

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 12:32 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan


**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Having reviewed material on your website, I also attended the recent meeting at the United Methodist Church in Shell Knob, MO.

I have been living in this area since 1988. There is nothing about the lake area for which I have found any fault. Wildlife roam through my lakeshore property on a daily basis and they have provided me with a wonderful feeling of tranquility.

My advice about any changes is the old adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." If our country should come out of its present deficit, there are many areas where any excess funds could be better spent.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 12:55 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Ms. Coburn- Received the invitation to attend the master plan public open house, but unfortunately I was unable to attend. In your recommended change to the master plan the land adjacent to mine would convert from 'environmental sensitive' to 'low density recreation'. I currently have a vegetation management permit. Would this, or could this potentially change my ability to renew the permit? If so, how? Thank you for your time. US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---


**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 2:55 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

We are long-time home owners and avid recreational boaters and fishermen. Our family of 8 use the lake frequently.

We prefer Alternative 2C because we have used and seen the destruction of Lake of the Ozarks and do not want the same to happen here. Restrictions on very large watercraft and more control of septic waste are also huge issues.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 1:55 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] AEP/SWEPCO

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Dana,

Thank you for listening to us so patiently on Thursday night at Shell Knob. I know it must be challenging coming up to speed on the AEP/SWEPCO extra high voltage powerline proposal and how it impacts Corp of Engineers property on Table Rock Lake. It has taken us months to get a grasp of what they've been planning for years to do to us.

If you read the EIS and testimony from SWEPCO engineers you learn that they've operated under the belief that "there is no federal nexus" which would require their application to conform to NEPA standards. In fact, US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) in rebuttal testimony <[http://www.apscservices.info/pdf/13/13-041-u\\_274\\_1.pdf](http://www.apscservices.info/pdf/13/13-041-u_274_1.pdf)> in the APSC 13-041-U docket, spent 4 pages describing "the fact" that a NEPA level assessment was not required. We have been in a state of shock since April that they've managed to get this far in their application process and were relieved when the USACOE decided to step in with their July 10 letter. That letter was kept under wraps until July 17, after the public hearings in Eureka Springs were over, and many of us believe that SWEPCO thought it could get away with a poorly done EIS simply because there is a revolving door operating between the company, the APSC and the Southwest Power Pool.

By all rights, SWEPCO should have asked for permits with the Army Corp of Engineers first. Instead, they took the strategy of ignoring the USACOE and planned to get state regulatory permission first, at which point pressure could be applied to get the Corp to go along with what was already a fait accompli.

If you are able to review their EIS for the project, you will find it deficient in a variety of ways when compared to an EIS performed to meet NEPA standards. One of those standards requires that an EIS address a range of alternatives including those offered by parties other than the applicant. SWEPCO offered the APSC only 2 alternatives. Either do nothing, or choose one of 6 highly destructive routes, each of which crossed the White River and KINGS.

We have been disgusted, and due to the revolving door between politics and the APSC commission, have felt powerless. We are all grateful that the Army Corp of Engineers stepped in with the July 10 letter. I personally want to invite you to send an even stronger letter. When you read that they regard NEPA compliance as unnecessary as you will if you read US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) rebuttal testimony <[http://www.apscservices.info/pdf/13/13-041-u\\_274\\_1.pdf](http://www.apscservices.info/pdf/13/13-041-u_274_1.pdf)> you will see that they continue to ignore the part of the July 10 letter in which your agency states that no route would be approved without further study and NEPA compliance. I hope a stronger letter will pull the plug on SWEPCO. You must keep in mind that you are being piecemealed. This proposed crossing is just the first. An even larger 500 kV line is planned by Entergy crossing the lake from the Kings River substation and going to Branson and Springfield. Where are these lines to cross? I have maps that I can share with you, and I can send you links to the planning documents. Or you can go to SavetheOzarks.org, where we are collecting links to important documents and making them available to all those who are deeply concerned about this powerline project.

Thank you so much!

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 2:43 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Stop SWEPCO Power Lines thru NWA

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To Whom it May Concern,

SWEPCO/AEP's plan to eradicate a 50 mile long x 150' wide path through Northwest Arkansas must be looked at more closely by the Corps. As you know NW Arkansas is one of the most natural, most beautiful and most environmentally endangered places in America. It is also one of the few areas that can claim to survive almost solely through tourism's dollars. Eco-Tourism is all we have here, and it works for us. If the big utilities are allowed to rape our land, what will we have to fall back on? Government assistance, I guess! Having to watch our forests, land, streams, lakes, rivers, wells, homes, businesses and economy demolished for such an unnecessary reason is too much to take! Then we will have to look at it every day worrying about illness, chemicals leaching through the ground, re-spraying, etc! UGH! Please do whatever it takes to help Save the Ozarks stop this idiotic plan that does nothing for Arkansas except cost us money!

## US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 3:59 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Comments on the Table Rock Master Plan.

The plan stating the COE wants a 50' vegetative "buffer zone" around the shoreline of Table Rock Lake is totally unacceptable.

This stupidity will accomplish nothing and is the worst idea I have heard of.

Table Rock's purpose, as designated by Congress, was to be a flood control and power generation reservoir, not some idiotic attempt to mandate and police a vegetative "buffer zone" for 50' back from the normal pool level which will all simply DIE the first time the flood control purpose of the project has to be used. Shorelines would become unusable to visitors and residents alike if you implement this wacko idea.

What possible benefit would this insanity be to anyone ? Answer...NO ONE but the tree huggers you are obviously currently employing and who are having undue influence in your misdirected planning attempts. Cancel this foolishness immediately !

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---


**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 4:30 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan for Table Rock Lake

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Thank you for the comprehensive options you have put forth for the Master Plan for Table Rock Lake. Very well thought out and presented.

We are very much in favor of your PREFERRED BALANCED PLAN.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the body of the email.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 10:05 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] comments for the Table Rock Lake Master Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello,  
I've read and considered the alternatives presented for the Master Plan Revision on the Corps of Engineers website. My first choice in the matter would be to go with Alternative 3 and my second choice would be Alternative 2. Thank you for your hard work!  
Take care,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 10:21 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan - Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I visited the open house at the new center on Table Rock this past week and was impressed with all the personnel there representing the Corps of Engineers and the planning that went into the event. I was pleasantly surprised and pleased with the approach taken.

I would offer a suggestion to the master plan. The proposed 50 foot vegetative area around the lake is a great concern to those who own low lying properties around the lake as the view of the lake is threatened by the proposed 50 foot area. Since the is to try to improve the water quality from development areas around the lake with a vegetative area why not reduce this area from 50 feet to 10 to 20 feet as a compromise as this may be more receptive to the adjacent property owners. I believe this 10-20 foot buffer would still have a positive impact to what the corps is trying to do.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 5:54 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Cc:** US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Revised Master Plan Comment Form  
**Attachments:** Scanned from a Xerox multifunction device.pdf

Is attached.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privilege intended only for use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the information therein. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the message.

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address

E-mail:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?

Keeping the Lake  
Clean, the Shoreline as Natural as possible and  
limited boat traffic.

### Other Comments

I think the Preferred Alternative is a great improvement  
over the existing plan, but I would limit the  
expansion of high density even more. I am fully  
in favor of the 50' vegetation buffer as this is key  
in preserving the beauty of the shoreline. The plan is  
very well done and addresses many critical items.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch,  
Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,  
Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 11:25 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan  
**Attachments:** img-819123017-0001.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

## US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



There are no real secrets to success.

Success in anything has one fundamental

aspect - effort... Take action with commitment.

---

This e-mail may contain Sprint proprietary information intended for the sole use of the recipient(s). Any use by others is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies of the message.

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT

Your Name

Address:

E-mail:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1   (2)   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? TO MANY RESTRICTIONS ON  
PROPERTY OWNERS.

Other Comments

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch,  
Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,  
Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil) , Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 2:11 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments Table Rock LAke Master Plan  
**Attachments:** Corps.pdf

Attached are my comments. Thanks.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address:

E-mail:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? 50' Vegetative Mgt Classification

Other Comments

My choice would be Alternative 2d - No Vegetative. I appreciate the opportunity to give my input. I don't think the public meetings were very helpful. I wanted more of an explanation of master plan from Corps personnel. Contract folks were not helpful. Seems to be lots of confusion about the master plan and the Shoreline Mgt Plan. That could have been addressed by Corps personnel.

I'm of the opinion an Advisory Council/group made up of various individuals from community government businesses - folks who are interested in the health of the lake would be beneficial to the Corps. A working board if you wish.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605.

Email: [MATRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:MATRMP@usace.army.mil) , Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:21 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Master Plan Comment

**Importance:** High

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

In my opinion Alternative 2c is the best choice because it will limit large Resorts from expanding into sensitive areas. We want to encourage continued use of Table Rock Lake but do not want to take away the beautiful wilderness areas that preserve habitats and permits fish to thrive in the lake because this is the reason that people enjoy coming to our area. I note that this alternative may have a negative effect on recreation, but I do not feel it will change enough to be noticeable. This is the best choice for the Health and Safety of the area.

I applaud the Corps for their attention to detail and asking the public to comment. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for all you do to keep our flooding at a minimum and adding to the economy of Stone County Missouri.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 6:14 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan

We do not want the 50' buffer zone in our area.

Sincerely,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:04 AM  
**To:** Coburn, Dana O SWL  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Little Rock District Contact Form: Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision (UNCLASSIFIED)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Response requested: No

Message:

I have attended your meeting about the different plans, and was told to go to this web site to express which plan I think would be the best one. On your web site I could not find any link for this.

I am a home owner of lake front property and with your Preferred Alternative my property value would go down with your 50 ft vegetative management. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to have a lake front home now you want to have the last 50 ft grow up and make it less accessable to go to the lake. How would you feel if the city where you live said they will not allow you to do anything next to the city roads and let trees weeds and what ever grow up in front of your property. and by the way they will never clean your streets. Just like you never ever clean up all the dead trees, junk that the lake floats up on the shore. I have pick up bottles, oil cans, dead everything that comes on shore. We lake front owners want the 2D alternative.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:09 AM  
To: Coburn, Dana O SWL  
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Little Rock District Contact Form: tablerock lake (UNCLASSIFIED)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 4:15 PM  
To: CESWL-PA SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Little Rock District Contact Form: tablerock lake

This message was sent from the Little Rock District website.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Response requested: No

Message:

In the last 20 years there has been a huge growth of large apartment buildings and time shares. This has caused much of the shore lined with trees to be destroyed. The individual housing or cabins can be nestled in the trees and not noticed, leaving the shore with trees. Condos are part of cities or towns implying stress and defeating the feeling of relaxation from the lake. People come to the lake to "get away". I had to see the lake commercialized to the extent it becomes a park in the center of town. On the other hand, I would hate to see the shore left completely untouched and it becomes unable to get to the lake or appreciate its beauty. When left completely untouched, the area has a great deal of brush, collecting trash. I think there needs to be a balance of clearing the brush but leaving the trees so people can still get to the lake to enjoy it and clearing all the trees for condos and apartments. There is a gentle balance needed. This is where the corp comes in. I believe you have done a good job in the past but as anything, plans need to be reviewed.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:15 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Table Rock Master Plan  
**Attachments:** scan0066.jpg

See attached form.

# Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.  
Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

E-mail: US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1    2    3    ④    5    6    7    8    9    10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? I oppose increasing the percentage of total Corps property designated as Natural Area. Natural Areas restrict access to the resources due to lack of roads. I strongly support Low Density Recreation areas and modest increases in those areas.

Other Comments

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,

Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

## US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 5:03 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Dana Coburn

My name is US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) my address is US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) I paid for a veggie permit as it was not transferrable from the last owner. We bought our house (that we live in full time) because of the lot. Its value is because of the lot. Its gentle grade. It has been mowed to the natural beach area for years. After the flood, we were given permission by your office to burn the mountain of driftwood so it wouldnt go back in the lake if it flooded again. We worked hard to do so. The flood killed most vegetation and erosion was starting to form muddying the lake. At our expense we worked our butts off restoring the area that has been mowed for years. We got the grass back and the erosion stopped. We have NOT and WILL NEVER fertalize this part of the corps property we are mowing. We do not fertalize our own yard. Why am I telling you this? Because I was not able to attend your meeting last week, but I own a barbershop so the feelings of my customers who were there got my attention. I understand you are planning on NOT letting current areas mowed within 50 feef of 915 to be mowed or maintained at all under the NEW plan. Well let me say I think this is totally unfair to us who have followed every detail of your veggie permit rules over the years to be penalized like this. We have bald eagles living in the trees right next to us.. The public LOVES the natural beach area and stop their boats to swim here etc. Now you want to make it a snake pit? Give me a break. There are hundreds of miles of steep rocky brushy shoreline here to maintain the beauty of the area without destroying what LITTLE natural beach areas we have. I know im rambling but I worked alot of years to afford a place like this, and now youre planning on taking it away? I dont want a "Lake of the Ozarks" either but those of us who have followed the rules, and maintained the property for all should be able to continue to do just that. We should be grandfathered in. Just like the private docks. They are grandfathered.

Thank you  
US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:45 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Cc: US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

I VOTE FOR:

Alternative 1 No Action: Land use classifications would stay the same as they are now, no shoreline areas would be designated as Vegetative Management, and there would be no revisions made to respond to changed conditions.

I cannot believe you would even consider a 50-foot Vegetative Management classification. This would mean that a 50-foot buffer would be added to our land use area that would prohibit mowing within 50 feet from the lake. This area when allowed to grow up would be a haven for ticks, chiggers, snakes and other problems. It would be unsightly in a residential subdivision as well as from the lake.

Finding a place to launch a boat or a slip to store it in is impossible now. The only people who benefit are the Marina operators who charge \$2,000/ year to store a boat and they charge this because there is no competition nor alternative. As with any government control you create a false economy that precludes free market activity which costs everyone more money.

I think you should put this to a vote of the people that use the lake and live there. I cannot believe you are wasting time and money on this study; spending money the US Government doesn't have. Our government is broke and you are wasting money on studies that are not needed. Go get a real job in the private sector and stop trying to dictate and control our lives.

I will be sending this to our Congressman and Senators.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

\*\*\*\*\*Internet Email Confidentiality Footer\*\*\*\*\*

Privilege/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to such person), you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message, and notify us immediately at 800.942.2022. If you or your employer does not consent to Internet email messages of this kind, please advise us immediately. Opinions, conclusions and other information expressed in this message are not given or endorsed by my firm or employer unless otherwise indicated by an authorized representative independent of this message.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:15 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] alternate pain

Dana, I have some reservations over the corps plan of a 50 ft buffer zone of the lake, I would rather see the corps go with plane 1 to make no changes to the current table rock lake plan, my concerns of tall unsightly weeds, snake, bugs. And no lake access

Are only a few at the top of my list.

Thanks for taking the time to read my concerns.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 1:00 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Document2  
Attachments: Doc2.docx; ATT00001.txt

Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment

Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>.  
<<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>> Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013. Please PRINT.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of the Preferred Alternative - Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

1XX	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10						

Strongly  
Strongly

Disapprove  
Approve

I Strongly Disapprove!

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?

Shore line vegetation barrier of 50 feet will block current lake views which will lower property values and therefore tax assessments. Schools and local government services will be negatively impacted by loss of tax revenue.

#### Other Comments

There is no reason to change the existing shoreline program. The personal at the meeting stated erosion was the main reason. Erosion is not a problem on the lake.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605, Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil)  
<<mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil>> , Website:  
<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>  
<<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

Table Rock Lake Revised Master  
Plan and Environmental  
Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

E-mail

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1XX 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Strongly

Strongly

Disapprove

I Strongly Disapprove!

Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?

Shore line vegetation barrier of 50 feet will block current lake views which will lower property values and therefore tax assessments.  
Schools and local government services will be negatively impacted by loss of tax revenue.

**Other Comments**

There is no reason to change the existing shoreline program. The personal at the meeting stated erosion was the main reason. Erosion is not a problem on the lake.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch,  
Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,

Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 11:58 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table rock master plan revisions

Dear Corps of Engineers,

I sincerely hope you do keep as much land surrounding the lake a "wilderness area" as possible. The natural beauty is the essence of the attraction of this area. Please do not allow the commercial pressures to dissuade you from "Mother Nature" at her best!

Thank you

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:27 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Cc: US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] TRL Master Plan Question.....

Dana Coburn:

My name is US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) and I am writing on behalf of the US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) units along the Table Rock Lake shoreline at  
US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

My question concerns the reference in Alternative 2 to a:  
50-foot Vegetative Management classification would be added along many shoreline areas and  
would overlay other land classifications.

- \* Would the US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
TRMP Plates Map be affected by this classification if adopted ?
- \* US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) many of our owners and guests enjoy the lake access as it  
currently is. We have seen many families exploring the shoreline or fishing from the shore.
- \* If this Vegetative Management area were enacted for the Kimberling Inn complex, these  
activities would be reduced considerably and have a negative impact on our owners and guests.
- \* Additionally, the buildings are about as close to the shoreline as you can get. The 50'  
vegetative area could increase ticks, spiders, and insect populations to an area that is used  
by owners and guests.

Thank You in advance for your response. Please Reply All with your response.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:14 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

I am writing to oppose any change to the current Master Plan.

This entire process is just another example of the Federal Government's intrusion into the American Public's personal lives. And, I cannot even imagine the money that already has been spent and will be spent to complete this Master Plan. And, that is only the beginning of the process because then the implementation of the Plan will cost additional mega dollars. These are dollars that our Federal Government does not have and that we taxpayers do not want spent.

It is argued that pollutants drain into the lake and that water clarity & quality is compromised. How ludicrous! Table Rock drains some 4,000 square miles according to the report and the water draining off of these acres is purified by the rocks and the debris that it runs over before it gets to the lake. And even if there is a small amount of pollutants, that cannot possibly adversely affect the huge amount of water impounded in the lake as indicated by the 750 miles of shoreline around the lake.

The protection of wildlife is another issue that is being argued. Once again, the wildlife has more than ample room to roam in the 4,000 square mile of drainage. A 50' Vegetative Management area along the shoreline is not going to make any difference in the propagation of the wildlife around the lake. And, I would argue that to decrease the maintenance of the vegetation along the shoreline will increase the amount of unwanted creatures such as snakes, rats, etc. that will then invade the homes surrounding the lake.

Can you imagine how overgrown the now beautiful shoreline will look in only 5 - 10 years if homeowners are not allowed to maintain the vegetation?

Another argument for this new Plan is Shoreline Erosion. This lake has been in existence for some 55 years. I see no evidence of serious shoreline erosion that concerns me as I boat up and down the lake.

I could go on & on if I cared to take the time to review all 217 pages of the document that was created to support this nonsense. But, I have neither the time nor the patience for such activity. And, I am terribly afraid that the US Army Corps of Engineers, a branch of our Federal Government, is going to whatever it damn well pleases anyway in spite of any comments that it may get from concerned citizens and taxpayers like me.

Thank you for your time.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

NOTICE: This electronic mail message and any files transmitted with it are intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. The message together with any attachment, may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, printing, saving, copying, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:00 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake plan alternatives

Hello, I would like to voice my support for Alternative 1 for the Table Rock Lake plan. I own property at the lake I think the way the lake is being managed is absolutely appropriate and I for one do not want anything changed. Thank you for your time. Jeff Davis

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

\*\*\*\*\*PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\*\*\*

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:27 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Update Zone 16

We have had a summer home at [REDACTED] for the past 40 years and have seen it grow and change over the years. I have seen the shoreline change with more and more docks. Our small cove had 2 multi slip docks and two private docks, to more than 15 multi slips docks. Due to the increase in docks the water traffic is extremely heavy in the area.

Should Dogwood Canyon be allowed to develop and add dock usage to the area, the water traffic would be out of control. Why would you want to add additional traffic to an already over-developed, heavy traffic area. I feel it would make Little Indian area unsafe for water sports, which is what attracted us and many other people at this time. There is "big water" in many other areas that could handle the kind of traffic a large lodge and additional docks would be better suited for.

We have always called Swiss Villa/Little Indian area "God's Country" we would like it to remain "God's Country"

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

[REDACTED]

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:22 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] LAKE MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

CORP of ENGINEERS

Regarding changes in Table Rock Lake Management Master Plan

I am in support of Alternative 1.

I am a property owner in Stone County off US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) Rd and a member of a private dock association off US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) Any other alternative other than Alternative 1, would affect both of my positions at these different spots.

I am very concerned about the last sentence of Alternative 2. Regarding a 50 foot Vegetative Management classification would be added along many shoreline areas and would overlay other land classifications. This statement is vague and unfair. It would be unsightly in a residential and boat dock area, where you try to protect your investment by maintaining a nice well-kept area to enjoy the lake.

Please consider Alternative 1.

Thank You

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:52 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Shore line mamagement

To take care of the shore line by the people who live along the shore line shows that they care. Weather the grass is long or short makes little difference in its ability to retard erosion. And the shore line looks better when taken care of by caring people.

I vote for #1

Thanks

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:50 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Attn: Dana Coburn Chief, Environmental Branch, Table Rock Revised Master Plan  
**Attachments:** <IT><FAX></FAX></IT>.pdf

Good Morning Dana,

Please read the attached survey for the Table Rock Revised Master Plan.

Thank you,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.  
Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

You  
Add

E-m

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

① 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? Safety and Value

We enjoy our Cove Lake front.

**Other Comments** My parents and my family have been vacationing at Table Rock for over 58 years. We have purchased a Cabin that we now have made into a home 3 years ago. Our whole small community of about 15 homes enjoy sitting at the lake shore. I feel by having so of regulation would greatly impact not only the value of my home but the safety for us and our grandkids. We have spent our entire retirement money to build our home where we have (which is very modest) because we can safely walk to the lake and sit on the shore flag. I beg that this is not taken away. I hope my kids and grand kids will enjoy our home as it is for many more years. Thank you for your consideration.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605, Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

Attn: Dana A Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:25 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table rock Master Plan 50' buffer comments

Dana,

My family and I are in favor of the alternative #1 regarding the Land use classification. The reason being is that this 50' buffer would preclude any lake access for my children to fish and otherwise enjoy the lake. Furthermore, unmaintained areas such as this 50' buffer would become unsightly, block lake views, significantly affect property values, and provide a heaven for unwelcome insects and reptiles.

Please consider this when deciding the future of Table Rock Lake.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:14 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Land Management proposals

Dana -

I would like to voice my opposition to the 50 buffer being considered at Table Rock Lake. Please leave the perimeter of our lake as it is now. The 50 buffer would be an unsightly area from both the lake and the land, and even though land management has said there might be options to mow once a year or mow a path to the lake shore, none of that is written into the option.

Please leave it as it is.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:15 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

Thank you for your online information, however, we are unable to find the definitions for the 6 classifications of land allocations as you are using them on the master plan revision. Those include: high density recreation, low density recreation, environmentally sensitive, project operations, wildlife management, and vegetative management Could you send me those definitions as soon as possible.

Thank you,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:19 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] master plan  
**Attachments:** corps.pdf

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



US Army Corps  
of Engineers®  
Little Rock District

Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

0      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

Strongly X  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? We think the rules have done well over the years.  
The main part of the lake and all rivers should be boat dock free .

**Other Comments** We think the 50' vegetation is a must and needs to be enforced on all shoreline.

The big problem is farm and septic run off into the rivers and lake. We think the county need to have all septic checked every 10 years , add the cost of checking the system to the property tax and lets get it cleaned up.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch,  
Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,  
Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil) , Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:14 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

Hello-

I'm writing specifically about the Swepeco 345 kV power line proposed to cross the White River between Beaver Lake and Table Rock Lake.

I am vehemently opposed to this line. I have lived near Table Rock Lake since 1971. It's been a joy. Our company has enjoyed both boating and fishing on the lake.

I am now 102 years old, and while family still comes to visit, I no longer go to the lake with them. This summer a grandson and a great grandson both enjoyed their time on the lake...the great grandson in a kayak near the condo they rented on Holiday Island. The grandson a month later brought his much larger, tournament fishing boat and also rented a condo on Holiday Island.

Allowing Swepeco to use pesticides anywhere near the lake would be a travesty! Please, do whatever you can to prevent it!

## US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:25 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Swepco

Dear Army Corp. of Engineers,

Please let's not repeat history by having another Trail of Tears when everyone moves out in order to get out of what was once the most beautiful countryside in the world.

Please reject Swepco's plans to put anything close to the White River or Tablerock Lake. Please keep in mind, that many species of trout and hellbenders, etc. need Clear and flowing water and when you start messing around with the riparian areas, there will be sediment and run off in the waters. Truly you have the power to exercise your right agt. their attempts at Eminent Domain because you are Federal.

We have lost many trees and many more will be lost. The red oak is infected by a boring insect that will take out much of the forests. CECC sprays herbicides all over NWA so also killing plants. No one is planting. Just cut cut cut and what will we have left?

Please deny Swepco like you did the other 3 routes. This area is also undisturbed.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:33 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Master Plan

I recently attended the meeting in Shell Knob concerning the plans for Table Rock Lake. We found the plan to be a good one, concerned and caring about the health of the lake waters and the Sensitive Environment areas. It was refreshing to attend a positive approach to a need. Thank you

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:21 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

Dear army corp of engineers,

I am opposed for many reasons to the AEP/SWEPCO plan to build a 345kV transmission line from Shipes Road crossing the Kings River and or the White River at any point to the proposed Kings River substation.

Thank you.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:06 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments re: AEP/SWEPCO proposing to cross the White River/Table Rock Lake  
**Attachments:** Corps of Engineers Final Written Comments Form 20130802 copy.pdf

Chief Coburn,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.  
We in the Ozarks are graced with some of the most pristine waterways in the country.  
Please use your power to protect the rivers, watersheds, and lakes, and do not allow these lines to devastate the ecological health, the economy, and the aesthetics of our precious environment.

Thank you,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

**Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.**

Please PRINT.

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)**

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9      10

**Strongly  
Disapprove**

**Strongly  
Approve**

**What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?** I AM OPPOSED TO ALL ALTERNATIVES.

I am OPPOSED to ALL OF THE PROPOSED ROUTES for Swepeco's high voltage transmission line.

This line would be devastating to the environment and the ecological health of NW Arkansas, to the economy of the region, to human health, and it would devastate the aesthetics of this beautiful Natural area. . It would take property away from citizens without just compensation.

The destruction of an estimated 800 to 1,000 acres would result in an enormous amount of deforestation, forest fragmentation, riparian damage,

**Other Comments** and untenable Earth, Air and Water pollution. The obliteration of countless trees, Nature's air conditioners, would dramatically increase heating. Places that have for decades sheltered protected migratory bird species would be threatened.

RIPARIAN'Colonial Nesting Sites' of Great Blue Herons, and the winter roosts of Bald Eagles would be disturbed, destroyed and abandoned due to - • noise and destruction necessary to build the line • interference with flight paths by high voltage lines (documented deaths from these lines) • methods of herbicide application • toxins from herbicides in the air, in the water, and in the fish they eat and feed to their nestlings.

This line would lay waste to endemic species in woodlands, in bluffs, in caves, and to the 'Natural Communities' in the fragile habitat of unique Ozark Glades known as 'Central Interior Highlands Calcareous Glades and Barrens'. In Carroll County alone these habitats often support rare, threatened, and even globally imperiled plants and animals. Persistent Herbicides in ROW's will impact the adjacent remaining habitats via herbicide drift. Clearcutting riparian zones will worsen erosion, resulting in more gravel and silt in riparian habitats, affecting the food chain and all biota dependent upon these waters. Springs, wells, caves, and ponds, Beaver Lake, the White River Watershed, the Kings River tributaries, Table Rock Lake - especially in KARST environment - would be at risk from drilling, blasting, and concrete fill, from herbicide mixtures many persistent in the environment for years, and pollution of the pristine waters of northwest Arkansas. Swepeco's proposal is based on obsolete data, using unsustainable technology, which will exacerbate the current trend in climate change. "Coal-fired power is the biggest source of carbon pollution and probably the biggest source of global warming." (NRDC) I implore you to STOP these lines.

We cannot continue to destroy all that is good and beautiful on this Green Earth. We are here to help protect this Rare and Precious Creation.

We must remember we are leaving this Earth to our Children and Grandchildren.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. **Fax:** (501) 324-5605, **Email:** [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil) , **Website:**

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise **submitted by August 30, 2013.**

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:24 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Comment

Please preserve the lakes under your jurisdiction from and all incursions by the SWEPCO high voltage transmission lines. These lines are an eyesore, promote degradation of the areas adjacent to the lake, including but limited to runoff from herbicides in the lake and erosion issues.

In general I favor a mix of recreational and preservation as the predominant goals of the master plan. The powerlines in particular and excessive commercial development in general run contrary to this goal.

Thank you,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:06 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Concern

Please do not pursue the 50' buffer along Table Rock Lake and allow vegetation.

I am a homeowner in the [US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)] Subdivison and own a slip in the [US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)] Boat Dock.

We have many children and grandchildren who enjoy their dock time and I cannot imagine all of those children trying to gain access to the dock with knee high weeds, which would be a haven for snakes. I do not wish for any of these children, nor myself, to be bit by a snake. It is important that our access to boat docks be safe.

Thanks for your consideration.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:05 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Attn: Dana Coburn -- Table Rock Lake Master Plan

Dear Ms. Coburn,

Please preserve the environmental integrity of our Ozark lakes. I am especially concerned about the potential of high voltage lines crossing Corps property and the damage these lines can cause to migratory bird populations, existing flora, and water quality. I hope for the good of the Ozarks and all of us who live here that you will reject all applications for the construction of new transmission line routes across Corps administered lands.

Thank you.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 8:48 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] vegetative management area at table rock lake

as a soon to be full time resident of anchor's point condos in kimberling city, i OPPOSE the vegetative management alternative. it would be unsightly, be a breeding ground for ticks, snakes and other vermin and make lake usage more difficult, including hiking boating and swimming. i like it the way it is and urge you to abandon this option.

thank you

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 6:11 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]

To whom this my concern,

My name is [US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)] and I own three properties on Table Rock Lake at the [US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)]  
[US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)] I am in favor of alternative #1 and I would be very disappointed to see the 50 foot buffer...

Alternative 1 is No Action: Land use classifications would stay the same as they are now, no shoreline areas would be designated as Vegetative Management, and there would be no revisions made to respond to changed conditions.

Best Regards,

[US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)]

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 5:48 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision

My wife and I have reviewed the various alternatives proposed and most assuredly and most strongly suggest Alternative 1 - No Action be the conclusive adoption acceptable. We have lived on the shore of Table Rock Lake for 27 years and strongly reject the 50 foot vegetative management suggestion. Even now when the lake level is high the incident rate of encountering copperhead snakes is heightened. A 50 foot marsh area bounding the lake will significantly increase the incident rate of snake bite. Children are most highly susceptible. Thank you for your consideration.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 4:16 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Comment Sheet  
**Attachments:** Lake Plan Comment Sheet.pdf

See Comment see attached.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the body of the email.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the bottom portion of the email.

Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan  
and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?

THE 50 FOOT VEGETATIVE MANAGEMENT AREA AROUND THE LAKE SHORE.  
THE REST OF THE PLAN IS OK EXCEPT THE 50 FT VEGETATIVE MANAGEMENT AREA.

Other Comments

I BOUGHT AN OLD CABIN AND TOTALLY REMODELED IT COSTING OVER \$100,000.00 AND NOW WE HAVE A PERMIT TO MOW 200 FT. FROM THE LOWER CABINS TO THE SHORELINE. THE VIEW OF THE LAKE IS WHAT BE LOVED ABOUT BUYING + ACCESS WHERE WE DID. IF WE CAN NOT MOW FOR 50 FEET WE LOOSE THE VIEW AND ACCESS TO THE LAKE. THIS DOES NOT SEEM FAIR. WE PUT A LOT OF MONEY IN OUR PLACE AND IF YOU PUT THE NO MOW FOR 50 FEET YOU DECREASED OUR USE + VIEW OF THE LAKE AND OUR PROPERTY VALUES. I DO NOT WANT IT TO BE LIKE THE LAKE OF THE OZARKS BUT THE HOUSES THAT HAVE MOW PERMITS SHOULD BE ABLE TO KEEP THEM NO MATTER WHAT PLAN YOU CHOOSE. IF YOU DON'T WANT TO GIVE OUT MORE THAT IS YOUR CHOICE BUT WE SHOULDN'T HAVE ANY TAKEN AWAY!! I KNOW THIS DOESN'T AFFECT A LOT OF HOUSES BUT THE VUES OF US IT DOES - THIS IS A CRITICAL ISSUE.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203  
Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 12:03 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake

Leave the rules like they are NOW!!!!

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 11:19 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Master Plan

My vote is for Alternative Plan 1. Too much government control already in our land of freedom. We retired here because of the lake and want to keep it nice, but so many regulations about getting to the lake and our slips/docks makes it hard for us seniors...enough problem navigating rocks, trees, brush now because of rules, 50 more would just add more problems not to mention snakes, critters, etc.

Leave it the way it is now!

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 11:09 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL

To: Dana Coburn, Chief  
Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental  
Little Rock District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

From: US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

I would like to share with you a quote by Daniel Webster "The Peoples Government;  
Made for the People; Made by the People; and answerable to the People.

I attended the meeting at Dewey Short Wednesday, August 14th and asked this question post the video to a representative of the Corps of Engineers, who regulates the environmental issues; the landowner to the waterway; the State Government by their Statues or laws; or the Federal Government. I gave him a position that occurred in the 90's when the boom came into the area, and we had environmental groups who were active in the area working to clean up the Lakes, and a follow up of activity with the State of Missouri DNR task force group, along with the Corps of Engineers and the local environmental groups was held at the Dewey Short facility and after presentations by the various groups no conclusion was given. I asked the Corps of Engineers what action are you going to take and the answer was it is up to the Local and State Governments to clean up the Lakes. This was accomplished in time by these groups with new Statues and County laws through the Planning and Zoning and Sewer Departments as well as Cities in the area. Taney County introduced a sewer sales tax that has been re-instated several times by vote of the citizens, Stone County has a septic tank program that is still active.

I would like to share with you the State Statues to review 640-115;120;125 and Ref: MO State Water Plan Serves: Vol.V11 on Google. Their is an interesting point Landowners are given: the Piparian landowners has the rights to make reasonable use of the natural stream flow. The Department of Natural Resources along with the Health and Ag. and PUC regulate the environmental issues for the State of Missouri.

I also reviewed the United States Army Corps of Engineers by Wipipedia (Google) of which states you operate under the Dept. of Defense and made up of civilians and military personnel and as I have been given the information by the personnel the duty is to control the flow of the waterways.

I am wondering if we have too many government entities with conflicting interests of our land and waterways? I vote on the new Master Plan a 1 until we work these issues out by local, State and Federal Governments as to what is best to protect our precious water for both humans and animals to drink. Water is one of our primary medicines to drink and stay healthy.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 11:03 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock

New Plan Discussion--- Please do not revise current rules!! To much intervention.

Alternate 1 has my vote.

Thank You

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:32 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan

Attention: Dana Coburn, Chief Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental

From: US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

While your recommended Alternative 2 has some very good aspects, as an adjacent property owner US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b), I strongly object to one proposed change from the current plan regarding shore management. That is the creation of a 50 foot no-vegetation clearing area from the 915 ft. elevation.

We believe that the Corps has not fully considered the unintended consequences of such an action:

1. The Corps belief that allowing weeds and brush to grow along the shoreline will help control erosion is a flawed concept. Unless the Corps precisely controls the lake elevation to below 915 ft., the lake elevation will continually drift higher and occasionally reach to top of the flood pool. Basically the Corps has no control of the lake elevation in the "power pool" per the Flood Control Act of 1944. This, in itself, will negate the erosion control that the Corps seems to contemplate. A better and more environmentally attractive way to control erosion in development areas like US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b), for example, would be to encourage the adjoining property owners to plant native grasses on the Corps property and easement. The basic problem is that there are too many trees in many areas of the Corps property around our neighborhood. In the older areas of our development where the Corps (many years ago) was less restrictive on tree removal, you can find ample evidence where grass is growing nicely and erosion control is working. In areas like behind my house, the use of high flood storage has caused much more erosion and killed large trees. While we support the control of erosion in subdivision areas like US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b), we believe that your proposed 50 foot set-back rule is flawed and has not been adequately analyzed. (By the way, I understand that resorts are exempt. Why are resorts much different than a subdivision of 200 homes with several miles of shoreline?)
2. The 50 foot set-back rule will create an opportunity for weeds and vegetation growth during the rainy season and dead vegetation thus created during the summer droughts. As we have seen this summer with the Beaver Creek fire in Idaho, under very similar conditions, a single lightning strike on similar dry brush and weeds has caused a huge fire event. Allowing such conditions to exist in heavily populated areas like US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) could exacerbate the potential for fires, especially if you consider the effects of Climate Change. Again, the development of native grasses would be a better environmental solution.
3. The 50 foot set-back rule will promote the development of noxious weeds. Many folks in our neighborhood are older folks with asthma and allergies. The increase development of rag weeds along the shoreline, for example, will create health issues as well. Has the health effects of this proposed action been addressed in the environmental report? What mitigation does the Corps propose? Will the Corps implement a shoreline spraying program similar to the one that Ameren/UE uses at Lake of the Ozarks?
4. If the 50 ft set-back rule creates an area of massive vegetation along the shoreline, will the Corps take on the responsibility of cleaning human generated debris? Each year during the Corps sponsored shoreline clean-up and several dozen folks from US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

walk several miles of shoreline to clean up human generated waste. Each year we collect enough trash to fill several trailers. We find pieces of foam, plastic bottles, life jackets, tires, and even an old bicycle and barbeque grill. Once the shoreline grows up into brush, us old folks aren't going to wonder thru the brush to clean up the Corps property and the Lake will become a big dumping ground. How will the Corps mitigate this? Will the Corps take over the shoreline clean-up?

In summary, the Old Master Plan has worked well and continues to be appropriate. We believe the Corps should stick with the current Master Plan and modify the current shoreline management plan to promote the development of native grasses along the shoreline. If it's not broke, why take a chance on screwing things up?

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 9:08 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] To: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch

I am opposed to any plans for AEP/SWEPCO to cross the White River/Table Rock Lake, anywhere or anytime.

Thank you,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:10 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Vegetation Buffer alternative 2d

Dana , I stongly dissapprove of alternative 2d for the following reasons,It would making it very difficult to move docks in and out plus we have a swimming area that kids would have to wade thru brush and tall grass to git to it. We have work hard to keep our area mowed and all the trash and driftwood picked up for years even during the floods of 08 and 11,and you want to ruin all of our hard work.Letting trees and brush grow up near docks will damage the the encapsulated floats.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 8:36 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Supporting Alternative #1

Dear Dana Coburn,

I write to respectfully express my support of the Corp of Engineers and the amazing job you have done managing Table Rock Lake over the past 56 plus years. I well remember as a child watching Table Rock Dam being built and have been continually impressed with the work of the Corp since then. The growth of the area and the economic impact the lake has had on the entire region is a testament to your ongoing stewardship of the natural resources entrusted into your care.

As a homeowner with property abutting the the Corp's lake area, I do have strong reservations about the proposal to add a 50-foot Vegetative Management classification. While I understand many of the purposes of the proposal, I strongly believe it is unnecessary.


I boat all up and down the lake, and can attest that there are many, many miles of lake shoreline that is completely untouched by man and is readily accessible to all the critters who share our wonderful countryside with us. Those areas do not need a 50-foot buffer, and adding one through the master plan revision would do nothing in those areas.

On the other hand, there are comparatively very few areas of lakefront where mankind has cleaned up the lakefront for easy access by people. These areas have been appropriately cleaned up, mowed, and kept neat and tidy for human enjoyment and access for recreation. Adding the 50-foot buffer would damage property values, make the lake less accessible, and introduce more critters that are a menace for us humans who also enjoy the lake.

It is, again, with great respect for the Corp and your work that I ask that you do not add the 50-foot Vegetative Management classification to your master plan.

Sincerely,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature and any accompanying text in the signature block.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 4:01 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment

Attention: DANA COBURN, Chief, Environmental Branch,

I STRONGLY DISAPPROVE of your proposed changes to Table Rock Lake for the following reasons:

The factors that affect my opinion are:

NOT BEING ABLE TO CONTINUE MOWING 100 FEET FROM THE LAKE WHEN POWER POOL IS AT 915FT ELEVATION, BECAUSE MY HOUSE IS AROUND 100 FEET FROM THE LAKE. WITH CEDAR TREES GROWING ON COE PROPERTY, THIS REPRESENTS A CONSIDERABLE DANGER TO MY HOUSE IN CASE OF FIRE. IN THE PAST, A GROUP OF YOUNGSTERS FROM KANNAKUK KAMP, ACROSS THE COVE FROM ME, PADDLED OVER AND STARTED A BONFIRE ON THE BANK. FORTUNATELY I WAS HOME AT THE TIME AND ABLE TO PUT A STOP TO IT.


I HAVE HEARD RUMORS THAT THE COE IS CONSIDERING THE POSSIBILITY OF RAISING THE NORMAL POWER POOL TO 917FT.  
IF THAT HAPPENS, MY HOUSE WOULD BE IN EVEN MORE DANGER.

SOME OF MY PROPERTY GOES CLOSE TO THE LAKE, AND THE DECISION TO MOW THAT AREA SHOULD MOST DEFINITELY REST WITH ME.

ALSO, THE AREA IN FRONT OF MY BOAT DOCK SHOULD BE EXCLUDED SO THAT IT CAN BE PULLED IN, IN CASE OF HIGH WATER,  
SO THAT THE DOCK ITSELF WILL NOT BE DAMAGED, NOR THE ENCAPSULATED FLOATATIONS BENEATH IT.

I do appreciate the fact that you are gathering input from those affected by the proposed changes and hope to hear from you about my situation.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 3:58 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] proposed plan

I am a condo owner on Table Rock Lake and I am not in support of alternative 2 proposal. This would be un-slightly and leave a haven for snakes, tics and chiggers. I am in support of alternative 1.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 3:30 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Master Plan Revision

Dana,

I have been unable to attend any of the open houses, and as a lake front property owner, was concerned on how this revision might affect me and my property if at all. I own a lot [REDACTED] in [REDACTED], I do not own a boat slip at this time and do not have a dwelling on the property.

I do have a question as far as the upkeep of the shoreline. For a time it was bush-hogged and kept relatively nice where you could see the lake from the lot, the last couple of times I have been down to the lot, the weeds are so tall on Corp property you can't get to the shoreline or see the water hardly. I was wondering if that will change once I get a dwelling built on the lot.

I look forward to hearing from you with answers to these concerns. Thank you, please feel free to call me if you feel that would be better. [REDACTED] leave a message [REDACTED]

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 1:42 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Revised Master Plan  
**Attachments:** corps of eng survey.pdf

Attached are the surveys about master plan, lake usage, etc.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.  
Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your  
Address

E-mail

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?

The 50' vegetative buffer zone - It will obstruct views of the lake from homes + will lower home values around the lake.

Other Comments

See other sheets.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605, Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 1:32 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake  
**Attachments:** usace.pdf

Respectfully submit comment form.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address

E-mail:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? "IF IT ain't broke  
don't fix it." Table Rock is a beautiful well-managed  
lake the way it is. Sometimes it seems the Corps  
of Engineers is punitive without cause. 35 year  
resident of Table Rock.

Other Comments

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch,  
Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,  
Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

1  
US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 1:10 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Revised Master Plan  
Attachments: doc02829920130823130754.pdf

Attached is my vote for the Revised Master Plan.  
Thank you!

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.  
Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address

E-mail:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

1 2-D 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  
Strongly Disapprove Strongly Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?

REAL ESTATE VALUES

Other Comments

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605, Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil), Website: <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>  
Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 12:26 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment and Concerns about Master Plan

Hi

As a current lake front property owner I would like to tell you I support Alternative Plan 2(d). I feel the vegetation permits are needed. If we were to no longer have these permits available, and the grass were allowed to grow it would cause more snakes, ticks and chiggers. (I am a nature lover but sure don't like to battle the snakes and the ticks) I am all for protecting our lake and keeping it as clean as possible and certainly support the new master plan. I hope our comments will be taken into consideration when the final plan is drawn. I really appreciate what the corp has done and is doing to take care of our lake!!!

Thanks for your consideration.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 9:51 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision

to: Dana Coburn:

I am writing you voice my support for ALTERNATIVE # 1. Further more, I am strongly opposed to the the 50' Vegetative Management classification proposed in Alternative #2.

This would significantly affect property value for homeowners, it would also create a potential hazard and danger to anyone walking to our dock.

Please register my concerns and vote for Alternative #1.

Sincerely,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 10:27 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision

**Importance:** High



To: Dana Coburn,

I am writing you to voice my concern over the 4 options available to vote on for the future management of Table Rock Lake.

Please note that all the slip owners in US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) (permit # US Privacy Act) vote for Alternative #1.

Furthermore, we are totally opposed to the the last sentence in alternative #2. The 50' Vegetative management classification that would be added along the shoreline.

Not only would this significantly have a negative affect on property value but would present a clear and present danger to anyone walking down to our docks.

I strongly encourage you to consider our concerns.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 10:27 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision  
**Importance:** High



To: Dana Coburn,

I am writing you to voice my concern over the 4 options available to vote on for the future management of Table Rock Lake.

Please note that all the slip owners in [REDACTED] (permit # [REDACTED]) vote for Alternative #1.

Furthermore, we are totally opposed to the the last sentence in alternative #2. The 50' Vegetative management classification that would be added along the shoreline.

Not only would this significantly have a negative affect on property value but would present a clear and present danger to anyone walking down to our docks.

I strongly encourage you to consider our concerns.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
[REDACTED]

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 10:25 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Shore Line

I vote for Alternative Number One.

If you use Alternative Number Two it would create an area to collect trash difficult to maintain. The area of my concern is between the lake and property at US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) at the lakefront east of boat docks.

If you use Alternative Number Two please "Grandfather the area as it is presently used." This would help protect my investment in the property.

Sincerely,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2013 8:20 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table rock master plan

Table rock master plan we are home owners at [REDACTED] we are opposed to doing any changes to the current boundaries based on the current distance from our condo to the lake this would not be good for our kids when they play if the grass area would not be maintained.

Thanks

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
[REDACTED]

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 8:00 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake

I urge you to consider Alternative No. 1. We are owners at **US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)** and are trying to preserve our shoreline and property value. If we have the 50/foot Butter our property would be unattractive and we are a residential area. Please do not take this away from us. We will have to sell our property which will be worth nothing and we have suffered enough in this tough economy. Thank you.

**US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)**



US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2013 6:52 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Reference Table Rock Lake Master Plan

Date: Friday August 23, 2013

To: Dana Coburn  
Chief, Environmental Branch  
USACE  
Little Rock District  
PO Box 867  
Little Rock AR 72203

From: Owners

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Subject: Proposed Table Rock Lake Master Plan

Because of the statement in ALTERNATIVE 2 ("A 50-foot Vegetative Management classification would be added along many shoreline areas and would overlay other land classifications") (if put in effect our area), this could greatly effect the value of our resort property and its

view of the lake, which at this time is wonderful and maintained very well. As a result, we choose to support/vote for ALTERNATIVE 1.

In a previous request from your office, we submitted an email in reference to the existing Sewer Treatment Plant and its proximity to the resort property. We referenced the (View - Odor - Noise) that impact not only the condo and time share property owners in our complex, but local business owners as well. Have you given any thought or have ideas that can be implemented to help us with this problem?

Sincerely, [REDACTED] US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 2:25 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on USACE Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment

Name:  
Address:  
Email:  
Phone:

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Comments on USACE Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment

I reviewed the draft master plan and endorse your recommended Alternative 2 (8 on the 1 to 10 scale) but believe the Option 3 conservative approach is better to preserve Table Rock Lake (TRL) as a "best lake" in the U.S and is my first choice option.

My points are focused on the recreation aspect although I believe other areas of this study seem on target and just need disciplined but fair USACE management and funding to implement. I did talk to Gary Sanders (lake water patrol) and understand many of my comments relate to his area of responsibility.

Comments:

USACE not issue any new docks or add on slips to existing docks.

I understand this is a painful area but boats on the lake must be limited. Over crowding means a bad experience for all on the lake vs. limits to allow real enjoyment of TRL up to a pre-established boating limit that allows enjoyment vs. chaos / unsafe lake. Current lake traffic is down the last few years because of national economic issues but that will change.

USCAE not permit anymore-oversized dock slips or resizing of standard slips to accommodate "big boats" on TRL

Most houseboats do not seem to create unacceptable wakes. I have watched gas attendants "hit the deck" at a TRL marina when a "big boat" went by just outside the no wake zone. It created a wake that rocked the dock to extent that it was not safe to stand up.

Also, Need to set aside certain areas of the lake for Wake Broad activities using water bags as they create very large wakes.

No wake areas

Most small coves and narrow inlets, especially with docks should be "no wake zones". I realize this is a water patrol area but shore erosion should be considered, which is a USACE area. No wake zone designation should be a joint agency effort.

Max boat speed on lake between 1 May and 30 Sep should be 40 MPH.

Understand this would require Missouri legislative action but I know of no non-racing sport that requires a higher speed other than a seaplane landing or taking off. There is a nighttime speed limit so why not daytime speed limits?

It is scary to see people in canoes or kayaks trekking across the lake near busy marinas or a person on a stand up paddleboard at the intersection of the James and White rivers with motorboat running 50+ MPH. Let all enjoy Table Rock Lake equally.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 7:09 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan

Alternative 1- no action.....this is my choice

Reasoning.....1...the lake is beautiful as is, and basically will stay the same with no action, other

than what is being done today.

we want our

it??? They will

brush,

Where does it

payback

grass and

built

the run off, how

and trees)

plans and

Rock Lake

2...in your video, Lake of the Ozarks is mention several times and do

to look like it it 10-20yrs. How will ANY of your actions prevent

NOT, and CANNOT. Why?? DEVELOPMENT is the reason!! NOT grass,

trees.

3...all of the plans, except the above chosen one will cost money.

this money come from, Taxpayers pockets. As a taxpayer what is the

to us if any. Their is none,you will only want more to watch the

weeds. Why? In 10-20 years when there is 30-50 more condominiums

around the lake with NO control over their use of water front or

will your plans be helping (as you govern and parole grass, weeds,

4...I fish, hunt and use the lakes, forest. I support most conservation

actively try to do my part. This Master Plan will not save Table

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 24, 2013 6:42 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] incorrect classification

Dear MS Coburn,

Please refer to top paragraph on Revised Master Plan for Table Rock Lake where it states, "Low Density Recreation in the previous Master Plan have been classified as ESA if those lands had no active permits and no adjacent residences." We have looked at the classification map of "alternative 2" and note that our shoreline has been changed from the 1976 classification of "low density rec" to ESA. You may not be aware that we do have a residence on our property adjacent to Core property. We request that it be corrected to reflect "Low Density" classification.

Please contact me regarding the exact location.

Thank You

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 24, 2013 5:52 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Changes

We are writing you concerning the Table Rock Lake Master Plan. Please do not change something that has served the area well for many years. We strongly support Alternative #1.

We own US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) - and US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) much closer to the shore line than 50 ft. The purposed 50 ft. buffer would add to health problems, MOLD and allergies along with the infestation of ticks, chiggers, snakes, other insects and small predator animals.

Please do not change the master plan - Keep Alternative #1

Sincerely

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 11:46 AM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Master Plan Revision Email Address

Name:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Address:

address see below.....

Phone:

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

The number that best represents my opinion of the Preferred Alternative - Alternative 2  
"Balanced Use"....I vote a 10...Strongly Approve

Factors that affect my opinion are these....

I strongly approve of Alternate 2-D, No Vegetative Management Area.

I would like to be able to clean my property from where my cabin sits US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) to the dock area, all along the shore line, including mowing.

The lake levels go up and down, according to our weather and amounts of rain....this leaves debris on the shore and also causes us to experience snakes, chiggers and ticks to build up. Cleaning this area would also make it easier for us to get to the dock cables to be able to bring the dock in and out with the changing lake levels.

There are a number of dead trees sitting in this area now that should be removed before a storm knocks them over on our electric on the property.

We would like to be able to burn the rubbish and debris at shoreline in a contained area.

I also do not want to lose the permit I already have for clearing vegetation.

Thank you for considering my opinions.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 24, 2013 11:43 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision  
**Importance:** High

To: Dana Coburn,

I am writing you to voice my concern over the 4 options available to vote on for the future management of Table Rock Lake.

Please note that all the slip owners in US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) vote for Alternative #1.

Furthermore, we are totally opposed to the the last sentence in alternative #2. The 50' Vegetative management classification that would be added along the shoreline.

Not only would this significantly have a negative affect on property value but would present a clear and present danger to anyone walking down to our docks.

I strongly encourage you to consider our concerns.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Saturday, August 24, 2013 11:27 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] TABLE ROCK LAKE MASTER PLAN c/o Dana Coburn  
**Importance:** High

After reviewing all 4 alternatives, our choice is alternative #1. It appears to be the least disruptive and yet provides for all parties using our lake while insuring property values are allowed to grow with the market.

The preferred alternative #2 has attractive features but for the last sentence. We are categorically opposed to the 50' vegetative management classification to be added to many of the shoreline areas and would overlay other land classifications.

We feel that would be significantly detrimental to both the value and beauty of our shoreline as well as individual property values. Not only would it be unsightly but our concern is for the health and physical well being of slip owners, their families and guests. A 50' border would allow for all kinds of insects, reptiles and other dangerous life forms to exist and reproduce. There have already been several incidents where people were bitten, stung and otherwise threatened by these kinds of creatures.

Please give this letter your utmost consideration and help preserve the positive future of our lake.

Sincerely,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Sunday, August 25, 2013 3:33 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Master Plan comment

I believe the 50 foot vegetation purposal is a good thing. This will improve the lake experience for all users.

Please don't be influence by the very small majority of lake front owners and the real estate agents.

Anything the Corps can do to keep the shoreline development down and in a natural state will enhance the lake for future generations.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

Sent: Sunday, August 25, 2013 3:31 PM  
To: CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment revised Master Plan

I would prefer the Balanced use, Alternative 2 if one or a combination the following were incorporated:

- A. Grandfather the current vegetation permits up to 200 feet from existing foundations.
- B. Where the 50 foot vegetation band and the 200 foot vegetation permit overlap, the overlap area be allowed to be cut once a year (for example between May 15th and June 30th).
- C. Allow the cutting of cedar trees (larger than the vegetation permit allows), the tree trunks can then be used to create natural barriers for rain gardens planted with native Missouri plantings.

Feel free to contact me to discuss these options.

· Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 5:01 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Revised Master Plan  
**Attachments:** 001.JPG; 002.JPG; 003.JPG; 004.JPG; 005.JPG; 006.JPG; 007.JPG; 008.JPG

Greetings Dana Coburn,

I do not support the establishment of a 50 foot vegetation buffer.

The following is provided in the spirit of your Feedback Form:

## US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

My opinion to the 2nd Alternative "Balanced Use"

1 (2) 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  
Strongly  
Disapprove

Most important factor:

The benefit of mowing to the waters edge is that it facilitates debris removal. I've been picking up trash for nearly 20 years or more. Since 2008, I've picked up everything from hypodermic needles to 4 foot Styrofoam blocks...and everything in between. My family and I have easily picked up over 250 (ea) 13 gallon trash bags from 270 feet of shoreline! After 2 weeks of high water I picked up 10 (ea) 13 gallon trash bags full of others garbage! I choose to pick up the trash and dispose of it properly. I do not just throw it back it the water for someone else to pick it up.

Other Comments:

Want to see what's out there, (Respectfully) get in a boat, visit a few coves and walk around...it's not all pretty! Attached are a few photos.

There are and will always be entities (Private, Commercial, and Governmental) that choose not to comply for their own motivations. People throw trash in the water or dump at low water and then watch it happily get taken away during high water. WE the few clean up others trash!

A nice factoid; last year we had 2 pontoon boats and this year we had 1 open bow and 3 pontoon boats push in for a swim break...I'm sure there has been more! Three had made small fires and one had made it an over-nighter! I think this is what the lake is all about...Family, fun and relaxation!!! If the beach had tall weeds, logs and disgusting debris, I suspect that they might not have pushed in!!

Those of us (owners) that endeavor to "Do no Harm" to the shoreline and keep it pleasantly accessible for others will see the shoreline return to a debris field!!!


With increased shoreline restriction, beaches will surely become less desirable; couple that with increases in corporate/Government ventures as revenue generators, will certainly negatively impact those that want to boat where they want, when they want and to push in where it looks hospitable!

I would say that most of the erosion is generated by the larger boats that now patron our lake; at 36 deg 39 51.70 N and 93 deg 32 47.60 W you'll see an area of shoreline that has substantial erosion made at higher water by large wake boats!. Erosion IS mitigated by rooted grasses; mowing helps propagate increased ground coverage.

Simply put, rarely will you see trash on mowed property and if 50' mowing restrictions is implemented, homeowners will be disenfranchised and perhaps more often that not will just allow trash and other debris to just move on down river! If you need to generate a little more revenue just add a Surcharge to the authorized vegetation permit of \$20.00 a year to mow per 100' (with a minimum of \$20.00).

Very Respectfully

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 9:31 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Enviromental Asswessment comments

I was not able to attend the most recent meetings regarding the above, but have looked over the information on your website and would like to submit my thoughts.

I have owned a lakefront home in the Hideaway area for approximately 17 years. I love Table Rock Lake and spend most weekends there year round. The lake and the quality of the water and the beauty of the area are very important to me.

I know your preferred alternative is number 2, I do have some concerns with that in regards to the 50 foot vegetative management classification. As I understand it, the area 50 foot up from the top of power pool, 917 would be allowed to grow up in vegetation. Currently, and ever since I have owned the property, I have had a vegetative permit and know the area I am allowed to maintain. My concerns are that by allowing that area to grown up, it will block the view of the area at shoreline. I see this as a safety problem as many times, our grand kids and neighbors kids are swimming and playing right at the edge of the water. We generally are there with them, but sometimes will sit in the yard and watch them. I am concerned that if vegetation is allowed to grow up, that view will be blocked, thus causing a safety concern.

My second concern is that by allowing the vegetation to grow up, there will be more snakes around the docks, thus making swimming not so inviting.

I am concerned too that when the lake level goes up again as it has twice in the last few years, it will be increasingly harder to move the docks in and maintain the cables that are attached to them as the flooding occurs if there is a 50 foot vegetation barrier.

In our area of Hideaway, a few years ago, the Marina was purchased. The improvements, docks and facility's that have been built there are a welcome and wonderful asset to the area and to all of Table Rock. In addition to the improvements at Hideaway, the Cape Fair Marina has become a wonderful destination to go to on our end of the lake. I support these folks continuing to be able to provide needed services and growth of their businesses. They are good neighbors!

I am not sure what the answer is, I do not support the 50 foot vegetative management classification, and I do support businesses being able to grow and provide services needed for recreation and enjoyment on the lake.

I am hopeful that whatever the end result is, it will be the right one.

Thank you for your consideration.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 6:27 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL; US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] tablerock proposal  
**Attachments:** US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) comments to ACE 50 ft buffer proposal August 26, 2013.pdf

Thank you very much for the willingness to hear from the Tablerock community. Attached are my comments on the proposal of a 50 ft buffer..

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.

Please PRINT.

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)**

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

**What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?** As a lakefront home owner, I full  
support conservation steps to keep Tablerock beautiful and to keep the  
quality of it's water. I walk this shoreline and swim daily. It is very  
important to our family and our small community. However, One must live here  
to fully understand what a 50 ft buffer would mean to our shoreline. Daily,

**Other Comments** we pick up trash, bottles, unmentionables, glass, fishing lewers,  
all along the shoreline. If a 50 ft Buffer was in place, these items would  
be caught in the grass / weeds and be unsafe to walk through. We keep our  
shoreline clean and as a reward for that, we have boats fishing in front and  
families anchoring out or pulling up to swim, and enjoy the shoreline. All  
of that would go away with a 50 ft buffer. I for one, would not want to walk  
through 50 ft of weeds to pick up trash along my shore line.. not to mention  
the additional mosquitoes and snakes that would now take home in the weeds.  
Surely, the ACE knows that we "homeowners" live here because we love the  
lake. We of all people, want to keep the lake as beautiful as possible. I  
would certainly encourage to ACE to work within the communities along the  
lake to come up with a more practical solution than to "punish" the ones  
that are working to keep our shorelines as pristine as possible. Would  
you have YOUR children walk through glass and trash filled weeds to be able  
to take an afternoon dip? Please reconsider this option.

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch,  
Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. Fax: (501) 324-5605,  
Email: [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil) , Website:

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise submitted by August 30, 2013.

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 4:19 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] FW: Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision

Dear Ms. Coburn: My wife and I wish to thank you for the time and effort you and your colleagues have invested in preparing the Table Rock Lake Master Plan Revision, and for the Corps' efforts to share this information with the public. My wife and I and our extended family have been coming to Table Rock Lake for major holidays since 1999, staying primarily at [US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)] In 2011 we purchased a house on the lake, in [US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)] which the Corps has done an impressive job of rebuilding.

As the country's population - and the population of the Table Rock Lake area - steadily expands, there is always the conflict between the maintaining the quality and aesthetic value of recreational assets that attract residents and visitors, and bowing to the economic interests of developers and businesses that profit from the influx of people. Unchecked, the economic interests tend, over time, to seriously degrade or even destroy the quality and aesthetic value of recreational assets. The Lake of the Ozarks is a primary example of this degradation, as you and your colleagues well know.

When my wife and I first came to Table Rock Lake years ago, we were awestruck by the pristine quality of the lake, both its clean water and its marvelous scenery. That's why we kept coming back and bringing our extended family. Since then, we have seen Table Rock's water quality, scenery, ecology, and even its on-water safety, steadily compromised by ever-increasing development along the shores, and ever-increasing boat traffic on the water. What was a relatively pristine landscape around the lake 10-12 years ago is now increasingly marred by developers' "slash and build" projects, in which scenic woodlands around the lake are cleared and replaced with huge, unsightly condo projects - and the accompanying community boat docks - which all stick out like sore thumbs.

No Master Plan for Table Rock Lake will please everyone. However, with America's, and the Federal government's increasing emphasis on environmental responsibility, I would hope that the Corps would err on the side of preserving to the extent possible the pristine qualities of this special lake. This would include, in my opinion, strictly limiting residential and dock development in order to maintain the environmental and aesthetic qualities of the lake, and putting firm restrictions on the types, sizes, and noise emissions of the boats that are allowed on the lake. Increasingly the boating safety on the lake is compromised by the increase in traffic, and by the dangerous wakes thrown up by the growing number large yachts. Also, the peace and quiet of the evenings along the shoreline are increasingly interrupted by the ear-splitting screams of ocean-class speedboats shooting by on the water.

In view of the following facts, I would urge the Corps to focus future development away from Table Rock Lake to less-developed areas in order to stop the steady erosion of Table Rock Lake's special qualities.

- The Corps' past projections for the recreational usage of Table Rock Lake have proven to be grossly inaccurate - a projected 20MM visitors by 2020 in the original Master Plan for the lake, versus the current reality of an estimated 40-50MM visitors in 2013;
- Current demographics in this country suggest that there will be even more residents and visitors flocking to the area for the foreseeable future;
- The Corps itself is facing serious budget cut-backs for the foreseeable future, restricting the Corps' ability to effectively monitor and police any plans regarding future development of, and activities on, Table Rock Lake;
- There are significant areas of undeveloped recreational land available on nearby lakes - Beaver Lake and Bull Shoals, to name just two.

With these facts in mind, I urge you and your colleagues to have the courage and foresight to take a very conservative and limited approach to the future development of this area. While it may be disappointing to the developers, resort owners, and marina operators, I urge the Corps to adopt the Alternative 3 - Conservative approach to Table Rock Lake's future development.

In the alternative, perhaps the best "plan" for Table Rock Lake right now is no long-term "plan" at all. Maybe the best approach is to adopt the most conservative of the Corps' current proposals - Alternative 3, or even a total moratorium on development -- for a shorter term, say five (5) years. This would give all parties concerned - the Corps, area residents, businesses, developers, environmental groups, state and federal conservation agencies, and other constituencies - a "breather" to determine what is really going on with the lake and the surrounding area, rather than speculating about what is going on. Then, at the end of this interim period, the Corp could produce a responsible, fact-based plan for a longer term, say 10 or 15 years.

In any scenario that the Corp ultimately chooses, Table Rock Lake itself must emerge the winner. Otherwise, all parties involved will, on some level, be the losers.

Respectfully,

**US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)**



US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)



# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 3:17 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: incorrect classification

Dear Ms Coburn,

In my previous email I failed to reference the Master Plan page number of 5-3 top paragraph, "Low Density Recreation in the previous Master Plan have been classified as ESA if those lands had no active permits and no adjacent residences."

I called and found that you are out of the office for a couple of weeks. My residence that I refer to in my request to correct the classification from ESA to Low Density Recreation is located at US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

The GPS coordinates are

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Thank you for your help,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

On Sat, Aug 24, 2013 at 6:42 PM, US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) wrote:

Dear MS Coburn,

Please refer to top paragraph on Revised Master Plan for Table Rock Lake where it states, "Low Density Recreation in the previous Master Plan have been classified as ESA if those lands had no active permits and no adjacent residences." We have looked at the classification map of "alternative 2" and note that our shoreline has been changed from the 1976 classification of "low density rec" to ESA. You may not be aware that we do have a residence on our property adjacent to Core property. We request that it be corrected to reflect "Low Density" classification.

Please contact me regarding the exact location.

Thank You

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 12:41 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Table Rock Master Plan

Dana Coburn, Chief of Environmental Branch, Army Corp of Engineers

Dear Mr. Coburn - I am concerned about some of the proposals for Table Rock Lake. I own a condo at the Kimberling Inn right on the Lake at Kimberling City, Mo. and I also am a part owner of a boat dock on the Lake in Cape Fair, Mo. The only acceptable plan is Alternative 1 which would allow the shore line to remain as is. I like seeing cleared and mowed areas when we are out on the Lake. Last thing I want to experience is a 50ft Vegetation Management area with a variety of creatures that live in such areas. Thank-you for the opportunity to give our input.

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

---

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 12:35 PM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment  
**Attachments:** Final Written Comments Form 20130802.pdf

My Comment form is attached.

Sincerely,

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

**Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.**

Please PRINT.

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)**

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly									Strongly
Disapprove									Approve

What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? I Think alternative 2 is too strict. I would be in favor of alternative 3-conservative. I feel that the lake is doing fine with the properties that already cut vegetation. I would like to see the Corps do something with the dead trees that stick up along the shoreline that are submerged. I think these are a danger to boaters and swimmers. I would also like to see more restrictive skiing on narrow arms of the lake as these are very dangerous.;

**Other Comments**

Comments may be submitted via mail, email, or fax with attention to: Dana Coburn, Chief, Environmental Branch, Planning and Environmental, USACE, Little Rock District, P.O. Box 867, Little Rock, AR 72203. **Fax:** (501) 324-5605,

**Email:** [M4TRMP@usace.army.mil](mailto:M4TRMP@usace.army.mil) , **Website:**

<http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>

Written comments must be postmarked, e-mailed, faxed, or otherwise **submitted by August 30, 2013.**

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 11:23 AM  
**To:** CESWL-TR Master Plan SWL  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Table Rock masterplan  
**Attachments:** US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b) Written Comments Form 20130802.docx

See attached form or below:

Your Name:

Address:

# US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of the Preferred Alternative - Alternative 2 "Balanced Use":

[<file:///C:/Users/willliala/AppData/Local/Temp/5/msohtmlclip1/01/clip\\_image002.gif>](file:///C:/Users/willliala/AppData/Local/Temp/5/msohtmlclip1/01/clip_image002.gif)

8

Strongly  
Strongly

Disapprove  
Approve

[<file:///C:/Users/willliala/AppData/Local/Temp/5/msohtmlclip1/01/clip\\_image003.gif>](file:///C:/Users/willliala/AppData/Local/Temp/5/msohtmlclip1/01/clip_image003.gif)  
[<file:///C:/Users/willliala/AppData/Local/Temp/5/msohtmlclip1/01/clip\\_image004.gif>](file:///C:/Users/willliala/AppData/Local/Temp/5/msohtmlclip1/01/clip_image004.gif) What are the most important factors that affect your opinion? I believe balanced use is the best because it allows for continued development of the lake shore residential properties while still providing a quality experience for the casual lake visitor. Currently developed areas (subdivisions, marinas, parks) should be removed from the vegetative management area and those areas should be given liberal approval of vegetation removal permits to match adjacent lots. Many current residential property owners, particularly those who have been on the lake for several years, have been allowed to remove most vegetation to develop lake views. New owners in established subdivisions like Holiday Island should have the same opportunity to develop lake views. I believe this would encourage completion of building in existing developments (there are many half built subdivisions with available lots) rather than encourage development in multiple new areas and thus provide more miles of natural appearing shoreline. Some increase in boat docks should also be allowed.



## Table Rock Lake Revised Master Plan and Environmental Assessment



Please use this form to provide your comments on the draft revised Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and potential impacts of the alternatives. The Draft Master Plan and EA may be found on the web at <http://www.swl.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning/TableRockMasterPlanUpdate.aspx>. Feel free to take an extra form and send it back later to USACE at the addresses below.

**Comments must be submitted by August 30, 2013.**

Please PRINT.

Your Name  
Address

E-mail:

**US Privacy Act 5 USC 552 (b)**

Please circle the number that best represents your opinion of  
the Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2 “Balanced Use”:

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10

Strongly  
Disapprove

Strongly  
Approve

**What are the most important factors that affect your opinion?** I believe balanced use is the best because it allows for continued development of the lake shore residential properties while still providing a quality experience for the casual lake visitor. Currently developed areas (subdivisions, marinas, parks) should be removed from the vegetative management area and those areas should be given liberal approval of vegetation removal permits to match adjacent lots. Many current residential property owners, particularly those who have been on the lake for several years, have been allowed to remove most vegetation to develop lake views. New owners in established subdivisions like Holiday Island should have the same opportunity to develop lake views. I believe this would encourage completion of building in existing developments (there are many half built subdivisions with available lots) rather than encourage development in multiple new areas and thus provide more miles of natural appearing shoreline. Some increase in boat docks should also be allowed.

**Other Comments**