Frank James.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.

BLRELA-EA-S-063	<p>My property is in the cove that borders big clifty park.</p> <p>I understand why you are doing the study. In my case there is probably no need for you to buy my land but if you needed to I probably wouldn't object to it. The bank is very steep and of no use to me. I do have steps that end at the current core line and yes today the bottom step is under water. Happy to cut it off if you buy my land. Bottom line is I see no issues for me. Good luck and feel free to reach out to me if needed.</p>	Comments provide support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-078	<p>In response to your letter to me dated May 18, 2021, please note that I have lived on Beaver Lake since 1983, same place. I am strongly opposed to any study, survey, or acquisition of land around Beaver Lake. P.S. The only fair way is for you to negotiate Hold Harmless agreements with property owners for your flooding problems. Acquisitions or flood easements should not be used unless absolutely necessary. Eminent Domain is out of the question.</p>	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-007	<p>I own a few acres on Beaver and I absolutely. do not want the Corp to purchase any from me.</p>	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-106	<p>Does the USACE have plans to stop renewing boat dock permits? If they did, would they tell us? The USACE had plans to acquire (take) private property from shoreline owners and didn't tell them, even when the Corps was asked to confirm private ownership of shoreline property days before the individuals purchased it, so that they private owners could use the land as intended. Is this correct?</p>	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-108	<p>Could the USACE decide not renew any or all existing boat dock permits?</p>	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-002	<p>Good morning. I just purchased my 36 acres, parcel # xxx in Benton County because of the privately owned land, to and out into Beaver Lake. I just happened upon the proposed Lake Acquisition document this morning, May 5, 2021, two weeks after closing on the property. I do not want to sell any of my land that borders Beaver Lake. Please put me on your notification list of any correspondence sent to property owners regarding this proposed land acquisition.</p>	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-004	<p>I am a landowner that has approximately 1,700 feet of shoreline property on Beaver Lake below the 1,128 ft lake level and I do NOT want to sell any of my property to the USACE. I bought the land on April 21, 2021, just days ago, because of the current and unique property boundaries. In fact, I met on site with two USACE representatives equipped with survey grade GPS equipment on April 5, 2021, just 16 days before I purchased the property, to verify that the shoreline private boundaries were in fact under water when the lake level was approximately 1,122.5 ft. Both USACE representatives that I met with on. site, as well as several others on telephone conversations, were advised of my plans for the property and that it was essential to me that I own the land that extended out into the water, an average of over 30 feet along the 1,700 feet of the (flooded/underwater/private) land in question. I have now learned that the representatives that I met with, and the others that I spoke to on the telephone, just two weeks before I purchased the property, knew about the information contained in the May 3, 2021 news release including the USACE plans to "study" buying (taking) private land that extends into the lake (routinely underwater) but did not mention it to me. They (the USACE) have admitted knowing that the USACE wanted to take the very land I had met with them about to verify private ownership, and of my plans for the property which would require private ownership of the shoreline. They said "we knew about the Corps' plan, but were not at liberty to tell you". Once again, I met with them on site just two weeks before I bought the property. The fact that this small, but very valuable strip of land is underwater, is no threat to me, and I want to maintain private ownership of this land. I had it surveyed, verified the survey with the USACE, purchased it, and I do not want to sell it, or give up any of my rights as a private property owner. If a private property owner wants to sell their land to the USACE then that is fine, but no one should be forced to sell their private property to the USACE.</p>	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-105	<p>By what date, will the comments and suggestions be made available for the public to see? Since the public only had 37 days to respond, I would hope the USACE, with all their resources, will make them available within days, not weeks or months.</p>	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-107	<p>How much flood pool capacity is lost each year to shoreline erosion compared to private property owner structures in real numbers?</p>	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-111	<p>There are parcels of land that have lost hundreds if not thousands of tons of soil into Beaver Lake due to shoreline erosion causing a loss of flood capacity. Is the USACE concerned about this erosion? If so, what are the numbers projected by the USACE for loss of flood capacity due to erosion? What are the USACE numbers projected for the loss of flood capacity due to private ownership of shoreline (flooded) land?</p>	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-025	<p>To whom it may concerplease do not take the cavern. It's a great family getaway and lots of Fun for adults and children.</p>	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.

BLRELA-EA-S-014	Regarding acquisition of War Eagle Cavern. We have toured this cavern a number of times and never found it flooded. To take this cavern away from the owners is wrong and you know it.... Hundreds of schoolchildren tour this cavern. Won't you be proud of taking this away from them!	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-061	Hello, Our POA, Edens Bluff Lakes Estates, at Edens Bluff Subdivision perfectly maintains our owned small portion of the bluff at Beaver Lake and maintains private access and use of the area. Under what scenario can we maintain private access and fulfill the desires of the Corps?	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-038	In the email it was stated that they want address this problem. What is the problem? I know that I have a flowage easement on my land and there has never been an issue.	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-040	I emailed you yesterday but haven't gotten a response. I asked you to explain what the "problem" is that the acquisition is supposedly correcting. Please respond.	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-029	Please DO NOT do anything with the lake that will result in the closure of the cavern that us and so many people have been able to enjoy for years.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-023	Please do not take land associated with War Eagle Caverns and thus cause the cave to close. This cave is very important to the economy of the area and is a amazing natural feature for people to visit. Thank you.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-093	The Beaver Lake Land Acquisition project is unnecessary and will have significant negative consequences to property owners and to the state of Arkansas. A petition to STOP this project can be found here: http://chnng.it/XbKNZPLPhas There are now over 1000 names on this petition all from people who are against this acquisition. We do not view having to surrender valuable property as a service. Please reconsider and find a better use for tax payer money.	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-083	Initial comment-the interactive map included at https://go.usa.gov/xsQyt appears to not be accurate as a portion of my adjacent neighbor's house is within the "current fee boundary" which is obviously not correct. Furthermore, since the legend on the map indicates that no user should base any decision on the map. Q1:How should a potentially impacted landowner determine the actual impact of the plan if the map is not of use? The article re: the reason for land acquisition the above-referenced site indicates that "funding and resource issues limited the government's ability to buy the inundation area up to 1128 MSL. This limitation has resulted in private property being flooded during periods of high water as Beaver Lake fulfills its authorized mission as a flood-control reservoir". Q2 What is the nature of and the approximate costs to the Corps annually of the private property above the current fee boundary flooding ? Q3 How many years is the Corps estimating it will take to recoup the expected cost of the land acquisition project via the savings in Q2? Q4 If the cost savings from no longer inundating private property above the current fee boundary is not expected to be the primary rationale for acquisition of this land, what is it? Q5 Since 2005, how many people have been injured as a direct result of inundation of private property above the current fee boundary?	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-005	In the last six Spring Seasons, Beaver has been at 1121 only one of those years. From 1126 up to full pool at 1130, dock and land owners have dealt with massive destruction from excessively high water mixed with the wake surfing / bladder boats. Plenty of evidence exists, in Beaver as well as other impoundments around the country, suggesting that the waves created by surfing / bladder boats rapidly cause severe shoreline deterioration, dock, lift and boat damage, damage to fish habitat, especially spawning areas, and acceleration of water degradation, and aging of the lake. Once the wakers hit the water, it is no longer possible to enjoy any other type of boating sports, especially fishing or leisurely floating, without the possibility of being capsized, thrown overboard, swamped and drowning. The better study, and use of money for studies,would be for the corps to develop a plan to manage the use of Beaver Lake by the wake surfers and minimize the detrimental impact of these abnormally large waves destroying even more of the things that make Beaver Lake great and enjoyable for ALL boating and swimming sports. A Google search of "studies of damage by wake boats" offers a plethora of evidence. The wake surfing industry has become a monster, just like the waves these boats produce. Wake surfing will have to be regulated, before its too late. The land that flooded during high water on our property doesn't exist anymore. The wakes of surfing boats washed it into the lake. Now, there's just a 5 to 7 foot vertical wall of clay, extending 25 feet onto what's left of our property and well past the 1130 mark. The Corps has lost billions of cubic feet of shoreline already, to 5 straight years of excessively high water combined with the opening of the wake surfing season. These waves are deceiving and hard to see at times. I was literally almost ejected out of my bass boat when I ran across one I did not see. I am 100% again the Corps of Engineers Condemning our land that we paid thousands of dollars per foot to buy. The problem will still exist regardless of who owns it.	Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study.

BLRELA-EA-S-044	I am writing to express concern about the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition Study being conducted by the US Army Corp. of Engineers. I understand this could affect War Eagle Caverns negatively. I am a teacher, so I enjoy this area greatly as a place for field trips, as well as a place where I have made memories with my own family. I don't think the study is worth the loss of this incredible resource. I would like to see War Eagle Caverns be open for many years to come. Thank you for your time.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-030	Please do not take the portion of land that allows people to visit War Eagle Caverns. This is an amazing place that visitors should continue to be able to enjoy.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-094	we own the property at xxx, Arkansas. Upon review of the map, we believe our property is not in scope of this project but can you please confirm?	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-033	Infringing your "territory" to Beaver Lake and onto private property who use this cave entrance and lake front as a source of income. Plus this is an educational spot for all children and schools in the area, Taking this area into your governmental control is a bad idea. I hope you will consider this carefully	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-001	The information states that existing structures in areas that fall into the fee acquisition category would not be affected. For existing structures that require occasional maintenance, such as adding or moving rip rap to prevent erosion or under mining of the structure, would we be able to continue that occasional maintenance to ensure the integrity of the structure?	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-010	Please don't flood the cavern! Its such an interesting place to go visit! So many visitors every year, not to mention all the time the owners have put in to fixing it up so nice.	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-039	Will land owners be required to sell land that floods or is it their option?	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-053	As a citizen who has taken my children and grandchildren to this cavern I would ask that you please reconsider your thoughts.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-047	I DO NOT agree to the proposed acquisition of the War Eagle Cavern!!	Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-021	It would be a travesty if the land acquisition of low lying land at Beaver Lake goes forward. It would force the closing of War Eagle Cavern and negatively impact the local economy. Cloing off public access to War Eagle Cavern can't be allowed.	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-031	War acre cavern is a beautiful place to visit. Please do not close this place .	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-080	Good morning, I have a few questions around this project 1. I just purchased this lot and plan to build a home on it how if at all will this change where I would be able to build the home on this lot? 2. Would this change the view and increase the depth of the tree line near the lakefront boundary of the lot? 3. Other than not being able to build any permanent structure on any additional fee land what else would impact my property from it's current state? 4. How much land potentially could be taken? 5. Why is it necessary to take more land if home owner is aware of what portion of property could be in a partial flood area? 6. With regards to equipment, tools and other property placed on my land that may be removed within a reasonable amount of time after the 12 month access period. What is reasonable? Very subjective. Appreciate your follow up to my questions.	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.
BLRELA-EA-S-085	I own property that would be impacted by the land acquisition project. I have the following questions and comments. 1. Why were affected property owners not individually notified of this project? I learned about it from a facebook posting. 2. When and how can we expect to be contacted for the ROE permit? 3. Will the actual surveys be conducted after the water surface has lowered to conservation pool or lower to allow for proper monumentation and inspection by all parties? 3. What is the priority for acquiring my land vs. other higher priority areas? I can't imagine that there have been any complaints regarding our property. 4. We have physical improvements that now reside on our property (mortared stone steps) that would be affected by the acquisition. Will it be possible to keep these intact even if the land is purchased by the government? 5. Will the appraisals be conducted by an independent appraiser? If there are disagreements, can I hire my own appraiser? What will be the process for negotiating under these circumstances? 6. Can I request that the government take a flowage easement on the subject property as an alternative to acquiring the land? Thanks for your consideration in answering these questions.	Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment.

BLRELA-EA-S-073		Submission attachments were provided in a format that cannot be opened by the USACE.
BLRELA-EA-S-027	<p>It saddens me that someone would even consider doing something that would shut down War Eagle. The number of children they are able to reach out to and give long lasting memories is unbelievable. My son went there our first year we moved to NWA. He still laughs about things that happened that week at camp...haha. He made one long distance friend that he continues to stay in contact with. War Eargle must stay in business.</p>	Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement.
BLRELA-EA-S-084	<p>Good morning. I met with Mr. Sean Harper. From that discussion, I wanted to make sure I added to my previous comments (submitted on May 18, 2021) that this study should be reviewed and analyzed on a parcel-by-parcel basis.</p>	Comments provide support for an action without justification.
BLRELA-EA-S-034	<p>To whom it may concern : we are begging the Corp of Engineers to rethink their plans of taking the land from public domain to Federal Domain. Those caves are a huge part of our community and without them our tourism and school field trips will be obsolete. Please do not take the land from Cosmic Caverns.</p>	Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study.