



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

Little Rock District

Appendix A

Public and Agency Involvement Supporting Documents

for

Beaver Lake Proposed Land Acquisition Study

July 2023



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LITTLE ROCK DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 867
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72203-0867

May 3, 2021

Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition

The Little Rock District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), hereby informs the public that the process to assess and acquire private land parcels that are frequently inundated by Beaver Lake during normal lake elevations has been initiated. The USACE will be conducting a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review to assess the impacts of the proposed action on the human environment.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for flood control, power, and other purposes. A Real Estate Design Memorandum was developed prior to construction that identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance, and control of the reservoir. The methods and technology used to identify and purchase these lands at the time left several frequently inundated areas unacquired by the USACE. The resulting Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake is uneven and at varying elevations.

To address the designed operation of Beaver Lake, the USACE is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the reservoir, the White River, and War Eagle Creek where water routinely inundates privately-owned property at the seasonal conservation pool or flood pool. Currently, the USACE estimates approximately 500 landowners are impacted. The acquisition of affected parcels would likely take several years, contingent on available funding. The initial acquisition effort would target land that is routinely inundated, or for which USACE has received public complaint.

In lieu of a face-to-face public meeting due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, USACE will provide a virtual presentation describing the identification and acquisition process, and instructions for submitting comments to USACE. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, and other applicable laws and regulations, a 30-day public comment period will begin on **May 11, 2021 and end on June 10, 2021**. The virtual presentation and comment instructions will be available for download starting May 11, 2021 at the following Little Rock District website:

<https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/>

Please contact Craig Hilburn, USACE Biologist, Regional Planning and Environmental Center with any questions you have at 501-837-1524. Written questions and comments can be emailed to CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil or mailed to Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, ATTN: Chief, Real Estate Division, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

Sincerely,

Brandon Wadlington on behalf of

Amanda M. McGuire
Chief, Environmental Branch
Regional Planning and Environmental Center

| AGENCIES CONTACTED DURING NEPA SCOPING | TITLE |
|---|---|
| Arkansas Department of Health | Secretary of Health |
| Arkansas Department of Health (Washington Co.) | Sr. Environmental Program Specialist |
| Arkansas Dept of Environmental Quality | Director |
| Arkansas Forestry Commission | State Forester |
| Arkansas Forestry Commission | County Ranger |
| Arkansas Game and Fish Commission | Director |
| Arkansas Game and Fish Commission | Captian, Enforcement |
| Arkansas Game and Fish Commission | Region 7 Supervisor |
| Arkansas Game and Fish Commission | District Fisheries Supervisor |
| Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department | Director |
| Department of Arkasas Heritage | State Historic Preservation Officer |
| Arkansas Historic Preservation Program | AAHP Director |
| Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission | Chief of Land Acquisition and Stewardship |
| Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission | Director |
| Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism | Director |
| Arkansas State Parks | Parks Division Director |
| Arkansas State Parks | Superintendent Hobbs State Park |
| Avoca Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Beaver Lake Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Beaver Water District | Chief Executive Officer |
| Benton County Administrative Offices | Benton County Judge |
| Benton County Emergency Services | Director |
| Benton County Sheriff's Office | Sheriff |
| Benton/Washington Regional Public Water Authority | General Manager |
| Bentonville City Hall | Mayor |
| Carroll County Administrative Offices | County Judge |
| Carroll County Sheriff's Office | Sheriff |
| Carroll-Boone Water District | General Manager |
| Department of Agriculture - Natural Resource Division | Director |
| Department of Agriculture - Natural Resource Division | Deputy Director |

| | |
|--|---|
| Department of Finance & Administration | |
| Eureka Springs City Hall | Mayor |
| Eureka Springs Fire and EMS | Fire Chief |
| Fayetteville City Hall | Mayor |
| FEMA, Region VI | Regional Administrator |
| Garfield City Hall | Mayor |
| Grassy Knob Volunteer Fire Association | Fire Chief |
| Hickory Creek Volunteer Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Highway 94 E Volunteer Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Huntsville City Hall | Mayor |
| Madison County Regional Water District | General Manager |
| Madison County Administrative Offices | County Judge |
| Madison County Sheriff's Office | Sheriff |
| National Park Service, Midwest Region | Environmental Coordinator |
| National Park Service, Midwest Region | Regional Director |
| NEBCO Fire/EMS | Fire Chief |
| Nob Hill Volunteer Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Rocky Branch Volunteer Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Rogers City Hall | Mayor |
| Rogers Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| Southwestern Power Administration | Administrator |
| Southwestern Power Administration | Chief Operating Officer |
| Southwestern Power Resources Administration | Executive Director |
| Springdale City Hall | Mayor |
| Springdale Fire Department | Fire Chief |
| The Nature Conservancy, Arkansas Field Office | State Director |
| Natural Resources Conservation Service | State Conservationist |
| Natural Resources Conservation Service | Assistant State Conservationist |
| Natural Resources Conservation Service | District Conservationist |
| U.S. Department of the Interior | Regional Environmental Officer |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6 | Region 6 Environmental Review Coordinator (NEPA Reviewer) |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Regional Director |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Field Supervisor |
| U.S. Geological Survey | Administrative Management Officer |
| U.S. Geological Survey | Regional Director |
| Washington County Administrative Offices | County Judge |
| Washington County Sheriff's Office` | Sheriff |



Beaver Lake, Arkansas

Comment Period

Questions or comments?

[illegible]

Name: _____ Affiliation: _____

Address: _____ City: _____ State: _____

Zip code: _____ Phone: _____ / _____ Email: _____

Mail or email comment sheet to the following Point of Contact:

Little Rock District Office – Real Estate Division:
ATTN: Chief, Real Estate Division,
P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Email: CESWL-

BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil

Additional information and comment sheets can be found at the following:

<https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/>



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

Comment Form Instructions

Beaver Lake, Arkansas

Land Acquisition Process

Comment Period

May 11 – June 10, 2021

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District (USACE), is beginning the process of identifying private land parcels that are frequently inundated by Beaver Lake during normal lake elevations for acquisition. The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for flood control, power, and other purposes. A Real Estate Design Memorandum developed prior to construction identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance, and control of the reservoir. The methods and technology used to identify and purchase these lands at the time left several frequently inundated areas unacquired by the USACE. The resulting Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake is uneven and at varying elevations.

To address the designed operation of Beaver Lake, the USACE is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the reservoir, the White River, and War Eagle Creek where water routinely inundates privately-owned property at the seasonal conservation pool or flood pool. Currently, the USACE estimates approximately 500 landowners are impacted. The proposed acquisition of affected parcels could take several years, contingent on available funding. This initial acquisition effort would target land that is routinely inundated, or for which USACE has received public complaint.

To add your comments, ideas, or concerns about the future land and recreational management for Stillhouse Hollow Lake, please submit comments using any of the following methods:

- Fill out and return a comment form available at:
<https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/>
- Provide comments in an email message or use comment form and send to:
CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil
- provide comments in a letter or use comment form and mail to:
Army Corps of Engineers
Little Rock District Office – Real Estate Division
ATTN: Chief, Real Estate Division
P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Thank you for your participation in this important effort.

| 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 Number | Comment | Category | Area of Concern |
| BLRELA-EA-S-003 | -01 | [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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 | -02 | 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 | -01 | 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 under-cutting. 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 | -01 | [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 a like. Why would you take away something so critical to tourism? | Environmental | Socioeconomics |
| BLRELA-EA-S-013 | -02 | [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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | [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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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. | Environmental | Socioeconomics |
| BLRELA-EA-S-020 | -01 | 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. | Environmental | Socioeconomics |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-022 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 teh 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 | -02 | <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 |
| BLRELA-EA-S-045 | -03 | <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> | Planning | POOCs |
| BLRELA-EA-S-046 | -01 | <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> | Planning/ Project Management | POOCs/Public Involvement |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|-----------------------|--------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-049 | -01 | 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. | Real Estate | Valuation |
| BLRELA-EA-S-049 | -02 | 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. | Real Estate | Valuation |
| BLRELA-EA-S-049 | -03 | 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. | Planning/ Real Estate | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-049 | -04 | 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. | Planning/ Real Estate | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-049 | -05 | 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. | Planning | Alternatives |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-050 | -01 | <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 [9610, 9614, and 9622 Oak Cove Ln], 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 | -01 | <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 may 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 access the effect this land acquisition (taking) will have on their property as a whole.</p> | Project Management | Public Involvement |
| BLRELA-EA-S-052 | -01 | <p>This proposal would essential 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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 a inconsistent poor attempt to fix the overall issue of existing unrealistic and inconsistent Corps property lines. It results in an ongoing issues 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 a 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 | -01 | <p>Nowhere is stated a reasonable purpose or proposed benefits for this idea.</p> | Planning | POOCs |
| BLRELA-EA-S-058 | -01 | <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 | -01 | 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. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-064 | -01 | Please ensure that you are working with the local floodplain administrator and obtaining all required local floodplain permits. | Environmental | Compliance |
| BLRELA-EA-S-065 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 imminent domain to take valuable land. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-067 | -01 | 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 | -02 | [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 "especiallly 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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 | -02 | <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 | -01 | <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.adeq.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.adeq.state.ar.us/water/planning/instream/, or call 501.682.0040.</p> | Environmental | Compliance |
| BLRELA-EA-S-086 | -01 | <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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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 | -01 | 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. | Environmental | Socioeconomics / Sensitive Resources |
| BLRELA-EA-S-088 | -01 | 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! | Environmental | Aesthetics |
| BLRELA-EA-S-089 | -01 | 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. | General | Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-089 | -02 | 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 | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-090 | -01 | ...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. | General | Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-090 | -02 | 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. | Environmental/ Project Management | Socioeconomics / Operations |
| BLRELA-EA-S-090 | -03 | 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? | Environmental | Socioeconomics |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-090 | -04 | <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: ... 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 the 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 | -01 | <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 #31 the Pointe (formerly #86 Point Mirage) 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 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <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 |
| BLRELA-EA-S-098 | -01 | <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. 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> | Planning/ Environmental | Alternatives / Compliance |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-100 | -01 | ...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. | Environmental | Energy |
| BLRELA-EA-S-101 | -01 | 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] | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-103 | -01 | 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 fowrad, 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. | General | Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-109 | -01 | 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. | General | Support/Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-109 | -02 | I think the USACOE 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. | Project Management | Public Involvement |
| BLRELA-EA-S-109 | -03 | 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. | Planning | Alternatives |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-110 | -01 | <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 | -01 | <p>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.</p> | General/ Planning | Opposition/ Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-113 | -01 | <p>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.</p> | General | Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-113 | -02 | <p>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.</p> | Planning | POOCs |
| BLRELA-EA-S-113 | -03 | <p>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.</p> | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-114 | -01 | <p>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?!</p> | Planning | POOCs |
| BLRELA-EA-S-114 | -02 | <p>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.</p> | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-114 | -03 | <p>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,</p> | Environmental | Socioeconomics |
| BLRELA-EA-S-115 | -01 | <p>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.</p> | General | Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-115 | -02 | <p>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.</p> | Planning | POOCs |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|---------------|---------------------|
| BLRELA-EA-S-117 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 | -01 | ...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). | General | Opposition |
| BLRELA-EA-S-119 | -02 | How about better water management??? Draw down the reservoir ahead of impending weather events, etc. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-EA-S-120 | -01 | 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-121 | -01 | 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 | -01 | 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 | My property is in the cove that borders big clifty park. 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. | Comments provide support for an action without justification. |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| BLRELA-EA-S-078 | 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. | Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-007 | I own a few acres on Beaver and I absolutely. do not want the Corp to purchase any from me. | Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-106 | 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? | Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-108 | Could the USACE decide not renew any or all existing boat dock permits? | Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-002 | 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. | Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-004 | 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. | Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-105 | 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. | Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-107 | How much flood pool capacity is lost each year to shoreline erosion compared to private property owner structures in real numbers? | Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-111 | 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? | Asked questions that do not lead to a substantive comment. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-025 | To whom it may concerplease do not take the cavern. It's a great family getaway and lots of Fun for adults and children. | 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 | <p>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.</p> | 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 | 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. | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-084 | 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. | Comments provide support for an action without justification. |
| BLRELA-EA-S-034 | 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. | Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study. |

| Questions Asked | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Submission Number | Question | Category |
| 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? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-015 | 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. | Project Management/Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-037 | I asked you to explain what the "problem" is that the acquisition is supposedly correcting. | Project Management/Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-038 | This is the third email I have sent asking for an explanation as to what the problem is and why this acquisition is being studied. | Project Management/Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-039 | Will land owners be required to sell lands that floods or is it their option? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-040 | 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. | Project Management/Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-061 | 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? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-062 | I would first like to better understand the amount of land I have potentially impacted and potentially some other options available as well. | Real Estate/Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-074 | Since much of the original Fee Boundary land is well above the 1,128' MSL figure, Why is the land currently above 1,128' MSL not made available for current land owners to purchase? Apparently the original boundaries were drawn as a convenience for the Surveyor in making straight lines. If the proposal is to purchase land up to 1,128' MSL, then the land owner should be allowed to purchase down to the 1,128' MSL level. | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-075 | How is the COE at Beaver Lake going to manage the parcel of acquired land that it is not able to do now, or has not already been doing in the last 60 years; and why does this require full purchase and ownership of the parcel? | O&M |
| BLRELA-EA-S-075 | What are the conditions for agreement based on COE flowage acquisition? If owners do not want to outright sell their land and do not have issue with the private land being flooded by the COE, what is the process for mediation if the COE is not in agreement, or likelihood that the land will be forcibly take? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-075 | If the COE and property owner cannot come to agreement concerning purchase or flowage acquisition on land that has existing structures, what will happen to those structures and who is responsible (including financially) for any modifications? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-075 | Is funding for land purchase the result of federal grant initiatives and, if so, is there a request for proposals, COE proposal document, and/or funding award document available for public review? If not, could the COE be more specific about the programmatic origins of funding please? | Project Management |
| BLRELA-EA-S-080 | 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. | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-083 | 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? | General |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--------------------|
| | <p>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".</p> <p>Q2 What is the nature of and the approximate costs to the Corps annually of the private property above the current fee boundary flooding ?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Q5 Since 2005, how many people have been injured as a direct result of inundation of private property above the current fee boundary?</p> | |
| BLRELA-EA-S-083 | | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-085 | 1. Why were affected property owners not individually notified of this project? I learned about it from a facebook posting. | Project Management |
| | <p>2. When and how can we expect to be contacted for the ROE permit?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> | |
| BLRELA-EA-S-085 | | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-085 | 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. | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-085 | 6. Can I request that the government take a flowage easement on the subject property as an alternative to acquiring the land? | Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-088 | Who benefits from this project? ... Why is the Corp attributing it to flood control? | Planning |
| BLRELA-EA-S-088 | Who owns the land that would become the new shoreline? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-EA-S-088 | Who is lobbying for this project? Who's idea was this? | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-094 | We own property at 10733 Cedar Forest Drive in Garfield, Arkansas. Upon review of the map, we believe our property is not in scope of this project but can you please confirm? | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-105 | How much flood pool capacity is lost each year to shoreline erosion compared to private property owner structures in real numbers? | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-106 | Could the USACE decide not renew any or all existing boat dock permits? | General |
| | 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? | |
| BLRELA-EA-S-107 | | General |
| BLRELA-EA-S-108 | Does the USACE have plans to stop renewing boat dock permits? If they did, would they tell us? | General |
| | 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. | |
| BLRELA-EA-S-111 | | Public Involvement |

ADVERTISEMENT

Corps officials mull acquisition study for land along Beaver Lake

by [Mike Jones](#) | August 15, 2021 at 2:13 a.m.

Follow





The Army Corps of Engineers is studying a plan to buy parcels of private property at Beaver Lake that are prone to flooding during high lake levels. (NWA Democrat-Gazette/Flip Putthoff)

ROGERS -- The Army Corps of Engineers is conducting a study that could lead to the acquisition of property along Beaver Lake's shoreline to address flooding concerns, and not all property owners are thrilled with the idea.

About 500 property owners would be affected, according to a Corps news release.

Morning Newsletter

Stay connected and informed with ArkansasOnline.com news updates delivered straight to your inbox.

The Corps announced in the spring that it was assessing the impact of frequent flooding along the public-private shared boundary on Beaver Lake. The Corps held a public comment period from May 11 to June 10, providing landowners and the public an opportunity to discuss options -- including potential land acquisition -- or to suggest alternatives for addressing the flooding of private land, according to a Corps news release.

according to a Corps news release.

"This is not a land grab," said Jay Townsend, Corps chief of public affairs. "This is an opportunity to use the Beaver Lake shoreline as it was intended."

The goal is to acquire as much shoreline as possible between 1,128 feet and 1,135 feet to help resolve flooding issues, he said.

"The long-term goal is to secure that land to operate the reservoir as it is supposed to be," he said.

Dennis and Vicki Boyer own and operate War Eagle Cavern on Beaver Lake. Devil's Gap cove is one of the low-lying areas the Corps is looking to acquire, they said. They don't yet know if this will include the mouth of War Eagle Cavern.

"If it does, then that will certainly affect our business," they wrote in an email. "The corps has not provided any answer to that. They said they won't know for sure until an official survey is done."

The Boyers said they have been in touch with the Corps office in Rogers, and officials haven't been able to provide a time frame or other details. They have discussed their concerns with local officials and state representatives.

"We do not think that this land acquisition is necessary," they wrote in an email to the Northwest Arkansas Democrat-Gazette. "Flood control is certainly important, especially for the Beaver Lake tailwaters beneath the dam. However, we do not think that the corps needs to acquire more land to accomplish this, and many other landowners agree.

"The corps has been raising the level of Beaver Lake past 1,128 feet for years. Every landowner we have spoken to would rather deal with a couple extra feet of water than have to surrender acres of land. This would potentially mean that people would have to alter or remove existing structures, would no longer be able to maintain that land and could not keep trespassers out. Furthermore, losing land in proximity to the lake could affect the value of remaining land."

Ken Farmer, a Benton County justice of the peace, said the most affected area in his district would be the Beaver Shores area along Lakeshore Drive.

"It looks to me like this property should have been part of the initial buyout when the lake was built," Farmer said. "I believe the property owners should be able to decide whether to sell to the Corps of Engineers."

THE ORIGINAL PLAN

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of the lake for flood control, hydroelectric power and other purposes. The lake was completed in 1966.

A real estate design memorandum was developed before construction, identifying land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance and control of the reservoir. The methods and technology used to identify and purchase the land at the time left several frequently flooded areas unacquired by the Corps. The resulting federal government boundary around the lake is uneven and at various elevations, according to the Corps.

The plan when land originally was acquired for Beaver Lake in the 1950s was to buy property around the inundation area up to elevation 1,128 mean sea level, according to the Corps, which oversees all operations of Beaver Lake.

However, money and resources limited the government's ability to do that.

Now, the Corps has received money to study the flooding problem, formulate alternatives and, if approved, begin acquiring some of the low-lying areas, according to a Corps news release.

The Corps received an initial \$1.7 million for the study. The money came in the federal fiscal year 2020. Money remaining after the study can be used for potential acquisition, Townsend said. The plan is to acquire as much identified land as possible if the project is approved, he said.

The Corps is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the lake, the White River and War Eagle Creek where water routinely inundates private property.

The acquisition of affected parcels would take several years, contingent on availability of money. Initial acquisition would target land that routinely floods or for which the Corps has received a public complaint, according to information on a website dedicated to the proposal.

WHAT'S NEXT

Corps officials are developing a draft environmental assessment for public release and review. Officials are reviewing the 122 public comments that were submitted, analyzing suggestions for alternatives and developing responses for assessments, said Jay Woods, spokesman in the Corps' Little Rock district.

The Little Rock district commander will review the environmental assessment once it is finalized and make a decision on how the Corps will proceed. The commander is given what is called a decision brief that includes all courses of action, even ones that are not feasible. Sometimes a hybrid decision can be reached, Townsend said.

The process typically takes one year.

Eminent domain through condemnation is authorized, but it will be used only if negotiations for acquisitions are unsuccessful, he said.

What is happening at Beaver Lake is a nationwide problem, Townsend said.

"These lakes were built 50, 60 years ago. You identify shortfalls," he said.

The process has left landowners such as David Harper in limbo.

"The whole process is mind-boggling to me," Harper said.

Harper said in an email that not many people know what the Corps is trying to do, and none of the owners he talked to were aware of the proposed land acquisition until he mentioned it to them.

Harper said he had a meeting with two Corps rangers April 5 to verify property lines for land he intended to buy along the lake.

He closed on the 36-acre property April 21. He has since started putting in a water well and getting electricity to the undeveloped land.

The property at 21755 Slate Gap Road has 2,400 feet of shoreline boundary, with 1,700 feet of that boundary out in the lake at normal pool level (1,120 feet) or higher, meaning the shoreline is privately owned, Harper said.

"This means that we own the land out into the water and have the property rights associated with privately owned land," he said.

If the Corps owns land between your property and the water, it makes a "huge difference" in what you can do with your property, he said.

On May 3, the Corps sent out a news release announcing a study on buying private land that is routinely underwater, Harper said.

"They have refused face-to-face meetings, and they have withheld information in order to push this land grab through," he said.

Harper provided a copy of a letter from the Department of the Army sent to him as a landowner. A few points in it have him concerned.

The letter notes that the landowner grants the government officers, employees, agents and contractors an "irrevocable right" to enter the land for 12 months to survey, make test borings and other work. The letter also notes "all tools, equipment and other property taken upon or placed upon the land by the government shall remain the property of the government and be removed by the government at any time within a reasonable period after the expiration of this right of way."

"I have never seen such an onerous easement request, and I can't believe anyone would sign it," he said. "The term is for 12 months, 24/7 access, and they can leave equipment on your property at any time and even leave it there past the 12 months. I just found out that they only sent that ridiculous easement request out to 10% of the private landowners. They are trying to keep a low profile and not stir the pot any more than they have to. Once they are in the door they will not hold back."

sur the pot any more than they have to. Once they are in the door, they will not hold back.

The requests submitted to some landowners was for rights of entry, Townsend said. These permits are not easements and allow the federal government to access lands only to conduct surveys. They are temporary and are not instruments to acquire land, Townsend said.

"We know we are up against a large government agency. They almost always get what they want, but we will fight them and at least let the public know what the Corps is up to," Harper said.



The Army Corps of Engineers is studying a plan to buy parcels of private property at Beaver Lake that are prone to flooding during high lake levels. (NWA Democrat-Gazette/Flip Putthoff)



The Army Corps of Engineers is studying a plan to buy parcels of private property at Beaver Lake that are prone to flooding during high lake levels. (NWA Democrat-Gazette/Flip Putthoff)

More News

Web watch

For more information on the Beaver Lake land acquisition study, visit <https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/Documents/>



NEWS RELEASE

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

BUILDING STRONG®

Release No: 11-22
Release: Immediately
Feb 22, 2022

Contact: Public Affairs, 501-324-5551
ceswl-pa@usace.army.mil
Media after hours: 501-563-6835

USACE announces public workshop for Beaver Lake land acquisition plan

ROGERS, Ark. -- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is hosting a drop-in public workshop from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. March 1 at the Four Points by Sheraton Bentonville, 211 SE Walton Blvd., Bentonville, Arkansas to discuss the process to acquire private land parcels that are frequently inundated by Beaver Lake during normal lake elevations and make comments about the Draft Environmental Assessment. All interested persons are invited to attend the workshop.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for flood control and hydroelectric power production. A Real Estate Design Memorandum was developed prior to construction that identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance, and control of the reservoir. the methods and technology used at the time to identify and purchase these lands left several frequently inundated areas unacquired by USACE. As a result, the Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake is uneven and at varying elevations.

USACE is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the reservoir, the White River and War Eagle Creek where water routinely inundates privately-owned property at the seasonal conservation pool or flood pool.

-MORE-

Currently, USACE estimates approximately 500 landowners are impacted. The acquisition of affected parcels is expected to take several years, contingent on available funding. The initial acquisition effort would target land that is routinely inundated.

At the drop-in public workshops, a short informational video will play continuously providing the opportunity for the public to learn more about the land acquisition plan.

Representatives from the Little Rock District will be present to answer questions on the acquisition plan.

The public's input may be provided at the workshops or at any time during the public comment period. The comment period will run from Feb. 23 through March 25. Comments may be submitted via mail, email or fax with attention to: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, Real Estate Division, ATTN: Chief, Acquisition Branch, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 or emailed to CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil.

For more information about the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition process, please visit <https://go.usa.gov/xtJgG>



NEWS RELEASE

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

BUILDING STRONG®

Release No: 13-22
Release: Immediately
Feb. 24, 2022

Contact: Public Affairs, 501-324-5551
ceswl-pa@usace.army.mil
Media after hours: 501-563-6835

USACE postpones public workshop and comment period for Beaver Land Acquisition Study

ROGERS, Ark. -- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District is postponing the Beaver Land Acquisition public workshop scheduled for March 1 in Bentonville, Arkansas. The public comment period scheduled to run from Feb. 23 to March 25 is also being postponed until USACE can reschedule the workshop.

USACE requires more time to adequately evaluate and complete the environmental assessment.

The 30-day public comment period will begin and a new date for a public workshop will be announced when the EA is ready for release.

USACE will publish a second news release when the EA is available for public review. Anyone who previously submitted comments and provided an e-mail address will be notified by e-mail of the availability of the EA and workshop date.

For more information about the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition process, please visit <https://go.usa.gov/xtJgG>.

--30--



NEWS RELEASE

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

BUILDING STRONG®

Release No: 11-22
Release: Immediately
March 4, 2022

Contact: Public Affairs, 501-324-5551
ceswl-pa@usace.army.mil
Media after hours: 501-563-6835

USACE announces new date for Beaver Lake land acquisition plan public workshop

ROGERS, Ark. -- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is hosting a drop-in public workshop from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. March 16 at the Four Points by Sheraton Bentonville, 211 SE Walton Blvd., Bentonville, Arkansas to discuss the process to acquire private land parcels that are frequently inundated by Beaver Lake during normal lake elevations and make comments about the Draft Environmental Assessment. All interested persons are invited to attend the workshop.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for the purposes of flood control and hydroelectric power production. Subsequent legislation added recreation as an authorized public purpose, and there are several environmental and land use statutes that also apply to operations at Beaver Lake.

A Real Estate Design Memorandum was developed prior to construction that identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance, and control of the reservoir. the methods and technology used at the time to identify and purchase these lands left several frequently inundated areas unacquired by USACE. As a result, the Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake is uneven and at varying elevations.

-MORE-

USACE is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the reservoir, the White River and War Eagle Creek where water routinely inundates privately-owned property at the seasonal conservation pool or flood pool.

Currently, USACE estimates approximately 500 landowners are impacted. The acquisition of affected parcels is expected to take several years, contingent on available funding. The initial acquisition effort would target land that is routinely inundated.

At the drop-in public workshops, a short informational video will play continuously providing the opportunity for the public to learn more about the land acquisition plan.

Representatives from the Little Rock District will be present to answer questions on the acquisition plan.

The public's input may be provided at the workshop or at any time during the public comment period. The draft Environmental Assessment will be released and posted on the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition webpage on March 9 and the public comment period will run from March 16 through April 15. Comments may be submitted via mail, email or fax with attention to: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, Real Estate Division, ATTN: Chief, Acquisition Branch, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 or emailed to CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil.

For more information about the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition process, please visit <https://go.usa.gov/xtJgG>.

*U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to host public workshop for Beaver Lake land acquisition

<https://www.5newsonline.com/article/news/local/us-army-corps-of-engineers-to-host-public-workshop-beaver-lake-land-acquisition/527-0bbfc491-a285-4efd-b365-2705defb68c8>

5 News - 3.7.22 - (Real Estate, Positive)

ROGERS, Ark. — The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is hosting a drop-in public workshop to discuss the acquisition of private land parcels on Beaver Lake.

The land in discussion is frequently inundated by Beaver Lake during normal lake elevations. Those who are interested are welcome to attend.

The workshop will be at the Four Points by Sheraton in Bentonville on March 16 from 2-7 p.m. Those who are interested are welcome to attend as officials with USACE discuss the process of acquisition and make comments about the Draft Environmental Assessment. Representatives from the Little Rock District will be there to answer questions on the acquisition plan.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized the construction of Beaver Lake for the purposes of flood control and hydroelectric power production. According to USACE, subsequent legislation added recreation as an authorized public purpose, and there are several environmental and land use statutes that also apply to operations at Beaver Lake.

Officials say due to prior construction, the Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake is uneven and at varying elevations.

USACE is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the reservoir, the White River and War Eagle Creek where water usually floods privately-owned property at the seasonal conservation pool or flood pool.

An estimated 500 landowners are impacted by this and acquisition is expected to take several years, contingent on funding.

The draft of the environmental assessment will be released and posted on the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition webpage on March 9 and the public comment period will run from March 16 through April 15.

Comments can be submitted via mail, email or fax with attention to:

Mail: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, Real Estate Division, ATTN: Chief, Acquisition Branch, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Corps of Engineers gives details on planned land purchases

by [Doug Thompson](#) | March 17, 2022 at 7:30 a.m.

[QShare](#)

Follow

BENTONVILLE -- At least 50 people attended a public workshop on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plans to purchase flood-prone property scattered around the banks of Beaver Lake, but the property owners involved who were interviewed disapprove of the idea.

Corps staff stayed for five hours beginning at 2 p.m. Wednesday to provide details and answer questions about the proposed purchases. The corps hopes to buy land that sometimes floods even during normal lake operations but was missed in the original purchases made before the lake was completed in 1966. The workshop took place at the Four Points by Sheraton hotel in Bentonville.

[Sign Up](#)

"When the lake floods and leaves trash and debris on my mother's property, we clean it up," said Scott Brock of Rogers. "If the corps owns it I'd have to get a permit to do even that. We've done a good job keeping it clean and mowed. The corps hasn't done that good a job on the land they own." Brock's mother and her now-deceased husband bought their house on the lake's western bank in 1980, he said.

Rapid development of the Northwest Arkansas region is the cause behind the corps' plan to fill the gaps in its ownership of areas to protect around the lake shore, said Jay Townsend, spokesman for the corps' Little Rock division. Townsend attended Wednesday's workshop.

"One out of seven people in Arkansas get their drinking water from the lake," Townsend said. "We want to operate the lake as it was intended. We're sympathetic and realize people have worked their entire lives to have a place along the lake, but this region is a lot more developed than it was 25 or 50 years ago." Controlling frequently flooding areas is vital to preserve water quality, he said.

The corps estimates about 500 landowners are impacted with an average area to be acquired to be about a quarter of an acre each. Acquiring of the land will take several years and that is only if the corps gets the necessary money, Townsend said. There is no estimated timeline or total cost, he said.

The corps will use third-party appraisals for any property it wants to acquire, Townsend said, and try to negotiate with property owners for a fair price to avoid eminent domain as much as possible.

The uncertain timeline leaves the affected property owners in limbo, said Larry and Carol Vos of Rogers. Anyone who wanted to sell can't sell the property with its future undecided, they said.

"They'd be paying me with the money I paid in taxes while there's trillions of dollars of deficit," Larry Vos said of the corps plan. "I don't think this is the best use of the taxpayer's money."

David Harper of Fort Smith bought 36 acres overlooking the lake including a stretch along the shore. He talked in detail with corps officials about his plans to build a private road leading down to the lake and facilities near it before completing the purchase in April 2021. The next month the corps announced his lakefront was part of the property it wanted to acquire.

"I asked them to show me a single case in which there was a problem with any of the property they want," Harper said. "I haven't seen one yet."

The Little Rock district commander will review the project's environmental assessment once it is complete and make a decision on how to proceed, Townsend previously said. The process typically takes one year. Affected landowners will receive a letter once the commander has made his final decision.

*Corps of Engineers announces date for Beaver Lake land acquisition plan public workshop in Bentonville

<https://www.nwaonline.com/news/2022/mar/09/corps-of-engineers-announces-date-for-beaver-lake/?news-arkansas-nwa>

Northwest Democrat Gazette - 3.9.22 - (Real Estate, Positive)

BENTONVILLE -- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will host a drop-in, public workshop to discuss the process for the government to acquire land frequently inundated by Beaver Lake during normal lake elevations.

The workshop will be from 2 to 7 p.m. Wednesday at the Four Points by Sheraton, 211 S.E. Walton Blvd., in Bentonville. The public also will be able to provide comments about the draft environmental assessment, according to a news release.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for the purposes of flood control and hydroelectric power production. Subsequent legislation added recreation as an authorized public purpose, and there are several environmental and land use statutes that also apply to operations at the lake, according to the release.

A real estate design memorandum was developed prior to construction that identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance and control of the reservoir. The methods and technology used at the time to identify and purchase these lands left several frequently inundated areas in private ownership. As a result, the federal government boundary around Beaver Lake is uneven and at varying elevations, according to the release.

The Corps of Engineers is reviewing site-specific data at areas around the reservoir, the White River and War Eagle Creek where water routinely inundates privately owned property at the seasonal conservation pool or flood pool, according to the release.

The Corps of Engineers estimates about 500 landowners are impacted. The acquisition of affected land is expected to take several years, contingent on available funding.

Public input may be provided at the workshop or at any time during the public comment period. The draft environmental assessment will be posted on the Beaver Lake land acquisition webpage. The public comment period will run from Wednesday through April 15. Comments may be submitted via mail, email or fax with attention to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, Real Estate Division, ATTN: Chief, Acquisition Branch, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Ark., 72203 or emailed to CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil.

For more information, visit <https://go.usa.gov/xtJgG>.

Beaver Lake property owners discuss land acquisition

<https://www.4029tv.com/article/beaver-lake-property-owners-discuss-land-acquisition/39457096#>

40/29 - 3.17.22 - (Real Estate, Positive)

BENTONVILLE, Ark. — Alleviating the ongoing flood problems at Beaver Lake is not an easy fix. The Army Corps of Engineers has been studying it for quite some time. Today, they are talking with property owners about the purchase of private parcels that are impacted.

Elevation 1128 has been underwater ten times in the last 14 years, said Jay Townsend with the Army Corps of Engineers.

That is why the corps is proposing transferring ownership of some properties to the federal government and purchasing others.

“The goal of this is to buy the land that we should have bought in the 1950s to be able to manage according to the dam’s original intent,” Townsend said.

About 500 people can be impacted. Scott Brock’s mother is one of them.

“The property owner’s concern is that they lose control over the land should they buy it from us and how will they maintain it,” Brock said.

Not everyone is against the proposal. Many don’t use their land or most have no structures on it. So, each case is unique. But property owners agree there are still a lot of questions. The corp is hoping this is the solution for multiple reasons.

“Arkansans get their drinking water from Beaver reservoir. So we need to purchase all the land around the reservoir to operate as intended and ensure we can offer that drinking water for another 50 years,” Brock said.

*Corps of Engineers gives details on planned land purchases

<https://www.arkansasonline.com/news/2022/mar/17/corps-of-engineers-gives-details-on-planned-land/?news-arkansas-nwa>

Democrat Gazette - 3.17.22 - (Real Estate, Positive)

BENTONVILLE -- At least 50 people attended a public workshop on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plans to purchase flood-prone property scattered around the banks of Beaver Lake, but the property owners involved who were interviewed disapprove of the idea.

Corps staff stayed for five hours beginning at 2 p.m. Wednesday to provide details and answer questions about the proposed purchases. The corps hopes to buy land that sometimes floods even during normal lake operations but was missed in the original purchases made before the lake was completed in 1966. The workshop took place at the Four Points by Sheraton hotel in Bentonville.

"When the lake floods and leaves trash and debris on my mother's property, we clean it up," said Scott Brock of Rogers. "If the corps owns it I'd have to get a permit to do even that. We've done a good job keeping it clean and mowed. The corps hasn't done that good a job on the land they own." Brock's mother and her now-deceased husband bought their house on the lake's western bank in 1980, he said.

Rapid development of the Northwest Arkansas region is the cause behind the corps' plan to fill the gaps in its ownership of areas to protect around the lake shore, said Jay Townsend, spokesman for the corps' Little Rock division. Townsend attended Wednesday's workshop.

"One out of seven people in Arkansas get their drinking water from the lake," Townsend said. "We want to operate the lake as it was intended. We're sympathetic and realize people have worked their entire lives to have a place along the lake, but this region is a lot more developed than it was 25 or 50 years ago." Controlling frequently flooding areas is vital to preserve water quality, he said.

The corps estimates about 500 landowners are impacted with an average area to be acquired to be about a quarter of an acre each. Acquiring of the land will take several years and that is only if the corps gets the necessary money, Townsend said. There is no estimated timeline or total cost, he said.

The corps will use third-party appraisals for any property it wants to acquire, Townsend said, and try to negotiate with property owners for a fair price to avoid eminent domain as much as possible.

The uncertain timeline leaves the affected property owners in limbo, said Larry and Carol Vos of Rogers. Anyone who wanted to sell can't sell the property with its future undecided, they said.

"They'd be paying me with the money I paid in taxes while there's trillions of dollars of deficit," Larry Vos said of the corps plan. "I don't think this is the best use of the taxpayer's money."

David Harper of Fort Smith bought 36 acres overlooking the lake including a stretch along the shore. He talked in detail with corps officials about his plans to build a private road leading down to the lake and facilities near it before completing the purchase in April 2021. The next month the corps announced his lakefront was part of the property it wanted to acquire.

"I asked them to show me a single case in which there was a problem with any of the property they want," Harper said. "I haven't seen one yet."

The Little Rock district commander will review the project's environmental assessment once it is complete and make a decision on how to proceed, Townsend previously said. The process typically takes one year. Affected landowners will receive a letter once the commander has made his final decision.

Beaver Lake Proposed Land Acquisition - Draft EA Comment Submission Record

| Submission Number | Date Submitted | Organization (Only if on Official Letterhead or submitted on behalf of Organization) | Form Letter | Submission Type | Duplicate |
|-------------------|----------------|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------|
| BLRELA-DEA-001 | 3/16/2022 | | | Court Reporter | |
| BLRELA-DEA-002 | 3/16/2022 | | | Court Reporter | |
| BLRELA-DEA-003 | 3/16/2022 | | | Court Reporter | |
| BLRELA-DEA-004 | 3/17/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-005 | 3/17/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-006 | 3/18/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-007 | 3/23/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | 3/25/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-009 | 3/26/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-010 | 3/26/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-011 | 4/3/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-012 | 4/5/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-013 | 4/5/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-014 | 4/5/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-015 | 4/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-016 | 4/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-017 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-018 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-019 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-020 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-021 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-022 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-023 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-024 | 4/7/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-025 | 4/8/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-026 | 4/9/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-027 | 4/9/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-028 | 4/9/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-029 | 4/10/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-030 | 4/10/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-031 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-032 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-033 | 4/11/2022 | Arkansas Dept. of Environmental Quality | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-034 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-035 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-036 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-037 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-038 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-039 | 4/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-040 | 4/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-041 | 4/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--|----|--------|----|
| BLRELA-DEA-042 | 4/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-043 | 4/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-044 | 4/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-045 | 4/13/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-046 | 4/13/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-047 | 4/13/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-048 | 4/13/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-049 | 4/14/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-050 | 4/14/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-051 | 4/14/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-052 | 4/14/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-053 | 4/14/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-054 | 4/14/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-055 | 4/14/2002 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-056 | 4/14/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-057 | 4/15/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-058 | 4/15/2002 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-059 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-060 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-061 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-062 | 4/15/2022 | | No | Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-063 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-064 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-065 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-066 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-067 | 4/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-DEA-068 | 4/17/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |

| Beaver Lake Proposed Land Acquisition - Draft EA Comment - Substantive Comments | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Submission Number | Comment Number | Comment | Category | Area of Concern | EA Response |
| BLRELA-DEA-001 | -01 | I own a vacant lot in a subdivision type area. I have two homes on each side of me. Anyway, I've just looked at the plat, or the map, showing how much red is being bumped into my property on the map, the red markings. And at this point I object to it. I'm not happy with it. I feel like it's kind of like a land grab, and I'm very uncertain about the future of the lot. (Remainder of comment refers to capital gains tax impacts on healthcare, other places where land has been taken, and other general comments unrelated to this study). | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-002 | -01 | We have land that would really be impacted by this land acquisition. And we just want to kind of voice our opinion about it. We have pictures and such of Corps owned land. As people may or may not know, they don't maintain the shoreline at all. It's real ugly with driftwood, and there are snakes and all kinds of stuff in that along the shoreline. But we own a piece of property where the ingress comes up on our property, and we manage to keep it looking really nice... When the water comes up, we've got all these huge logs and everything that come up on our property, but since it's ours, we deal with it. We burn them. We do whatever we need to do to keep all that cleaned out. And, of course, if the Corps purchases this land, it will be theirs, and it will look like all the other Corps of Engineer land with just excessive amounts of driftwood along the shoreline, you know, of course, snaky and who knows what else in there. They're not friendly places for people whatsoever. So our primary reason to be against this is the fact that it's just going to ugly up our part of the lake.... Another point I failed to mention is this is going to be a huge amount of money that the Corps of Engineers is going to be spending, to acquire all this land from the landowners. And in my opinion is just a huge waste of taxpayer money, buying land that is already owned by private landowners. And it really won't affect the way the lake is managed in any way, shape or form. (Remaing comment refers to unfair permits, and other examples of unclean shorelines). | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-003 | -01 | I live on Beaver Lake. I've lived there since 1983. I'm here talking about the land acquisition by the Corps. I think that's something they should have addressed back in the 50's when they first came up with this lake. The erosion on my property --- there are two places on my land that they want to acquire, and both of them, the erosion is already all gone. I live on a point, and it's basically a rock seawall all the way around my property. So you're not going to gain anything by trying to take my property. Furthermore, I have a 40-foot houseboat on my property, on the lake. I can't afford to pay \$300 to \$400 a month to park it anywhere else. I have had it parked there now for 20 years, and I want to keep it there for another 20 years. I'm not hurting anything. And I think if you guys need to do something, you need to get a flood easement only, and get hold harmless agreements from the landowners, but you should not go in and try to acquire people's property from them. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-004 | -01 | Why, after 50+ years, is it so important to take private property away from the current owners that have maintained their property for so many years? | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 2.1 Purpose and Need |
| BLRELA-DEA-004 | -02 | If said land is taken up to the 1125+/- level from the current landowners, will the other Corps land that is above that level be available for purchase to the landowners adjacent to it? | Planning | Alternatives | Table 3.2 Alternatives Considered |
| BLRELA-DEA-006 | -01 | In the USACE land acquisition document, Table 3.1 <i>Measures Initially Considered</i> , the suggestion that the Corps only buy land from those that want to sell, the Corps said this was not a good option because "Unable to only flood property that is purchased from willing sellers". If that argument is valid then why does the Corps think it is okay to purchase approximately ten percent of the private land that extends out into the water, or as the Corps says " <i>inundated with water</i> "? What is the difference? It is my suggestion, in order to be fair, the Corps should buy all or none of the land in question. If the funds are not available, then the higher ups must not feel that it is a worthy project. That being said, I would propose that the Corps place all monies paid to private landowners in escrow and the private property owners retain all rights to their land until one hundred percent of the proposed acquisition is completed, if ever. It is not fair to single out the initial ten percent and hold them to a different satndard than the other ninety percent. Thank you for your time and consideration. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-007 | -01 | I am opposed to the planned Acquisition of our private land. We do not want to be burdened by the proposed restrictions the Corps would likely place on our property. We are particularly concerned about being able to keep and maintain our steps that we constructed on our land in July 2016. The steps are between elevation 1128 and 1120 where there is a significant, steep drop that made it unsafe for us (we are in our 80s) and our guests to walk to our dock. For our sake and to meet the spirit of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) we installed steps with a handrail to allow safe access to our dock. The eight steps and hand rail we installed are very important to us....my wife could not get to and from our dock without using the steps and handrail. We cannot rely on the uncertainties as well as the expense of the Corps permitting process, therefore we request an exemption, or what ever it takes, to allow the unencumbered use of our steps in perpetuity. We do not in any way want the government to infringe on our rights to keep and maintain the steps. Perhaps this could be done through a real estate interest that was discussed in the draft NEPA regarding War Eagle Caverns (or some other exemption) that would be completed before the proposed acquisition. Having the ability to control our property to waters edge was an important factor to us when we purchased our land; and as lake property prices are skyrocketing, it contributes even more to the extra value. We do not want the government to infringe on our existing rights.This No Action alternative will also allow landowners to remove debris, logs and other dangerous objects that accumulate in back of coves on their property, without getting a Corps permit to do so. This would contribute to improved boating safety and water quality. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -01 | I would like to state unequivocally that this project is not welcome at my property at XXX near monument #611-1-2A. I also understand that is not and will not be a consideration. I am hoping to at least influence a fair negotiation that leaves all options on the table. I love that I have access to the shore a majority of the time. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -02 | I would like to know what complaints you have from landowners regarding the stated problem of landowner complaints this is supposed to address. My guess is that this action will create far more complaints. So public complaints are not the real reason for this activity or there would be other options like offering the complaining parties a land purchase rather than taking everyone's as originally stated. | Planning / Real Estate | Alternatives | Purchasing land from complaining parties is addressed in Section 3.6 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -03 | <p>During the drop in, I noticed a distinct change from that reasoning to the reasoning, congress told us to this many years ago, so we are just trying to do what congress said. After visiting with my congressman, I think this action would fail to pass currently. In the power point for the acquisition study, slide 4 notes the congressional action true to form. However, when we go to that action on the record, the congress just authorizes the project and refers back to the engineer's study. The Engineer would have been in charge of acquisitions and would have to have been satisfied at that time that the zones were adequate to operate. Congress did not designate this elevation as you're documents and words suggest. The chief engineer of the army (later the COE) determined that and oversaw the purchase of in compliance with the intent at that time. Going back now and redefining the intent is disingenuous. In a powerpoint that claims it intends to give us links to documents relevant to the project on slide 2, it seems like this engineer's report you state is the reason for the current project would be a key document to include. I have requested it from the library of the congress, but have not received it yet.</p> | Planning / Real Estate | Alternatives | <p>Section 2.1 of EA discusses the content of the Real Estate Design Memorandum executed at the time of construction of Beaver Lake. REDM specifies "Beaver Lake requires fee simple lands up to a guide contour of 1,128' MSL..."</p> |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -06 | <p>If that is not feasible, considering the original piecemeal purchase plan and its issues the USACE is trying to resolve, the inverse problem is also true. Many of the tracts originally 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. I would find this more palatable than a dollars for land exchange and there would be areas that could work on the property line.</p> | Planning | Alternatives/Real Estate | <p>Section 3.6.1.2 of EA discusses land exchanges.</p> |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -07 | <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/Real Estate | <p>No Action Alternative is included in the final array of alternatives evaluated, per NEPA requirements.</p> |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -09 | <p>5.2.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Implementation of the No Action Alternative may have long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts on local topography and soils should private landowners modify their property (e.g. re-sloping, installing retaining walls, etc.). Introduction of fill dirt, soil disturbance, and increased erosion of shoreline/stream banks result in increases in sediment load in the water and unnatural increases in rates of sediment deposition in the resource</p> <p>As the COE is well aware topographic earth work is already forbidden by law in flood ways and the land up to the considered elevation is apparently in that. So the detrimental issues discussed are already forbidden. Please clarify how this conclusion was reached or couldn't be addressed by purchasing easement.</p> | Planning | Environmental | <p>FEMA regulated floodplains come with some requirements based on zoning, such as requirements for flood insurance. There are no FEMA regulations preventing construction of structures on private land around Beaver Lake.</p> |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -10 | <p>5.3.1.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Implementation of the No Action Alternative could result in long-term, minor, adverse impacts from private landowners altering the topography, which would affect the local hydrology. Any spills of hazardous chemicals stored on private land has the potential to adversely affect groundwater in the karst region.</p> <p>See note on 5.2.1 for topographic concerns. As to chemicals, please explain how that isn't reason to banish people from the karst region all together. As the COE knows, a spill from miles away could surface in the lake in a karst region. Please better explain how grabbing a few feet from a landowner helps in a karst region or why it isn't also listed as a problem with the proposed action. For the vast majority of section 5.3 Water Quality, this is repeated, so I'll quote from your own report, "Any spills of hazardous chemicals stored on private land has the potential to adversely affect groundwater in the karst region." (See 5.3.1.1) So any time this report discusses spills or nutrients entering the waterway in the alternative 1 and then claiming alternative 2 is beneficial is absolutely wrong and contradictory to the report as a whole and contradictory to the sciences including hydrography, hydrology, and geology. In fact, if the most flat and accessible area of a parcel of private land happened to be what you forcefully purchased, it could be argued, you have made a spill more likely and therefore made the risk to the waterbody worse. Clearly storage is more safe in flatter, more accessible areas and especially in a karst area, distance is a fairly minor factor.</p> | Planning | Environmental | <p>Benefits to groundwater and surface water are discussed in Sections 5.3.2.1 and 5.3.2.2 of the EA.</p> |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -11 | <p>5.3.2.1 Alternative 1 –Implementation of the No Action Alternative may have long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts on water quality, particularly on those tracts that have been cleared to the water edge. Agricultural and residential activities on these private lands contributes to nutrient loading or spikes/increases in nutrients, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus. Both chemicals are extremely high in chicken litter which is a common application to agriculture fields and fertilizers. ...related to filtration and treatment of drinking water.</p> <p>Phosphorus and Nitrogen are elemental nutrients, not chemicals. By this logic dihydrogen monoxide is also a chemical commonly known as water. Why the misleading terminology in a technical report? There are maybe 2 landowners of the affected approximately 500 who would be spreading chicken litter on the affected land. Land bordering the Lake is far too expensive for farming to be the typical use, it is primarily residential and no resident wants manure spread on their yard. This is absolutely ludicrous that it would be included. My feeling is this was canned from another environmental study and if I were hired and funded, I would find in a project in the White, Buffalo, or Illinois river basin with this in it. Additionally, all of NWA and the Beaver water shed is in a nutrient management plan zone meaning all agricultural spreading of fertilizer must be approved. You could easily restrict the issue that way if you felt it a concern without impacting the vast majority of landowners. It's not like moving that point up the hill 20 to 100 feet keeps phosphorus and nitrogen from running off into Beaver lake. Future development in the water shed will happen regardless of what you do with this plan. Developed communities will shed water to the drainage structures and eventually it will come to Beaver Lake. Grabbing up a few feet of embankment doesn't change that. Also leaves and sticks and logs also contain the nutrients phosphorus and nitrogen. As those debris from trees break down, they release those nutrients into the water. If this were a major concern, dead flora would not be floating all along the shoreline currently.</p> | Planning | Environmental | <p>Phosphorus and nitrogen are both chemicals (see periodic table of elements) and nutrients. Both are key ingredients in fertilizers used on lawns. Increasing distance from excess nutrients to lake may provide increased area for vegetation growth (depending on soil) which will aid in capturing nutrient runoff.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|--|----------|---------------|---|
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -13 | <p>5.7.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Implementation of the No Action Alternative would have long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts on recreation at Beaver Lake. There have been instances of landowners with shoreline-owned property (or even under water) stretching cables or ropes across coves to keep public boats of the water overlying the private land.</p> <p>5.9.1 Alternative 1 – No Action The implementation of the No Action Alternative may have long-term, minor, adverse impacts on the health and safety at Beaver Lake. As discussed in Section 5.7.1, there have been instances of landowners with shoreline-owned property (or even under water) stretching cables or ropes across coves to keep public boats of the water overlying the private land. These cables and ropes can create safety hazards for boaters.</p> <p>Pretty certain this is already prohibited under the navigable waterways and waters of the US laws. Simply enforcing those laws would be sufficient to resolve this issue rather than taking people's lands who have not violated those laws. If people are willing to break existing laws, moving the property line back isn't going to help, so it should also be included as a problem with the considered alternative.</p> | Planning | Environmental | Not prohibited on private property. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -14 | <p>5.10.1 Alternative 1 - No Action Implementation of Alternative 1 would have the potential for future contamination of the private land parcels from spills or the storage of hazardous materials on the property.</p> <p>Moving the spill up 20' is not going to resolve this. It must also be included in the considered alternative as an impact since as noted, we are in a karst region.</p> | Planning | Environmental | Not all material moves vertically in karst topography - it also moves horizontally (which is faster in many cases) |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -15 | <p>5.11.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Implementation of the No Action Alternative would have long-term, minor, positive and negative benefits to the aesthetics, depending on an individual's perspective. Those landowners that have cleared their property to the shoreline would continue to enjoy the scenic vista of Beaver Lake. Conversely, some individuals recreating on Beaver Lake enjoy the relative solitude and pristine condition of the shoreline and the ability to see residences and other structures above the shoreline (in those areas where vegetation has been cleared) can detract from their enjoyment</p> <p>If it's according to perspective or subjective, it doesn't belong in a conclusion. It's opinion. According to your own document, the land would continue to be managed as it is currently. You taking a portion of people's land isn't going to resolve it. No houses or structures are supposed to built below the take line anyways.</p> | Planning | Environmental | There is no prohibition to build houses or structures on private property surrounding Beaver Lake. Any private property purchased that has been cleared of vegetation will be allowed to revegetate, which may have a positive benefit to aesthetics by reducing visibility of structures on private property. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -16 | <p>5.4.4.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum (DM) "As cleared shoreline areas become revegetated over time, there should be additional roost sites available for bats, as well as perching sites for bald eagles."</p> <p>Umm no. Not unless you take out the dam entirely and dry the area out which would defeat the purpose of the project. New trees will not grow in areas that are persistently flooded. Has the person who wrote this environmental study ever been outside or do they think bats and bald eagles will roost on washed up dead trees laying on their side? Statements like this make me question the credentials of the author.</p> | Planning | Environmental | Vegetation growth depends on soil types as well as hydrology. Some areas considered for acquisition only flood periodically - which will still allow for some vegetative growth, as evidenced by vegetative growth (including trees) on USACE-owned property at similar elevations. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -17 | <p>5.8.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum (DM) Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in long-term, minor benefits to air quality in the area as carbon-sequestering vegetation would be allowed to revegetate cleared shorelines. While there would be benefits to air quality with implementation of this alternative, the acreage of lands proposed for purchase is extremely minor in comparison to already USACE-owned and vegetated acres, thus benefits would be considered minor. This alternative does not entail construction activities that would emit greenhouse gases, as such a General Conformity analysis and determination are not required.</p> <p>The vegetation will continue to sequester carbon at the same rate. The dirt and rocks and grass will behave the same or worse for sequestering carbon as they always have. It is possible the areas would become brushy and choke out the grass currently in place. However, the frequent flooding will not allow new trees to grow. If there is a minor effect, it would be negative.</p> | Planning | Environmental | Private shorelines that have been cleared of vegetation provide little to no carbon sequestration value. Allowing those properties to revegetate will increase the carbon sequestration value. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008 | -18 | <p>5.10.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action) - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum (DM) Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in long-term, significant benefits to the terrestrial and aquatic environment at Beaver Lake through the protection of the land parcels by placing them in federal ownership. While spills of hazardous wastes from adjacent property are always a risk, USACE policy would prevent the storage of any such materials on federal fee owned property.</p> <p>You see this is contradictory right? The only way to reduce the risk of hazardous material spilling into this lake is to reduce the number of people. Reducing the space for them to operate has nothing to do with it statistically since we can assume the chemicals will flow through the karst into the water from anywhere on their remaining property. Therefore, the only way to reduce the risk of hazardous chemicals entering the water is to reduce the likelihood of a spill in the watershed, not the area the spill can occur in.</p> | Planning | Environmental | Cannot assume all hazardous material would only flow into karst and not surface waters. Primary entry points into karst geology include caves, sinkholes, and springs. Creating/enlarging vegetative buffers around these features would reduce the risk of spills entering groundwater. Similarly, having more area between potential spills and the lake provides increased opportunity for spills to be stopped/absorbed in surface soils before reaching Beaver Lake. |
| BLRELA-DEA-009 | -01 | It does not make any logical sense on how purchasing and controlling these "slivers" of property can have any impact on how you control Beaver Lake levels. These "slivers" can't account for any more than 0.1 or 0.01% of the flood lands. It hasn't made a bit of difference for the last 58 years so why start now? The corp line already encompasses thousand of acres above the pool level or flood level which is already used to control flooding. The property I currently own that extends into the lake has been improved to help with what you want to control. To me this is an unnecessary and wasteful effort of manpower and money of tax payer money whereas it could be spent elsewhere for the better good. We don't need any more government control in and around Beaver Lake. there is more than enough already. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-010 | -01 | I previously submitted comments regarding my opposition to the land acquisition. After attending the public input session on March 16, I am more convinced that the proposed land acquisition is NOT worth pursuing and is a waste of taxpayer money. It will NOT help the Corps further its mission for Beaver Lake, will work against the land owners, prevent clean-up efforts, add to more pollution and debris, and make the lake less safe for boaters and land owners. Please refocus your efforts on issues that actually need attention on Beaver Lake, work with the land owners (not against us), build better partnerships, and try to make a positive difference. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|----------|--------------|---|
| BLRELA-DEA-011 | -01 | <p>We purchased our land on Beaver Lake in 1994 and built our home in 2005. There are eleven lots in our subdivision in a gated community called Gram B Point, with seven of the best lake-front lots on Beaver Lake. To give you our comments, we find it extremely important to tell you we purchased the lot with the lowest elevation in the development. The majority of the lots drain in an easterly direction straight onto our property. Having been a land developer in Dallas for 32 years, we were totally aware of the drainage basins above us and designed our grading and construction to handle the challenge. Not once have we had a problem with storm water entering our home. In regards to flooding from the lake, equal care was given to our engineering and planning. During our planning we met with the Corp on several occasions to ensure we would not violate any restrictions regarding the Corp easement. Most importantly, since the day our construction began to the moment these comments were written, our home and lot have not flooded and almost as importantly, have not come close to flooding. During these years there were several occasions of extremely high water, some even requiring the Corp to open the flood gate on the dam. Again, even our yard was not flooded during these events. Last month our POA had its annual meeting. This acquisition study was discussed at length. Again importantly, not one single homeowner reported any water during the high-water events getting near their homes. There may be areas on Beaver Lake that have flooding problems, but there are none in our subdivision. We absolutely do not understand why the Federal (and State) government would even consider using eminent domain to take a corner of our property when there is not a problem.</p> <p>Finally, our property was designed around the 1135 elevation. This elevation extends across one corner of our yard and within feet of our home. We designed and positioned our home on the land with the Corp of Engineer's approval. Our main floor elevation is 1145. Surely you can see there is absolutely no problem or even a potential for a problem on our property. Upon review of our comments, please contact me to discuss. Thank you for your consideration.</p> | H & H | Alternatives | The purchase of private property from willing sellers would allow the Corps to better manage Beaver Lake for its many authorized purposes. Flooding of private structures is not the focus of the study, however by acquiring lands in fee up to elevation 1,128' MSL from willing sellers would prevent the construction of structures below such elevation, which would be at risk of flooding. |
| BLRELA-DEA-0012 | -01 | <p>Hi, our property is one that has been identified as a potential acquisition - we own 3 acres on the north side of the Point Mirage peninsula . The main reason we purchased this property last year was the corps line location - our shoreline is by far the most valuable aspect to this property for our kids, our relatives and ourselves. We have two handicapped individuals in our family that require us to ensure ALL debris is cleared from the shoreline. In addition, our house plans are complete and designed in a way to support all corps rules, including those parts that require a safe distance from corps line/water levels. We are also considering ways to prevent further erosion as we understand the concern. It's unsettling to think that our plans for purchasing the property would now be reversed, resulting in a major loss as the total value of the property would be SIGNIFICANTLY reduced just by acquiring this small sliver. Not an easy pill to swallow for a young family as we have already made investments in our newfound 'lake life' (watercraft, boats, architectural reviews/plans, land clearing, etc.)</p> <p>In short, we've spent the last several years saving and researching for a dream property. We've found a piece of land that meets our criteria right here in our 'backyard' at Beaver Lake (we are NWA natives). We would vote strongly against any plans to acquire our property and would ask to keep the take line as is.</p> <p>We are open to joint efforts to reduce erosion, but are not ready to risk the loss of value, quality and our dream location.</p> | Planning | Alternatives | Section 3.6.2.2 (Proposed Action) has been revised to reflect purchase of properties from willing sellers only. |
| BLRELA-DEA-013 | -01 | We are not in support of any land acquisition in regards to our property on Beaver Lake. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-014 | -01 | I have installed rip-rap rock to protect the land from erosion. I will continue to be a good protector of the lake shore line. I would hope that the shore line boundary will stay where it is. If not, I would like a commitment from the Corp of Engineers to maintain the rip-rap which will prevent erosion that would take a deck and social area which we use very often. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-015 | -01 | I do not agree with the proposed movement of the corps-line to the 1128' elevation. I do not want the Corps to take any action and to leave the take-line where it currently is. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-016 | -01 | My wife and I own property off of CR116 on Henry Hollow. A significant portion of our property is designated for acquisition according to this plan. We are STRONGLY opposed to this plan, as it regards the seizure of our property. The argument made for this acquisition is that Beaver Lake floods low-lying parts of properties. On NO OCCASION among the numerous times that the lake has reached flood levels (1130+ ft), has the lake level reached our property. Therefore this argument is not relevant, whatsoever, to our property. It should be removed from any acquisition plan. The portion of property in question is undeveloped, and would never be developed with any structure. Yet we enjoy walking along it, and the access to the lake which it allows us. To seize this property would significantly lower our property values, beyond anything we would be paid, and would harm our enjoyment of the lake. Please do not move forward with this proposal. We will never willingly consent to the acquisition of this part of our property. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We hope you take our comments seriously, and reconsider this acquisition plan. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-017 | -01 | Thank you guys for the difficult work of managing Beaver Lake. I know that it is very time consuming. I would like to respectfully note that I am not in favor of this land acquisition proposal. I feel strongly that the take-line should be left in it's current location. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-018 | -01 | Our land does not flood and there is no reason to take any part of our land. Also I do not believe that taking any land is going to be helpful to anyone and would just cost the CORPS money. I have reviewed the proposal and it doesn't seem to benefit anyone including the CORPS. Seems that leaving it as is is the best for everyone. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|----------|--------------|--|
| BLRELA-DEA-019 | -01 | My wife and I are just one of many property owners standing to lose property if they go ahead with this “land grab” which is all it is in my opinion. If they were truly worried about the water quality they'd start by inspecting all the old sewer/septic systems around the lake. Many leak or are nonexistent...some have outhouses right on the edge of the corp by the water! Why waste all that money to buy land that people don't want to sell when there are much bigger fish to fry? Any worries or concerns with what happens to these parcels they want to buy or lawsuits that could come up could be handled by legal agreements with the land owners at a fraction of the cost. I along with many others am appalled that this would be the corps main focus during times like these. I'd appreciate a call to talk about this more and to see if someone has any influence with the powers that be to bring some common sense to this “project”. Seems like someone found a way to secure their job for a few more years..... Thanks for letting me vent but this just isn't right. P.S. HOW ABOUT ONLY BUYING THE LAND THAT OWNERS WANT TO SELL? We don't know of any yet.....We sure don't..... | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-020 | -01 | Having just learned that the Corp is considering a Land Acquisition at Beaver Lake, I am writing to express my opposition to the acquisition. Being a land owner of nearly 74 acres, I have chosen to keep the land as natural as possible. This is the desire of all family members as well. Please keep me in the loop of the outcome of the proposal if possible. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-021 | -01 | I appreciate your willingness to inform, and invite Beaver Lake property owners to comment on the proposed acquisitions of property on Beaver Lake. Regarding the proposed acquisition, the property my husband and I own is one that appears will be impacted. We understand the reasons the study was done and that there are some properties that are negatively impacted by water when it's at 1128 ft, and the need to insure the shoreline is kept clear to allow proper water management. We respect the property that the Corp owns abutting our property. We have not attempted, nor would we attempt to interfere on that property. To that end, we respectfully request that the current take-line remain as it is on our property. We are fortunate to have an amazing view of the lake. Much of the lakeshore of our property is not owned by the Corp and was a factor in our decision to purchase our property and the value of our home, as it allows us to ensure that our view of the lake remains clear. We are concerned that the full use and enjoyment of our property and view may be negatively impacted if you pursue acquisition on our property. I thank you for the opportunity to comment, and welcome any dialogue deemed helpful or necessary, to help come to a resolution. | Planning | Alternatives | Section 3.6.2.2 (Proposed Action) has been revised to reflect purchase of properties from willing sellers only. |
| BLRELA-DEA-022 | -01 | DO NOT ADJUST THE TAKE LINE. WE HAVE DONE A LOT OF WORK TO OUR SLICE OF HEAVEN AND WE DO NOT WANT OUR PROPERTY TO BE TAKEN. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-023 | -01 | Please do not take my property. I DO NOT want any changes to the shoreline. We have done a lot of work and utilize every bit of our beautiful property on the gorgeous shoreline of Beaver Lake. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-024 | -01 | Please do not change my property lines. I do not want to sell any of my land. Please keep the Corps take-line in its current position. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-025 | -01 | I own property on Beaver Lake, and would be affected by this acquisition proposal. I do not want to lose any of my property. I believe the Corps of Engineering should be able to control the water level sufficiently. Maybe you should consider seeking some control over power generation. In my situation, the flooding has no effect on my property, as it is in a drainage area. Please leave the current take line where it is. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-026 | -01 | We are asking you to take no action and leave where it is the current elevation line targeted by the Corps of Engineers for Beaver Lake. We stand to lose our entire lake front property should the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition project go through. This would severely impact the resale value of the 5 acres I own, which are currently on Beaver Lake. There is no reason to change the corps elevation line as cities, villages, and builders dictate what can be built on flood plane. The corps has already claimed much of Beaver Lake property and has as many access points as it needs for its projects. Please leave our property alone and remove 3889 Mundell Road, Eureka Springs (Billee Anderson Trust) from your Eminent Domain Beaver Lake Land Acquisition project. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-027 | -01 | I am protesting the acquisition of penitentiary hollow property shoreline due to erosion from flooding. This location of Beaver lake is eroding due to not posting a NO Wake Zone for water vehicles. People come into this cove way too fast, sometimes at speeds of 60mph. Also when it rains we are noticing that the Army Corp of Engineers are not dispersing the overflow as fast as they should. This is what is causing the erosion. Not property owners just enjoying the lakeshore. We enjoy being able to fish off our docks and swimming in our cove. This area needs to be a NO wake zone, like it should have been all along. | Planning | Alternatives | The Real Estate Design Memorandum (REDM) executed at the time of the construction of Beaver Lake identified the need to acquire all properties up to elevation 1,128' MSL, in fee, to be able to effectively manage the many authorized purposes of the lake. Purchasing from willing sellers will help achieve the goal of the REDM. Establishing a No Wake Zone is outside the scope of the study. |
| BLRELA-DEA-028 | -01 | I have been a shore line property owner in Penitentiary Hollow of more than 900 feet and am VERY opposed to the Corp of Engineers proposal to seize privately owned shoreline supposedly eroding due to lake level flooding. I have owned this property since 2003, nearly 20 years & there has been little or no erosion during that time. The failure of the Corp of Engineers to maintain regulated lake level during heavy rains is negligent - they have historically allowed the level to rise far too high in the cove and eventually proceed to generate & drop the level suddenly all at once thereby producing a brown soil & mud to leave into the normally blue water of the cove needs to be addressed. Also please note that shoreline property owners in this cove have repeatedly requested that the Corp make our cove a LIW/NO wake zone as the cove next to us has been for years. The continuous traffic of high speed motor boats and jets skis racing into Penetentiary Hollow is dangerous and damaging g to our shoreline- their wake is considerable! Plus the use of alcohol and other substances by these boaters while on the mthe lake makes their presence hazardous -they climb and jump off the cliffs and waterfall ledge. There needs to be prohibitive action taken immediately. Please hear our protest to this land aquisition proposal! | Planning | Alternatives | The Real Estate Design Memorandum (REDM) executed at the time of the construction of Beaver Lake identified the need to acquire all properties up to elevation 1,128' MSL, in fee, to be able to effectively manage the many authorized purposes of the lake. Purchasing from willing sellers will help achieve the goal of the REDM. Establishing a No Wake Zone is outside the scope of the study. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|--|----------|--------------|--|
| BLRELA-DEA-029 | -01 | We are asking the Corps of Engineers to take no action and leave where it is the current elevation line targeted by the Corps of Engineers for Beaver Lake. We stand to lose our entire lake front property should the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition project go through. This would severely impact the resale value of the 5 acres owned under the Billee Anderson Trust, which is currently situated on Beaver Lake. There is no reason to change the corps elevation line as cities, villages, and builders dictate what can be built on floodplains. The corps has already claimed much of Beaver Lake property and has as many access points as it needs for its projects. Please leave our property alone and remove 3889 Mundell Road, Eureka Springs (Billee Anderson Trust) from your Eminent Domain Beaver Lake Land Acquisition project. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-030 | -01 | Property owners do not care if property flooded so no need to lower flood pool or make any changes for the current project. Questions: I am one of the landowners affected by the proposed plan. I own property at XXX. The current property boundary runs high up adjacent to my property, far above 1135ft, and then cuts down across the end of the cove where the proposed acquisition is noted. Can you consider swapping some of the land above so it follows the contour of the shoreline for the proposed acquisition property? (Remainder of comment in Questions/Clarifications). | Planning | Alternatives | Section 3.6.1.2 of EA discusses land exchanges. |
| BLRELA-DEA-031 | -01 | As owner of property address 10961 10962 Lathams Landing Rd. Garfield Ar., I am opposed to the Corps acquiring any of my lake property. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-032 | -01 | I am seeking out to whom it may concern of the potential acquisition of my property on beaver lake. This would affect my land, and I'm totally OPPOSED to this. I hope you find another place for your study! | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-034 | -01 | As land owners who are affected by the change in the water levels, we have learned and come to understand the ongoing need for such changes in the water level at beaver lake. The portion of land that is designated on our land is at a significant steep angle and is not usable property. We understand and accept the annual flooding of this area. We also very much support the flowage acquisition, but will significantly challenge purchase acquisition by the Corp, especially if it affects the structures we have built to access the boat dock. We believe it to be unnecessary to spend Corp budget and tax payer money if owners such as us, are willing to provide flowage rights to Corp. We are very surprised that the Corp has the budget to do this, but not the budget to outlaw/control watercrafts that create 3 to 5 foot waves that have eroded a huge parts of the shoreline along the lake. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-035 | -01 | I am writing today to express my concern of any potential acquisition of our property on Beaver Lake. This acquisition would directly affect our land. Again, We are completely opposed to this acquisition, and we hope you reconsider moving forward with your study. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-036 | -01 | I bought a property a couple years ago for the sole reason because of the low take line. If you raise the take line in our cove, this property will no longer have the value it has now. Please leave the take line alone. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-037 | -01 | As the property owner on Beaver lake at 336 Paradise Cove Lane, Eureka Springs, AR, I am not in favor of the land acquisition plan, as it would have a significant effect on the resale value of the property. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-038 | -01 | Leave the lake alone please! Don't mess with a good thing. PLEASE | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-039 | -01 | We are reaching out regarding the potential land acquisition of Beaver Lake shoreline property. We are current landowners and we are highly opposed to the USACE acquiring any of OUR land. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-040 | -01 | John K, Dupps and Dupps Squared, Inc. are property owners on Beaver Lake and we would be directly affected by the proposed land (lake) grab by the Corps. We paid a premium for our properties for the property line elevations. We are veimiently opposed to the proposed action and will take legal action to thwart the attempt. Feel free to contact me if you wish to discuss further. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-041 | -01 | My primary residence property is located in one of your identified "red zones". I acquired this parcel of land and built trails to access the farthest end of the property. Should the Corp acquire this portion of land, I would loose a section of land that I paid a premium price for in 2013-2014. I would also loose the trails that I placed on the property. This land has never even come close to flooding. Flooding is NOT an issue for this little parcel of land. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-042 | -01 | I am not in favor of any required land sale or use of eminent domain along beaver lake that is not wanted by the land owners. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-042 | -02 | EA: In many locations, owners have placed fill land constructed retaining walls in these areas. Even small amounts of fill reduces the flood storage capacity of the lake from the designed level needed to decrease flood risk risks both in the lake and downstream. My response: If you as a land owner have chosen to build in a flood zone it is at your risk and peril and should not change flooding when required. Exactly how much capacity is lost due to retaining walls etc. I have not seen any info on that and expect it to be very small percentage. Additionally there is a ton of floating trees etc. that also reduce storage capacity of the lake as well but nothing is done to correct that. | H & H | Alternatives | EA comment is based on the current loss of flood storage capacity as well as the risk of further reduction in the future. The majority of private land parcels currently do not retaining walls or other structures that reduce storage capacity, however they could be built in the future. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|--|----------|--------------|---|
| BLRELA-DEA-042 | -06 | What about the landowners who have property lines significantly above the the water mark you want to purchase. Should they not be given there rightful land back since it is above the line? If not how exactly can you justify taking of land below it. | Planning | Alternatives | Section 3.6.1.2 of the EA discusses rationale for no land exchanges, or selling USACE property. |
| BLRELA-DEA-042 | -07 | There are many things that could be done without the need to spend money on a study to correct issues. I see nothing in the study giving reason to taking of land, that shows any true benefit to land owner or public that is not already happening in its current conditions. By taking rightful land owners land without there consent is unacceptable. Much of the land is in a flood plan already with nothing to be gained from the corps as it will flood regardless of who is the owner. Compensation to a land owner for property that they do not want to sell will never truly be compensation. This is just a massive waste of tax payer money with no upside. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-043 | -01 | No Action is my recommendation. This situation has been little to no issue for 60+ years, and there have been no lawsuits yet from this. I think most land owners have no issue with the flooding and see the ownership of these parcels as added value to their properties. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-044 | -01 | My wife and I own land that is on Beaver Lake that will be affected by the proposed taking. Currently the take line is some 50 -75feet above the highest level the lake can attain and over the course of the past 18 years the level of the lake has never come even close to rising above a level that is some 50 feet above the highest level the lake has been during the past 18 years. To take additional land in the area that abuts our land would be useless. Additionally if anything should be done some of the land already taken should be relinquished by the army corps as the lake level has never reached as high as the current take line and due to the height of the dam it does not appear that it ever could reach the level of the current take line as it abuts our land. I would be happy to discuss this with the Army Corps or to meet with them at a mutually agreeable time and place. Thank you. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-045 | -01 | Please DO NOT change the shore line boundaries. We have lived on this property for 20 years and have never complained about the high water or damage to our property caused by the high water. Our property line is at the 1120' lake level and if this measure is approved you would be taking a significant piece of property that we are not interested in selling (about 200' of shoreline). I do not see how taking my property would better fulfill your mission of flood control or providing drinking water. we are adamantly opposed to this measure. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-046 | -01 | I respectfully submit as a land owner on Beaver Lake since 1991, I am not in favor of the Land Acquisition Proposal and see no reason for these actions. I urge you not to acquire the lands as proposed. These actions will not impact the quality of the water. Let the landowners take care of their properties. I do agree that keeping the lake at 1120 feet is beneficial. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-047 | -01 | To Whom it May Concern: I am a Beaver Lake property owner that will be somewhat affected by the land acquisition proposal. I would prefer to have no changes in the current property status. I'd rather Corp money go to set up a system to help keep the lake healthy and pristine without taking property and affecting values. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-048 | -01 | Our land location on Beaver Lake does not flood. We take pride in keeping our dock in good order and up to specifications. It seems to us that doing all the procedures in areas that don't flood is a waste of taxpayers money. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-049 | -01 | To Whom it May Concern: Attn: Chief~Real Estate Division: Re: the property located at 3115 CR148, Eureka Springs, AR ("the Property"), I disagree with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("the CoE") Beaver Lake Land Acquisition Proposal. Instead, I agree to release the CoE from any liability associated with any damage to my property as a result of any actions taken by the CoE. More formally, by my submission of this document, I do hearby release, acquit, and forever discharge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("the CoE") and its employees from any and all claims, demands, breaches, causes of action of any nature, liabilities, statutory violations, damages, losses, costs, expenses, liens, or controversies of any kind or nature whatsoever, contractual or implied, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, direct or derivative, whether known or unknown, or which its heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns may hereafter have or claim to have arising out of or related to actions it may take which may damage The Property. As such, I expect The Property to be omitted from the CoE's planned acquisition efforts. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-050 | -01 | I recommend NO action be taken! Remainder of comment was considered Out of Scope | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-051 | -01 | To whom it may concern - Chief of Real Estate Division. I write to adamantly <u>oppose</u> the acquisition of any of the more than 1,000 feet of shoreline of my land on Beaver Lake. I have owned this property since 2003 and thre is no erosion or flooding going on in that cove except for when the CORPS allows the water level to get too high and then generates and drops water level very drastically all at once - when silt and some dirt do leach into the water. If the take level was properly maintained year around this would not happen. I do not believe this acquisition plan is necessary or fair or prudent and state here that I hold the corp harmless in the event of any flooding or erosion - As a major shoreline owner in the cove I am seriously opposed to this proposal. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-052 | -01 | To Whom it may Concern: Hello, my name is Marcia Runge. I feel that things should be left as they are, as the saying goes: "if it's not broke don't fix it." A form should be produced for property owners to sign for the Corps of Engineers "to hold harmless" of flooding owners' property. Our area does not hava a flooding problem. Please re-consider the actions proposed and modify lake level to appease all who may be affected, and keep the lake level at or below 1128 elevation. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-053 | -01 | In the 1950s and 1960s the U.S. Gov. aggressively acquired the land needed for Beaver Lake project. Flood easements were negotiated and acquired as needed. Compensation was paid. Much of the land you now want to take is only an issue because Beaver Lake has eroded its shores <u>all along</u> its 500 mile shoreline. Much of this shoreline has flood easements, some do not. You must leave things as they are. The Corps of Engineers is not entitled to a 2nd bite of the apple. No one, including USACE is entitled to benefit from thier mistakes. I live on Beaver Lake - 40 years. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|----------|--------------|--|
| BLRELA-DEA-054 | -01 | (Partial Comment - remainder is Out of Scope) I own property on Beaver Lake that has been identified as routinely inundated during high lake levels. I have studied the information for acquisition and am opposed. Not everyone can afford to build seawalls to protect their property from washing into the lake. However, it seems to me that the potential to put in a seawall, backfill and restore lost land increases the value of my property significantly, when compared to acquisition by the corps. A potential buyer, with sufficient funds, would find that filling in the inundated area of our property would be a very positive thing for this piece of property. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-055 | -01 | (Partial comment. Remainder is Out of Scope) I own 3,000' of corp line in the back part of Little Clifty cove where North Clifty Creek meets Beaver Lake. I have owned it for 10 years now and the past 2 years we have lived here. I believe I have been the best tenant to this land in the past 60 years... I actually can't believe that our Country, being current over 30 trillion dollars in debit, is going to use our tax payers money to buy useless land that sometimes floods and no one can build on because of this. I have no issues with the flooding that occurs and look at it as part of the ecosystem here.... Please just leave the boundaries where they are. Will this then set a president where you could take all of my fields that I have been paying taxes on for a decade and actually keeping the rift raft out from trashing it? | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-056 | -01 | The lake level has been maintained perfectly over the years. I seen no reason to make any changes after all these years with the current Take-Line configuration. There are unanswered questions, and it is my fear that changing the Take-Line will result in confusion and heartache for those of us who love Beaver Lake. Please leave the Take-Line where it is now. Thank you for your consideration. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-057 | -01 | I am against the Beaver Lake Land Acquisition because it will take lakeshore between our house and the lake which over a period of time would block our view of the lake. The present Corp line has been present since the 1950's and has not been a problem. Also, no notice was given to affected landowners about the land acquisition meetings which was very deceitful and done purposefully to stifle opposition and input. The compensationn for loss of our shoreline will not be commensurate with the loss of our front yard, lake view and shoreline. The Corps can't protect or care for the shoreline as we have. The Corps has done nothing to protect the shoreline or remove garbage. In the past 3 years the Corps has caused more shoreline damage since the lake was formed which has caused more sediment in the lake. The Corps is discriminating against individual landowners by granting special consideration to private and commercial business for shoreline acquisition. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-058 | -01 | I am a property owner impacted by the proposed land acquisition study. I am very disappointed that I had to learn of this acquisition study via word of mouth and that the Corp of Engineers did not send me or other landowners that border Corps property a letter outlining something so significant as asking for input on acquiring our land. My property is on Edgewater Drive south of Mundell Road. In my instance the lake water that encroaches onto my property at extreme high water is minimal and does not impact the use of my land at all. It is a very rocky shoreline and would never be considered for building any kind of structure. For my property I would recommend that the Corp of Engineers make no changes at all. If this initiative moves forward at all toward a land acquisition I would like to meet a representative from COE at the shoreline ASAP to understand what would be considered to amend my lot line. I would also like the COE to please communicate to me in writing about this initiative as it progresses. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-059 | -01 | (Partial - remainder of comment included in Questions/Clarifications) We're writing to offer landowner feedback regarding the USACE - Beaver Lake Land Acquisition. Our first email offering input was sent on 6/2/2021... Bringing us closer to the matter at hand, as you know from our prior correspondence last year, we have absolutely no interest in selling any part of our property. Having just semi-retired in 2020, 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 it is proving difficult. Our ownership of this property in no way obstructs the USACE ability to manage the lake or water level of the lake, or any other part of necessary lake operations. Today the USACE 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. As shared last year, if you would like us to grant the USACE 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 for recreation and to keep it clear of dangerous debris as mentioned above.... In summary: We are in complete opposition to selling any part of our property. We've worked very hard over the years to afford the purchase of this lakefront parcel which is the most valuable piece of our property & most used by our family. Our property shoreline has intermittently been water inundated since 1966 when Beaver Lake was completed. Please feel free to continue to do so. We & prior owners understood that this is just a part of what the Corps needs to do periodically. Not once have we complained, nor will we. Our recommendation: Keep managing the lake as you have since 1966. Continue managing the water level and inundating our property as needed, we are fine with this and understand the need. 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. Please consider allocating this money toward other meaningful projects which would have a positive impact for all vs a negative impact on private property owners. We would be open to negotiating a full USACE 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 | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-060 | -01 | I'm writing in regards to the property you are attempting to acquire that I have maintained for more than 40 years. What is 40 years of maintenance and development worth? I am strongly opposed to the government attempting to acquire lands that have been flooded by their own mismanagement and lack of funding. Your entity is attempting to take the most valuable piece of my property for fair market value. What is fair market value for a priceless piece of property? In no way shape or form should the corps benefit from their own ineptness. I would furthermore agree to not hold the corp liable for any damages caused flooding, debris and erosion past and future and would be willing to sign a legal document to that effect. Effectively saving millions of dollars that would allow for better parks, ramps, management and control of the lake which is an area that's a higher priority than attempting to purchase land that no one is going to use anyway. If anything, I implore you investigate those that have built structures, ramps and walkways that extend into the lake which is a violation of your shoreline management plan and make an example of them by making them remove at their own cost. Execution of your proposal will result in litigation and drastically increase the cost of this project. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|--|-------------|--------------|---|
| BLRELA-DEA-061 | -01 | Is this really a public comment because it appears no one else gets to see or hear about it? This platform is very similar to the public hearing that was denied public access. Where is the due process in any of this taking private property. If the USACE takes these properties it will start domino effect across the country of taking of States revenues, tourism, and Citizen's Constitutional Rights. The right to own property is very elementary. The USACE after 70 years of mistakes is attempting to profit and take the most basic of rights away from those who sacrificed for generations to enjoy their property and access to Beaver Lake. These families have put their soul into these legacy properties in terms of money, hard work, and maintenance. There is nothing to be gained in the taking of these properties especially according to the mission statement of these aquisitions, which is better water quality. How is taking someone's property going to change water quality? The erosions of the shoreline are in the control of the USACE and yet USACE continues to erode the shorelines more so today than ever. I would appreciate any common sense answers to these basic questions that can't seem to be answered through this hostile taking of private property. Please note legislators that this program will also lower the tax base for schools and lower sales taxes for the state. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-062 | -01 | (Partial - remainder of comment in Questions/Clarifications) No Action! Doesn't the Corps already have the right to flood and control of what is built in these areas without the expenditure of US taxpayer dollars to remedy such a small problem? | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-063 | -01 | I own parcel XXXX, part of which is a Potential Acquisition Area (PAA). The configuration of that parcel, when intersected with the PAA, has the *potential* to create an orphan parcel. By that I mean the PAA may completely cut the parcel in such a way as to create an island parcel, not connected to the rest of my property and thus I will need to cross my neighbors property to access my property. The reason I say *potential* is that there are known spatial positioning errors in the GIS data held by Benton County, the aerial photographs used in the USACoE mapping application as well as the mapping representation(s) of the USACoE boundaries. Overlapping all these errors is difficult and thus the true intersection cannot be known until a survey crew can assess all of these issues. However, I want to alert the USACoE to this potential at this property - as well as the possibility that it may occur in other properties across Beaver Lake. Additionally, if the PAA does *not* create an orphan parcel it may create a functional orphan parcel as it may be connected to my property by a very small corridor (10-30 feet wide). As you are planning, not acquiring as of yet, this scenario should be considered and taken into account as it may require you to purchase additional property. | Real Estate | Alternatives | The acreage of any private land parcels purchased from willing sellers will be determined by land surveys - not based on GIS data. Decisions on any "orphan parcels" identified by the survey would be made during landowner negotiations. |
| BLRELA-DEA-064 | -01 | Hello. My name is Chloe Lawson. My husband and I are property owners with land that connects to the lake. We do not support your proposal. We value our land, not the market value and we are not interested in being forced What is concerning is that we never received any notice of your proposal via email or phone call, which does not bode well for building a trusting relationship within the community. Also, will this set a precedent where every 5-10 years we will lose more property for your project? We support conservation in the Natural State but we do not support this decision. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-065 | -01 | We attended the public meeting in Bentonville, looked at the displays, talked with the various representatives of the Corp. We cannot see any benefit of the COE acquiring additional land currently owned by approx 500 landowners. It is a hugh waste of tax payer dollars for no to little gain. The COE does not take care of the land they own now which will only get worse if they acquire more. We are looking out our window at War Eagle Creek near Point 12 and the debris is terrible. No to the proposed acquisition. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-066 | -01 | The Corps of Engineers should leave the take lines on properties as they have been for 50 years. The Corps has more land that it can maintain now --including land at the end of CR 108 which served as a Corps park and is now leased out. The Corps should be taking care of the property they have and not acquiring more from land owners. | Planning | Alternatives | Chapter 3.6.2.2 of revised EA: Proposed Action - Purchase land according to prescribed elevations in Design Memorandum <i>from willing sellers only</i> . |
| BLRELA-DEA-067 | -01 | In reading the Feb 2022 Draft EA, I would like to dispute the screening out of Alternatives 5, 6, and 7. One issue I have is that there is absolutely no citation, no evidence, no model, no data, nor explanation to the core reasoning which screened these three alternatives out. There is in essence a one sentence statement in Alternative 5, while the reasoning for screening out Alternatives 6 and 7 simply refers back to Alternative 5. The statement in the Draft EA is "Lowering the flood pool elevation would result in increased risk to life and property downstream as a result of increased occurrences of emergency surcharge operations." and it is completely insufficient. How many feet was considered in lowering the flood pool? 1 foot, 10 feet, 100 feet? Was there an analysis to how many additional lives are at risk? Is it 1 or 1,000 or 1,000,000? What is the additional risk to properties? Is it land or structures? Is it \$1.00, \$1,000 \$100,000,000? How many additional occurrences of emergency surcharges is it? 1 per year? 100 per year? How exactly would lowering the flood pool result in increase risk? What USACoE operations would increase this risk? Without any information such as that how is it possible to make the statement that is written? The spirit of NEPA is transparency in governmental operations and to give proper consideration of the impacts of these operations. The sentence in the Draft EA completely violates this spirit as it is used as flawed logical reasoning to eliminate three alternatives simultaneously. | H&H | Alternatives | Additional discussion added to Chapters 3.6.1.3 and 3.6.1.4 (Alts. 5 and 6). An analysis of different lowering depths (1 foot, 10 feet, etc), number of lives or value of property at increased risk, is not required. As discussed in the Chapters listed above, any reduction in flood storage would result in an increased risk to life and property. Regardless of the increment, USACE cannot prioritize reduction of flooding on lakeside private property over potential loss of life. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|----------|-----|--|
| BLRELA-DEA-067 | -02 | <p>An additional issue I have with the Draft EA is that an alternative that was not even listed is instituting a policy whereby Beaver Lake is managed so the water level stays closer to the middle/bottom of the conservation pool than at the top of the flood pool - in particular with respect to coming into the rainy season. The bottom of the conservation pool can be not lower than 1076 while the top of the current flood pool is 1130. That is plenty of elevation (and acre-feet of water) to work with. If Beaver Lake is managed so when coming into the rainy season, the level is generally closer to the middle/bottom of the conservation pool there will be plenty of head room for rains to be held back and the adjacent landowners of Beaver Lake would not receive flood waters nor would there be any affect to downstream projects and/or landowners. It would not be intellectually honest to say that there are to many unknowns to implement this as a policy because you actually are doing this right now with the Beaver Lake Dam Interim Risk Reduction Measures. Additionally, for the next three years, you will be collecting real data on how well this IRRM policy supplies the multiple needs/uses of Beaver Lake (as opposed to your statement above which has no data backing it up). Managing Beaver Lake in this manner would be much cheaper than acquiring land (and you will not have alter the flood nor the conservation pools) and it would be impossible for this policy to increase the risk of downstream lives and/or property as it would literally be holding waters. In conclusion, instituting a policy which manages Beaver Lake to be closer to the middle of the existing conservation pool coming into the rainy season would be more akin to one of the core missions of the USACoE - flood *control* as opposed to *controlled* flooding which occurs when the level of the lake is left close to the top of the flood pool coming into rainy season which leaves the USACoE no option but to flood the lands in question.</p> | Planning | H&H | <p>This "new" alternative is essentially Alternitive 7 in the Draft EA "Lower both flood and conservation pools to avoid flooding private property". Rationale for screening is included in Sections 3.6.1.3 and 3.6.1.5</p> |
|----------------|-----|---|----------|-----|--|

| Beaver Lake Proposed Land Acquisition - Draft EA Comment - Out of Scope/Non-Substantive | |
|--|--|
| Submission Number | Notes (Why out of Scope) |
| BLRELA-DEA-007-02 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008-4 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008-5 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008-8 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-DEA-008-12 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-DEA-042-3 | Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study. |
| BLRELA-DEA-042-4 | Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study. |
| BLRELA-DEA-042-5 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-DEA-050 | Comments indicate lack of support for an action without justification. |
| BLRELA-DEA-054 | Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study. |
| BLRELA-DEA-055 | Comments provide concern for a project/action or location that is outside the scope of the Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study. |

| Beaver Lake Proposed Land Acquisition - Draft EA Comment - Questions Asked | | |
|--|---|-------------|
| Submission Number | Question | Category |
| BLRELA-DEA-005 | I'm just wanting a ballpark figure on this acquisition or how the amount will be determined. Thank you for any information you can provide. | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-DEA-030 | Also, currently there is a Spring on the proposed acquisition property. It is has a constructed rock wall around it to protect it. I was told that historically it was the source of drinking water for the area. If something ever happens to my water supply, that is my source for water. What would happen in this case? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-DEA-033 | Could we have a little extra time to gather comments? We did not see the latest release with the updated information. | Planning |
| BLRELA-DEA-043-2 | What happens when the corps floods the lands above the magic 1128 elevation after they buy the land? Do they then have to pay the land owners for flooding this land or do they try to buy or take it? Or do they just flood it like they have for all these past years? | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-DEA-059 | <p>To share further & update our comments on your most recent documents, to include the NEPA required Environmental Assessment :</p> <p>1) USACE stated that the "Problem": "Since construction of the Beaver Lake Project, the fulfillment of Congressionally-authorized project purposes has been hampered by the inability of the Government to manage those parcels along the shoreline which are in private ownership." Our property has no alterations which would hamper or otherwise restrict the USACE to fully manage the lake.</p> <p>2) USACE stated "Planning Objective" • "Maximize the ability of the Beaver Lake Project to manage the Congressionally authorized purposes effectively and efficiently." Our property has no alterations which would hamper or otherwise restrict the USACE to fully manage Beaver Lake effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>3) Stated in your Environmental Assessment Draft: "Some owners of the private property that the Government failed to acquire as required in the REDM have built structures that have reduced needed flood storage and have impeded Recreation and Shoreline Management missions. These trends are on the rise due to growing development pressures at the Reservoir." Our property has not been altered in any manner which would cause a reduced flood storage or impede recreation or shoreline management missions.</p> <p>4) USACE stated: "Fiscal year 2022 funding includes funds to begin the process of acquiring identified land parcels needed for management of the Project." We've heard conflicting accounts of the actual funding available and what specifically your longer term plans are to include a timeline thereof. Could you please share the exact funding available and how many of the 161 acres this funding is expected to impact.</p> <p>5) With regard to the 161 acres. This is only .0056 or .56% added to the already 28,299 area acres the USACE controls, and it's hard to imagine that this is going to have any material impact on points 1 & 2 above. Could you help me better understand the real benefit you are expecting to attain, and the cost vs benefit of using tax payer dollars for this project.</p> <p>6) USACE website content regarding Flowage Easements: "As an Owner of Flowage Easement Land, You May Not: Construct or maintain any structure for human habitation, permanent or temporary, on the flowage easement land. Also, placing or raising of a structure within the easement area by use of piling or other type of foundation or raising of the site through use of fill is prohibited. Place or construct any other structure or appurtenances to existing structures on the flowage easement land without prior written approval of the District Engineer. "Other structures" are construed to mean any kind of structure including but not limited to buildings, ramps, ditches, channels, dams, dikes, wells, earthen tanks, roads, utility lines and tramways." I share this content to again ask that you consider flowage easements as an alternative to any type of forced land fee acquisition. This defined flowage easement seems to meet what you are wanting to achieve.</p> | Planning |
| BLRELA-DEA-062 | Why are you not dealing directly with the 500 red zone owners? What are the names and addresses of all 500 red zone owners? Also contact information. Please publish this information. | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-DEA-068 | I am a landowner bordering Beaver Lake and I'm impacted by this initiative. I want to be notified by mail of the progress of this assessment. Considering this impacts my property line with the Corp I should not be learning about this via word of mouth. | Planning |

NWA EDITORIAL | Land owners want Beaver Lake plan to take a dive

Lakeside owners worry about Corps' plan *by* [NWA Democrat-Gazette](#) | August 22, 2021 at 1:00 a.m.

Follow



RED SKY AT MORNING. The morning sky takes on a reddish hue at sunrise on Tuesday Aug. 17 2021 at Beaver Lake near Rocky Branch park east of Rogers. The saying, "Red sky at morning, sailors warning. Red sky at night, sailors delight" is from a rhyme often repeated by mariners. Go to nwaonline.com/210818Daily/ to see more photos..(NWA Democrat-Gazette/Flip Putthoff)

Sometimes an idea floated can sink like an anchor.

That's not exactly what's happened to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' plan to acquire some of the private property around Beaver Lake on which the lake's waters often rise. In this case, the idea remains afloat, but a good number of lakeside property owners would love to swamp it.

Lakes rise and fall all the time, based on precipitation within their watershed area and on the needs for power generation at the dams built to form the lakes. A primary goal of lakes like Beaver Lake, which is part of the White River system, is flood control.

In a perfect world, the Corps prefers to own and control all the land usually, or even occasionally, submerged by the lake's waters. Back in the late 1950s and early 1960s, when Beaver Lake was built, the federal government acquired the land necessary for the lake, but a lack of funding kept the land acquisition on the conservative side.

Normally, it seems, if one landowner was regularly flooding an adjacent landowner's property, the owner being flooded would be frustrated. But on a big lake, having the shoreline come up into a piece of property makes it all the more valuable. And instead of the Corps controlling everything at the water's edge, the private property owner has more control. Not having to ask the federal government for permission, whether to build structures or landscape or even just mow, can be valuable, too.

Now, the Corps says it's probably going to want all or most of the land the lake inundates. The agency is studying how to make that happen through negotiated purchases or even the last-resort use of eminent domain.

The Corps estimates its plan affects as many as 500 property owners, some of whom want to tell the Corps to go jump in a lake. Why, those property owners say, does the Corps need to change a situation everyone has been living with for 50 years-plus?

The answer? It is about control. It's proper for the Corps to own the land Beaver Lake regularly floods, the agency says. Controlling activities around the lake's border is also important, given Beaver Lake serves as the drinking water source for Northwest Arkansas residents.

This is going to be a years-long process, all dependent on the availability of money for the Corps. That's always a big question mark. Meantime, it's fair that people expect a compelling answer as to why the status quo isn't acceptable. Sen. John Boozman says it ought to be. And just as when the lake was built, landowners don't care much for the idea of giving up property, even if they'll be compensated.

One thing is for sure: The more the Corps presses the issue, the more property owners are going to make waves.



NEWS RELEASE

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

BUILDING STRONG®

Release No: 46-22
Release: Immediately
Aug. 30, 2022

Contact: Public Affairs, 501-324-5551
ceswl-pa@usace.army.mil
Media after hours: 501-563-6835

USACE announces second public workshop for Beaver Lake land acquisition study

ROGERS, Ark. -- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is hosting a drop-in public workshop from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. September 13 at the Four Points by Sheraton Bentonville, 211 SE Walton Blvd., Bentonville, Arkansas. Information will be available at the workshop regarding potentially impacted properties and the newly proposed willing sellers only acquisition alternative. All interested persons are invited to attend the workshop and provide comments. Representatives from the Little Rock District will be present to answer questions on the acquisition process.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for flood control, power, and other purposes. An accompanying Real Estate Design Memorandum developed prior to construction identified land and interests necessary for the operation and maintenance of the reservoir. The methods and technology used to identify and purchase these lands at the time left some low-lying areas unacquired. As a result, the current Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake does not meet the full mission requirements.

-MORE-

USACE initiated a process in March 2021 to assess all low-lying private land parcels along Beaver Lake that were unacquired by USACE in the original acquisition. to include, the White River, and War Eagle Creek Analysis showed the insufficient land base has negative impacts on the Congressionally mandated missions and identified approximately 500 landowners that may be impacted. The USACE is attempting to contact potentially impacted property owners by mail to invite them to attend and comment.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable laws and regulations, a 30-day public comment period will begin on September 13 and end on October 13. Information regarding the revised acquisition process and comment instructions will be available beginning September 1 at the following Little Rock District website: <https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/>

For questions, please contact the Beaver Lake Project Office at (501) 340-1230 or the Little Rock District Office at (501) 324-5551. Written questions and comments can be submitted online at <https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/Public-Comment-Form-BVL/> or mailed to Project Manager, PPMD, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 or emailed to CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil.

--30--



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LITTLE ROCK DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 867
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72203-0867

August 30, 2022

**Agency and Stakeholder Workshop
Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Little Rock District (USACE) is conducting a second scoping period for the Beaver Lake Proposed Land Acquisition Study in response to comments received during the public review of the Draft Environmental Assessment. As part of this effort, USACE is scheduling a State/Federal Agency and Stakeholder workshop from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. September 13, 2022 at the Four Points by Sheraton Bentonville, 211 SE Walton Blvd., Bentonville, Arkansas. Information will be available at the workshop regarding potentially impacted properties and a proposed willing seller only acquisition process. All interested persons are invited to attend the workshop and provide comments. The purpose of this stakeholder workshop is to share information on the study and to seek your participation and comments.

The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for flood control, power, and other purposes. A Real Estate Design Memorandum developed prior to construction identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance, and control of the reservoir. The methods and technology used to identify and purchase these lands at the time left some low-lying areas unacquired by USACE. As a result, the current Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake does not meet the full mission requirements.

USACE initiated a study in March 2021 to evaluate all areas around the reservoir, the White River, and War Eagle Creek that an acquisition could potentially affect. Analysis shows the insufficient land base has negative impacts to the Congressionally mandated missions. Currently, USACE estimates approximately 500 landowners are impacted.

USACE will host a public scoping workshop in the afternoon from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the same location. Agency staff and Stakeholders are welcome to attend that workshop as well. The second scoping period will help improve public awareness and allow USACE to collect additional public comments on both the proposed land acquisition study and the new proposed acquisition strategy.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable laws and regulations, a 30-day public comment period will begin on **September 13, 2022, and end on October 13, 2022**. Please find information regarding the study, revised acquisition process and comment instructions available beginning September 1, 2022, at the following Little Rock District website:

<https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/>

For questions, please contact the Beaver Lake Project Office at (501) 340-1230 or the Little Rock District Office at (501) 324-5551. Written questions and comments can be submitted online at **<https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/Public-Comment-Form-BVL/>** or e-mailed to the following address:

CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil

Comments may also be sent through the mail to ATTN: Project Manager, PPMD 700 W Capitol Avenue, Federal Building 7th Floor, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

Sincerely,

Derek J. Murken
Operations Project Manager
Beaver Lake Project Office



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LITTLE ROCK DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 867
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72203-0867

August 30, 2022

Public Notice

Beaver Lake Real Estate Land Acquisition Study

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Little Rock District is conducting a second National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping period for the proposed Beaver Lake Land Acquisition in response to the comments received during the public review of the Draft Environmental Assessment. USACE is studying a new, additional alternative that narrows the focus of possible land acquisitions to willing sellers only. The second scoping period is to collect public comments on the new proposed alternative.

USACE is scheduling a drop-in public scoping workshop from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. September 13, 2022 at the Four Points by Sheraton Bentonville, 211 SE Walton Blvd., Bentonville, Arkansas. The workshop will provide information regarding potentially impacted properties and the acquisition process. All interested persons are invited to attend the workshop and provide comments.

USACE initiated a process in March 2021 to assess and possibly acquire low-lying private land parcels along Beaver Lake that could be impacted during normal lake operations. The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized construction of Beaver Lake for flood control, hydroelectric power, and other purposes. An accompanying Real Estate Design Memorandum developed prior to construction identified land and interests necessary for the operation, maintenance, and control of the reservoir. The methods and technology used to identify and purchase these lands at the time left some low-lying areas unacquired by USACE. As a result, the current Federal Government boundary around Beaver Lake does not meet the full mission requirements.

USACE performed an analysis of low-lying areas around the reservoir and found properties where the original acquisition did not purchase all required real property interests. The USACE estimates approximately 500 landowners are potentially impacted, and will provide informational stations at the workshop so that people can identify and understand the location of those properties

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable laws and regulations, a 30-day public comment period will begin on **September 13, 2022 and end on October 13, 2022**. Information regarding the revised acquisition process and comment instructions will be available beginning September 13, 2022 at the following Little Rock District website:

<https://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Real-Estate/Beaver-Lake-Land-Acquisition/>

For questions, please contact the Beaver Lake Project Office at (501) 340-1230 or the Little Rock District Office at (501) 324-5551. Written questions and comments can be mailed to Beaver Lake Project Office, 2260 N. 2nd Street, Rogers, Arkansas 72726 or emailed to CESWL-BeaverLakeAcquisitionPublicComment@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Derek J. Murken
Operations Project Manager
Beaver Lake Project Office

| Submission Record | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Submission Number | Date Submitted | Organization (Only if on Official Letterhead or submitted on behalf of Organization) | Form Letter | Submission Type | Duplicate |
| BLRELA-S2-001 | 9/8/2022 | Arkansas Historic Preservation Program | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-002 | 9/11/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-003 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-004 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-005 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-006 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-007 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-008 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-009 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-010 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-011 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-012 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-013 | 9/13/2022 | | No | Workshop | No |
| BLRELA-S2-014 | 9/14/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-015 | 9/15/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-016 | 9/16/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-017 | 9/17/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-018 | 9/25/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-019 | 9/26/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-020 | 10/2/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-021 | 10/5/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-022 | 10/5/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-023 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-024 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-025 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-026 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-027 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-028 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-029 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | Yes |
| BLRELA-S2-030 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-031 | 10/6/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-032 | 10/10/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-033 | 10/10/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-034 | 10/10/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-035 | 10/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-036 | 10/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-037 | 10/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-038 | 10/11/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|---|----|--------|----|
| | | Mitchell, Williams, Selig, Gates & Woodyard, P.L.L.C. | | | |
| BLRELA-S2-039 | 10/12/2022 | Attorneys at Law | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-040 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-041 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-042 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-043 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-044 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-045 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-046 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-047 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |
| BLRELA-S2-048 | 10/12/2022 | | No | E-Mail | No |

| Substantive Comments | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------|
| Submission Number | Comment | Category | Area of Concern |
| BLRELA-S2-001 | <p>The staff of the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) reviewed the scoping letter for the proposed land acquisition for property around Beaver Lake in Benton County that is not yet owned by the United States Corps of Engineers (USACE). Based on the provided information, the AHPP has no issue with the proposed acquisition of the properties around Beaver Lake. As mentioned in the draft Environmental Assessment, properties owned by USACE are subject to the National Historic Preservation Act and are subject to review for historic properties, therefore if any ground disturbance were to take place in the future, historic properties would be protected.</p> <p>Tribes that have expressed an interest in the area include the Cherokee Nation, the Osage Nation, the Shawnee Tribe, and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians. We recommend consultation in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2).</p> | Environmental | Cultural Resources |
| BLRELA-S2-002 | (Summary) I would like to suggest a better way for the USACE to acquire selected parcels of land around Beaver Lake, than simply dividing owners of to-be-acquired shoreline property into two groups of, (1) Willing Sellers, and (2) Unwilling Sellers. Apparently you have decided that all affected landowners will be "sellers" whether they like it or not! However, by doing so, you also will create considerable ill feelings toward the government, often which can only be reconciled through prolonged and costly formal Court proceedings. In doing so, you may have overlooked a group of affected landowners who might be willing to exchange their occasionally flooded property for an equally valued parcel of nearby USACE dry land, through an in-kind swap procedure. (particular example given in letter). | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-004 | We feel the willing seller only proposition is a positive first step. We came to the meeting to find out if we would be impacted, and how we should plan. All our fears were laid to rest & everything was explained. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-005 | 1) I prefer not to sale. (question included in Questions/Clarification Tab. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-006 | Full support of voluntary sales only. Open to discussion of shoreline management plan benefitting all. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-007 | We aren't willing sellers. We want to make sure NO imminent domain actions occur. Fine if other land owners want to sell. We don't obstruct the water and try to be mindful of Corp regulations. The new "mission" is in question, don't see the benefit. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-008 | We think this is a good idea and would be willing to consider surveying our affected property and possibly selling all or part of the area. | Planning / Real Estate | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-009 | We are NOT willing to sell. We are AGAINST imminent domain action of any kind. We have no objection to others selling their property if that is their wish. I see no benefit to the corps "mission" by taking more property. The "mission" has been fine for the last 70 years. This looks like a land grab. Greed. Completely unnecessary. | Planning / Real Estate | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-011 | To Whom it may concern. At this time we do not want to sell back any land. We are trying to keep the soil from washing into the lake by not clear any trees at the top of the mountains. | | |
| BLRELA-S2-012 | This is the second meeting we've been to. We came to the prior meeting, and we're very, very concerned because of the imminent domain part of this land acquisition. What we're understanding right now, it's only willing sellers. So, if that's true, we would support that, of course, much more than the first option. | Planning | Alternatives |

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-------------|--------------------|
| BLRELA-S2-013 | I live at 10777 Gram B. Circle in Lowell, Arkansas, and my property is one of 500 that are affected by the Project. I've been involved in making comments throughout the initial process, and I wanted to make a comment to the effect that I'm pleased the Corp is stepping back and looking at an alternative process, where it's not an involuntary taking, as opposed to looking at volunteers, people that are willing to sell. Realizing that is not likely to solve the entirety of your problem, I am hopeful that there will be additional input into alternative ways to consider which properties are involved in whatever process of acquisition that takes place. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-014 | Thank you for taking the time to host the September 13 meeting. I appreciate the COE listening to previous comments and changing the land acquisition approach. I am in favor of the new approach (working with willing sellers) and not forcing unwilling property owners to sell. My family and I are NOT willing to sell any portion of our land at this point. Thank you again for listening and acting on the land owners' feedback. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-017 | We own one of the parcels that extends into Beaver Lake. We are thrilled that the USACE has decided not to force the sell of private property. Thank you. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-018 | I have owned my property since 1983 and have never had any problems when the lake level has been high. Based on my history and experience I have no interest in selling property at this time. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-019 | I am one of the land owners who is affected by the land acquisition proposal. I attended the Public Meeting held in Rogers, AR on September 13, 2022. I was very pleased with the new proposed alternative put forth by the corp. Given the history of the lake I think it is only fair that land owners be given a choice on whether or not to sell their property to the corp. I was very unhappy with the way that the corp originally handled this issue. It felt very sneaky and underhanded. I only heard about the land acquisition by happenstance and I'm grateful that landowners spoke out against it. Transparency is always the best route and I was surprised that the corp failed to originally notify affected land owners. Thank you for taking a step back and devising the new alternative proposal. I fully support it. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-021 | Thank you for the alternative to acquire land from willing sellers only. I fully support that method. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-022 | I'm in favor of the amended proposal that includes willing sellers only. This will allow a more equitable transfer of some of the property. The study could be reassessed or expanded at another time should the need still exist. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-023 | I support purchasing from willing sellers only. I am a landowner who has land that is affected by this proposal. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-024 | I am in favor of the Corp purchasing land from willing sellers Only. NO imminent domain. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-025 | The corp should be able to purchase land from willing sellers. Absolutely do not support imminent domain. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-026 | I support purchasing land from willing sellers only. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-027 | We support purchases of land from willing sellers only for an amount negotiated and agreed upon by the landowners. We do not support acquisition of land without monetary compensation or if a landowner is unwilling to sell. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-028 | I think changing the acquisition to willing sellers only is definitely preferable. As one of the property owners who will be affected, I hope to have the option. I love Beaver Lake and my property and definitely would be disappointed to be forced to relinquish it. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-030 | I am in favor of the Corp buying land from willing sellers only. I do NOT agree with their ability to impose imminent domain. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-031 | (Summary) You called this pm and asked for comments. We were never notified of the 9-13 workshop, so no knowledge of any of it. We are NOT willing to sell any land because we have no idea what you want or where the new boundary would be. I gave you permission to survey around a year or so ago and have never heard anything or been contacted. (Remainder of comment describes shoreline erosion issues). | Real Estate | Public Involvement |

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| BLRELA-S2-032 | NO additional land should be purchased around Beaver Lake. IF any additional land is purchased from private land owners by the Corps of Engineers, it should be from WILLING SELLERS ONLY, and ABSOLUTELY NO FORCED SALES BY EMINENT DOMAIN and the remaining targeted sellers should be given a guarantee in writing, that no further land will be acquired by eminent domain. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-033 | I support the new proposed alternative to acquire affected parcels from WILLING SELLERS ONLY. We own one of the affected land parcels. If any portion of our property were acquired by the Corps, it would greatly diminish the value of our property. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-034 | (Summary) NO additional land should be purchased around Beaver Lake. If any additional land is purchased from private land owners by the Corps of Engineers, it should be from WILLING SELLERS ONLY, not forced sales by eminent domain. The time for land acquisition by the Corps of Engineers at Beaver Lake has long passed!!! Majority of comment references land values, trash, erosion, etc. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-035 | I support the latest proposal to acquire land from people willing to sell. This makes sense and is a win-win for both the land owners and the USCE. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-036 | Eminent Domain is the government's legal excuse for stealing land. It stinks. The fact that the Army Corps of Engineers failed to notify each and every land owner affected by this proposal in advance of the process, and the "Public" meeting speaks volumes about how the Eminent Domain process "works". Although I was unable to attend the "Public" meeting, I haven't heard anything which explains the necessity for the purchase of this land. Green New Deal ? | Project Management | Public Involvement |
| BLRELA-S2-037 | I have tried to review information on your site and find it to be the least user friendly of any sight I have ever used. That being said, I received a letter dated August 30, 2022. The only date available, September 13, did not afford me the opportunity as I was out of town and could not be present. I want it to be made clear that I do not wish to sell any portion of my land along the shoreline or inland portion. Information provided is too vague to fully understand. | Project Management | Public Involvement |
| BLRELA-S2-038 | I fully 100% support the new proposal of purchasing of land ONLY FROM WILLING SELLERS. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-039 | (Summary) To state simply, Wayne and Jerri Eaton support fully the Corps' decions to revise its acquisition strategy to focus on willing sellers. The Corps should further memorialize this strategy by updating the relevatn environmental impact review and tailoring the revised analysis to reflect the narrowed focus. | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-040 | The statements have been made "that all residents affected have been contacted". We have never been contacted and our property was shown on the 1st map. I could not get the currrent map to open. I am grateful that only willing sellers will have their property acquired. We have only had our property for 3.5 years but we are being responsible and take care of areas of erosion caused by the water. It is a beautiful lake and we want to keep it beautiful, sustained and useable for generations to come. | Planning/Project Management | Alternatives/Public Involvement |
| BLRELA-S2-041 | I am against all land acquisitions on Beaver Lake. The only exception for land acquisitions would be for "willing sellers only". | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-042 | Hello-I own property impacted by this Beaver Lake Land Acquisition Study. My 4.7 acres are located near Edgewater Drive south of Mundell Road. I was very pleased to learn that the land acquisition is being proposed to be changed to willing sellers only. How my property is impacted at high water is unlikely to alter how I or others in the future use that land that floods. I will not be a willing seller. It's not worth my effort or CoE's effort and tax dollars to change the property line. Thank you to the Corps for listening to the input of the property owners and offering us this option. | Planning | Alternatives |

| | | | |
|---------------|--|----------|--------------|
| BLRELA-S2-043 | <p>Attached, please find our comment form. We are glad that the revised plan affects willing sellers only. As unwilling sellers, feel free to remove us from any potential efforts to purchase our land. As an affected property owner with property on Henry Hollow, I commend the Corps for revising its plans to include willing sellers only. The part of our property under consideration is a central part of our trail system, does not suffer from flooding, and as long as we are its owners, will never be developed. Therefore, it does not fit the profile of the justification for acquisition. Moreover, we will never be willing sellers.</p> <p>We have no problem with the Corps acquiring land from willing sellers, and are very happy that the Corps takes preserving the natural character of the lake so seriously. Indeed, we looked at property in many other states before buying a lake house on Beaver. Its natural beauty, combined with our ability to have a dock adjacent to our property, is what made us owners here.</p> | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-044 | <p>(Summary) IF ANY further land is acquired, it hould be ONLY from WILLING SELLERS. There should be ABSOLUTELY NO FORCED SALES OF LAND FROM PRIVATE OWNERS TO THE CORPS!!! IF the Corps proceeds with Only Purchasing Land From Willing Sellers, the Corps should give WRITTEN GUARANTEE to the remaining land owners that they WILL NOT come back and take the remaining land by eminent domain. Majority of comment references trash and erosion.</p> | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-046 | <p>(Summary) IF ANY MORE LAND IS PURCHASED BY THE CORPS, IT SHOULD BE FROM WILLING SELLERS ONLY!!! THERE SHOULD BE ABSOLUTELY NO FORCED SALES OF PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY TO THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS!!! POSITIVELY NO EMINENT DOMAIN TO FORCE ANY SALES!!! Majority of comment references property values and lack of communication.</p> | Planning | Alternatives |
| BLRELA-S2-048 | <p>We appreciate that the verbiage changed to "willing sellers only" as we feel it was an important adjustment to the way the acquisition and study is being proposed. It is important to keep in mind that no land owner should feel forced into selling their private land to a lake that has already been established for the past 60 years. Please keep in mind that there is no reason to spend tax dollars towards acquiring more land when in reality the government funded dollars should be focused on and go towards such things as damn wall replacement, camp site bathroom/shower facility plumbing updates, and other purifications that will provide more sensible environmental benefits to Beaver Lake. The Core already controls and maintains this beautiful lake in a sense that landowners wish to maintain control of the land they originally purchased within their property boundaries and we think it is fair it fair it stays that way.</p> | Planning | Alternatives |

| Out of Scope/Non-Substantive Submissions | |
|--|---|
| Submission Number | Notes (Why out of Scope) |
| BLRELA-S2-015 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |
| BLRELA-S2-016 | Value-based comments that do not provide any justification or facts to back-up the statement. |

| Questions Asked | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Submission Number | Question | Category |
| BLRELA-S2-003 | I received the study packet when I attended the workshop. I apologize: I thought I had more time prior to submitting my questions. If I may still submit, my question would be this: it is my understanding that you are basing your acquisition on elevation levels. If that is the case, there would be a small parcel of our property across the gully (above elevation) to which we would no longer have access. If the Corps would consider purchasing this small parcel as well, we would consider the sale. | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-S2-005 | If will be made sale I would ask how may we have lake access from nearby locations most are close 15 miles from our house. | General |
| BLRELA-S2-010 | As an owner, I would not normally be a willing seller. I would be interested in a tradeoff for dock zoning and permit. | Real Estate |
| BLRELA-S2-020 | My name is Marilyn Hendricks and I own land on Beaver Lake that is potentially affected by the Land Acquisition Study but have never received any mailings from the Corp of Engineers regarding this or any other matter over the years. Two neighboring landowners contacted me and one of them provided me a copy of the letter she received dated August 30, 2022. My property address is 18873 Mayes Road, Fayetteville, AR 72703 and is located on the lake between Blue Springs and Beav-O-Rama. The property was initially owned by my father, Walter Mayes, who passed away in 1987 and subsequently passed on to his children. (At that time, the mailing address showed as Route 1, Fayetteville, AR 72701). Evidently records need to be updated or corrected so that I will get notifications from the Corp affecting Beaver Lake. I have included my mailing address and contact information on the Optional Information form provided and would appreciate any assistance you can provide in this matter. Thank you. | Project Management/ Planning |
| BLRELA-S2-045 | This message in regard to the corps purchasing lake front property in order to control erosion. It will effect me and my neighbors. I have lived on the lake in the same house for 28 years. We have more vegetation on our property along the lake than we ever had. However, the bank has eroded 2 feet deep the entire length in the past 5 years where it never has before. The only thing that has changed is the recent popularization of wake boats. They produce waves much greater than any natural waves are extremely destructive as the evidence shows. Can you not do something about them? | Project Management/ Planning |
| BLRELA-S2-047 | Hello, just wanted to provide feedback that we may be interested in your acquisition of our affected parcel dependent on terms and price. Please keep us advised of your next steps. | Real Estate |

BEAVER LAKE PROPOSED LAND ACQUISITION

Public Website Visitors for Beaver Lake Land Acquisition Subsite:

March 15 – April 16 (2022) – First NEPA Scoping Period

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition HOME PAGE: 952 visits

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition DOCUMENTS: 275 visits

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition: COMMENT-CARD: 280 visits

Feb 23 – March 25 (2022) – Draft Environmental Assessment Comment Period

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition HOME PAGE: 1312 visits

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition DOCUMENTS: 288 visits

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition: COMMENT-CARD: 70 visits

Sep 13 – Oct 15 (2022) – Second NEPA Scoping Period

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition HOME PAGE: 152 visits

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition DOCUMENTS: 275 visits

Beaver Lake Land Acquisition: COMMENT-CARD: 54 visits

Total Visits: 3658