

Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee Meeting

Held at:

Dewey Short Visitor Center

December 12, 2019

Beverly L. Nagle, CCR

For The Record LLC

A Locally Owned Court Reporting Agency

1232 E. Trafficway, Springfield, MO 65802

Ph: (417) 881-1186 Fax: (417) 881-4557

www.fortherecordllc.com

Page 1

A P P E A R A N C E S

Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee: KEVIN MCDANIELS, Designated Federal Officer

TAMERA JAHNKE, Chairperson

ROBERT HUNT, Missouri Department of Natural Resources

RYAN BENEFIELD, State of Arkansas & Arkansas Natural Res. Commission

BECKY SHORTT, Operations Project Manager & Alternate Designated Federal Officer

SHEILA THOMAS, Table Rock Lake Chamber of Commerce

PAT COX, Owner/Operator of the State Park Marina & Harbor Marina

Corps of Engineers: Twilia Harrison, Table Rock Lake Chamber of Commerce

Dana Coburn, Project Manager, US Army Corps of Engineers

Deanna Ray, Counsel on Legal Matters for Table Rock Lake

Rheannon Hart

Trish Tannehill, GIS Specialist

Rodney Raley, Deputy Operations Project Manager

1 MS. SHORTT: I'd like to call this meeting to
2 order at this point.

3 MR. MCDANIELS: All right. Welcome,
4 everybody. This is the first meeting of the Table Rock
5 Lake Oversight Committee. My name is Kevin McDaniels.
6 I am the designated federal officer for this committee.
7 If you all have the agenda, we can follow along with
8 that a little bit; and we're actually going to start off
9 with some introductions. And as we all introduce
10 ourselves here, we're going to allow the court reporter
11 a little bit of time to make sure that everybody's name
12 is properly recorded. But everything here will be
13 recorded, everything that's said. So I'll let you go
14 next.

15 MS. JAHNKE: Okay. So I am the Chairperson of
16 the Committee. My name is Tamera Jahnke, also go by
17 Tammy. And we'll just go around the room and let people
18 introduce themselves.

19 MR. HUNT: My name is Robert Hunt. I work for
20 the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

21 MR. BENEFIELD: My name is Ryan Benefield. I
22 represent the State of Arkansas and work for the
23 Arkansas Natural Resources Commission.

24 MS. SHORTT: Good morning, again. My name is
25 Becky Shortt. I'm the Operations Project Manager here

1 at Table Rock Lake, and I am the alternate designated
2 federal official for this committee.

3 MS. THOMAS: Good morning. My name is Sheila
4 Thomas with Table Rock Lake Chamber of Commerce.

5 MR. COX: Good morning. My name is Pat Cox.
6 I'm owner/operator of the State Park Marina and the
7 Harbor Marina on Table Rock Lake.

8 MS. HARRISON: Twilia Harrison, Table Rock
9 Chamber of Commerce.

10 MR. MCDANIELS: And we have a team from the
11 Corps of Engineers back here.

12 MS. COBURN: Good morning. My name is Dana
13 Coburn. I'm the Project Manager from the US Army Corps
14 of Engineers.

15 MS. RAY: Good morning. My name is Deanna
16 Ray, and I am part of the office of counsel. And I
17 handle legal matters for Table Rock Lake.

18 MS. HART: I'm Rheannon Hart. And I also work
19 for the Army Corps of Engineers.

20 MS. TANNEHILL: Trish Tannehill. I'm the GIS
21 specialist for the Corps of Engineers, Operations.

22 MR. RALEY: My name is Rodney Raley. I'm the
23 Deputy Operations Project Manager here at Table Rock
24 Lake.

25 MR. MCDANIELS: Okay. So as part of this

1 committee and the next thing that we have to do, all of
2 the membership here is being designated as a special
3 government employee by the Department of Army and
4 Department of Defense. So we are going to administer an
5 oath of office. Okay. So if the Committee would stand
6 up and face the flag. And you can follow along on Part
7 A here if you'd like, and then repeat after me.

8 (Oath Administered)

9 MR. MCDANIELS: And then each of the Committee
10 Members, you all can sit back down, but you need to read
11 Part B and C, and then sign this document.

12 (Committee Members Comply)

13 MR. MCDANIELS: Okay. So the next item on
14 here is the purpose of the Table Rock Lake Oversight
15 Committee. And I'm going to read to you from the
16 charter that has been approved, the objectives and scope
17 of activities. Pursuant to section 1185C2 of the 2016
18 WIIN Act, the Table Rock Lake Oversight Committee shall
19 review any permit issued under the existing Table Rock
20 Lake Master Plan at the recommendation of the district
21 engineer, Little Rock District, US Army Corps of
22 Engineers, and advise the district engineer on revisions
23 to the new Table Rock Lake Master Plan and the Table
24 Rock Lake Shoreline Management Plan.

25 So also in the WIIN Act it designated specifically

1 who the committee members would be, and it's by who they
2 actually represent, not necessarily by name. So Tammy
3 represents conservation and Pat represents boating.
4 Sheila and Twilia represent economic development; Ryan
5 represents the State of Arkansas; Rob represents the
6 State of Missouri; and that's how we got to the
7 composition of our panel.

8 So during the course of this meeting, we're going
9 to do an overview of the draft plans where we are now.
10 Many of you are probably aware that probably a couple
11 years ago we did a public meeting with the existing
12 draft SMP. We got public feedback. The Corps of
13 Engineers has gone and made revisions for that plan
14 based on that public feedback. So as we kick off this
15 committee, we're going to go over those changes that are
16 made and present the draft plans. Those draft plans are
17 available currently on the Table Rock Lake Oversight
18 Committee Web site, and that address is here on the
19 agenda sheet for you. After that, the committee will
20 have discussion on both of the plans.

21 So as part of this committee is subject to what's
22 called FACA, which is The Federal Advisory Committee
23 Act, and there's a lot of regulations that go along with
24 that. Part of that is that all of these meetings are
25 open to the public, but at this particular meeting the

1 public is not invited to comment. Comments will be
2 allowed at meetings two and three. We'll have a
3 three-hour block, three minutes maximum. And you can
4 find that information located in the Federal Register
5 notice that was published. Comments can also be sent in
6 in writing, and those locations are listed at the bottom
7 of the page here; and we'll go over that towards the end
8 of the meeting.

9 Any media inquiries are going to be sent to our
10 public affairs office. We do have representatives from
11 that office who can field questions after the meeting.
12 And then again, all documents are available on the Table
13 Rock Lake website and the pertinent documents are also
14 placed into the GSA database under the Table Rock Lake
15 Oversight Committee.

16 So at this point, we're going to have Dana Coburn
17 do a presentation on the draft master plan and shoreline
18 plans.

19 MS. COBURN: Good morning. Can everybody hear
20 me? Good. So the purpose of today's presentation is an
21 overview of the Table Rock Lake Master Plan and
22 Shoreline Management Plan. A little bit of background,
23 we're going to take a walk down memory lane.

24 Okay. So we first started with the Table Rock Lake
25 Master Plan. We began planning in June of 2012. We

1 held public and agency scoping workshops in November and
2 December of 2012. We had a Draft Master Plan public
3 comment review period in July and August of 2013. We
4 held public workshops in August of 2013. And then in
5 February 2014, we held the Final Master Plan and
6 Environmental Assessment. They were released. In the
7 fall of 2014, we began work on the Table Rock Lake
8 Shoreline Management Plan.

9 A little bit of information on the scoping that
10 took place in 2012. Again, the public comment period
11 was held from the 14th of November to the 14th of
12 December, 2012. We had three workshops, and those are
13 the dates listed in 2012. They were in Reeds Spring,
14 Shell Knob, and Branson. We had a total of 1,357
15 attendees that signed in at the workshops, but we know
16 that it was probably more like 1,800 that attended based
17 on the seating capacity, as everybody did not sign in.
18 We had 615 comments collected via comment cards, fax,
19 letters, e-mail, and verbal comments.

20 During the draft released in 2013, we had a public
21 comment period from the 30th of July to the 30th of
22 August. We had four public workshops and over 1,200
23 attendees. We collected 842 comments; again, comment
24 cards, fax, letters, e-mails, and verbal comments.

25 For the Draft Master Plan, we had four original

1 alternatives developed after the scoping phase and after
2 comments were collected. We had alternative 1, which
3 was the No Action; alternative 2 was Balanced Use;
4 alternative 3 was the Conservative; and alternative 4
5 was High Development. After the Draft Master Plan
6 release and we collected the comments, we had five
7 additional alternatives developed, and that was
8 alternative 2A, Slow Growth; alternative 2B, Historic
9 High Density; alternative 2C, New High Density;
10 alternative 2D, No Vegetative Management; and
11 alternative E, which was a hybrid and eventually became
12 our Selected Alternative.

13 The Selected Alternative Hybrid 2E was based on the
14 public review of the draft comments, and it was our
15 ninth alternative and it was a hybrid of alternative 2
16 with combining parts 2B, 2C and 2D. And this slide
17 gives you an illustration of, from the 1976 master plan,
18 the land classifications that went to the 2014 master
19 plan.

20 We next started on the Table Rock Lake Shoreline
21 Management Plan update. Again, we began planning this
22 in the fall of 2014. We held public agency and scoping
23 workshops in March of 2015. We held focus groups from
24 August 2015 to June 2016, and then we did have a public
25 review and comment period on the draft SMP and draft

1 environmental assessment from June 2017 to September of
2 2017. We held workshops in July and August of 2017, and
3 now we are here in December of 2019, starting the Table
4 Rock Lake Oversight Committee.

5 For scoping, during the Shoreline Management Plan
6 update, we held scoping workshops over a three-day
7 period in March of 2015. Again, all the workshops were
8 held in the Branson Convention Center. We had 482
9 attendees and collected 502 agency and public comments.
10 We had a comment period of 16 March through 1 May of
11 2015. And we developed six alternatives for the draft
12 released during the summer of 2017; alternative 1, which
13 was No Growth; alternative 2, Benefits to General Public
14 Use; alternative 3 was the No Action; alternative 4 was
15 Neutral Changes; alternative 5 was Accelerated Private
16 Development; and alternative 6 was Maximum Private
17 Growth.

18 During the draft release in 2017, we held a comment
19 period from 30 June to 15 September 2017. We did three
20 workshops and collected 3,175 comments, with 861
21 attendees to the three workshops.

22 After the public comment review and the workshops,
23 we came back and we now have a seventh alternative in
24 the draft Shoreline Management Plan, and that is
25 alternative 4A, Revised Neutral Changes. I'm going to

1 walk you through some of those highlights.

2 So in alternative 4A, this is now our proposed
3 preferred alternative, the Park Buffer allocation name
4 has changed to Public Recreation Area. Some of the
5 Public Recreation Areas around the lake have been
6 reduced. This will allow the potential for vegetation
7 permits in some areas that were not previously allowed.
8 Docks located outside of LDA and outside of Marina
9 Buffer Areas that have been placed in LDA will be
10 relieved of grandfather status for some of these docks.
11 And docks located in Restricted Limited Development
12 Areas will have fewer restrictions. If all other
13 criteria is met, those docks may expand. They may add
14 swim docks, but they would not be able to add slips.
15 Community Dock only and Courtesy Dock only allocations
16 have been changed to LDA. Some of those allocations
17 have been relocated if inactive.

18 For Private Floating Facilities, which are also
19 called Docks, new permits will be issued for new docks
20 containing a range from 1 to 20 slips. There is now a
21 combined total of 30,800 boat slips and launching ramp
22 parking spaces that can be placed on the lake. We are
23 acquiring two printed, legible, 11 by 17 and one
24 electronic set of engineered stamped plans. Maximum
25 slip size has changed from 14 by 30 to 12 by 30. And

1 request to modify docks can only be submitted by the
2 permittee and only one request will be considered in the
3 five-year permit period.

4 So again, Private Floating Facilities, or Docks,
5 PWC lifts attached to the docks must be owned/used by a
6 slip opener in the dock. We did have originally, in the
7 draft release in 2017, a requirement for alternative
8 power sources. We are taking that out in this draft.
9 But you will see in the fourth bullet, licenses for new
10 land based electric service will not be approved. If a
11 dock within -- with existing land based service is
12 relocated or moved, the existing electric service must
13 be removed and the area restored prior to the issuance
14 or approval of the boat dock permit. In these
15 instances, new electric service must be provided by an
16 alternative power source. If a dock is rebuilt at the
17 same location, the existing electric service may be
18 used. Licenses for existing electric service to the
19 docks may be renewed.

20 For vegetation modification permits, mowing and/or
21 underbrushing permitted area may be limited in certain
22 circumstances when determined to be in the best interest
23 of the stewardship of the natural resources, for
24 instance, if there's a protected species habitat, such
25 as a bald eagle nest or if a safety issue is discovered

1 on site such as a creek crossing, a bluff or a
2 government-maintained road. Trees and shrubs up to two
3 inches in diameter, measured at ground level, may be
4 removed. Cedar trees up to three inches in diameter,
5 measured at ground level, may also be removed.

6 For other permits and outgrants, there will not be
7 new -- no new ski courses -- ski course permits will be
8 issued. No new licenses will be issued for stairs,
9 steps, mooring buoys or tramways. And on the third
10 bullet, this was also in the draft released in 2017, we
11 are taking that out in this current Master -- or current
12 Shoreline Management Plan.

13 So Kevin talked a little bit about the Table Rock
14 Lake Oversight Committee. We received this legislation
15 back in December of 2016 under WRDA. From March of 2017
16 until 21 October of 2019, there was a lot of work done
17 behind the scenes to try and get this oversight
18 committee set up. This gives you a little bit of
19 information on what kind of packages were sent forward
20 and what took place to try and establish this oversight
21 committee.

22 So our path forward, we did have an administrative
23 meeting in September, and we are here in December of
24 2019 for our first meeting. The second meeting will be
25 held on the 23rd of January, also here at the Dewey

1 Short Visitor Center. We have a requirement for all
2 written public comments to be received by the 27th of
3 February, 2020. Our third Table Rock Lake Committee
4 Meeting will be the 5th of March and the fourth Table
5 Rock Committee Meeting will be on the 6th of May. And
6 that is the end of my presentation.

7 MS. JAHNKE: Thank you. Are there questions
8 from any of the Committee Members?

9 MR. BENEFIELD: I'm sorry, I'm coming into
10 this with less knowledge than most people. So the
11 status of the Shoreline Management Plan's in draft. The
12 master plan's also in draft or is it finalized?

13 MR. MCDANIELS: So the original update to the
14 master plan back in 2014 was actually signed and
15 implemented by the district; however, the WIIN
16 legislation directed the Corps of Engineers to revise
17 that which, in essence, means that we will be taking
18 comments on the master plan as well. We will review
19 those, and when the final release is made, the intent
20 would be to resign that master plan also.

21 MR. BENEFIELD: So I guess that we'll be
22 making recommendations on that also?

23 MR. MCDANIELS: Correct.

24 MR. COX: I have a question related to the
25 electrical service on boat docks. Are there any clear

1 reasons why we're changing that to an alternative
2 source? Is it safety? Is it difficulty in maintaining
3 the inspection process? What is the rationale for that?

4 MR. MCDANIELS: So I'll give a couple
5 comments, then I'm going to have Becky also comment,
6 from the lake. The policy of the lake has been that all
7 new boat dock facilities have required solar power for
8 several years now. So basically after the comment
9 period, we're resorting back to what the previous policy
10 had been at the lake that we have been following, and
11 Becky can tell you how long that has been for.

12 A couple of issues there when you're looking at
13 cumulative impacts of putting in multiple electric lines
14 around the lake, you're looking at, and there's a few
15 bullets up there that reference the ARPA, the NEPA,
16 things of that nature, environmental concerns, historic
17 concerns, and cumulative impacts. And then, simply, the
18 number of outgrants being issued, the costs associated
19 with those, the processes with that, which is also part
20 of the WIIN Act that we are told to make the program
21 more efficient. And I'll let you comment on that as
22 well.

23 MS. SHORTT: The same as what Kevin was
24 saying, the change that we have made to the current
25 draft that we have proposed for everyone to look at now

1 is the policy that we've been operating under since
2 2014. We originally proposed for everyone to move to
3 solar power for multiple reasons, safety being one of
4 the things that is an issue, but also like Kevin was
5 saying, the corridors, the overhead power and also
6 underground power along the shoreline, the impacts to
7 the land from those and the maintenance that it takes to
8 keep those lines cleared. And the other part of that is
9 the federal laws that encourage the federal government
10 to be green in our rule making.

11 MR. COX: I'll follow up with that. Do we
12 know of any other Corps of Engineers lakes that are
13 implementing this or have implemented this, converting
14 to solar on boat docks?

15 MR. MCDANIELS: Yeah, we have multiple lakes
16 around the Little Rock District that have already
17 implemented this. And Dana, can you speak to -- do you
18 recall the research we did around the nation?

19 MS. COBURN: As Kevin was saying, we have gone
20 through multiple master plan and Shoreline Management
21 Plan revisions at various lakes in the Little Rock
22 District in Beaver Lake, Bull Shoals Lake, and right now
23 Greers Ferry Lake is looking at implementing the solar
24 requirements.

25 MR. COX: So does it work? I mean, are people

1 putting the battery capacity on their docks so they can
2 operate 110 or how are they doing this?

3 MR. MCDANIELS: So I happened to speak to
4 somebody from Beaver Lake the day before yesterday and
5 asked them if they have had any complaints or heard any
6 pushback since they implemented this in their new plan,
7 and they said that they have not. So I think it's a
8 matter of specking it out to what your requirements are,
9 you know, looking at the number of cycles for how often
10 you use a boat lift or if you're charging batteries on a
11 fishing boat or doing things of those nature.

12 We did have some companies at the public meetings
13 that I recall that installed solar power that talked
14 about being able to design systems that would fit to
15 most everybody's usage patterns.

16 MS. THOMAS: Becky, just to clarify, this rule
17 has been in place since 2014, so all new docks since
18 that time have been required to install solar; is that
19 what you said?

20 MS. SHORTT: Becky, that's correct.

21 MS. THOMAS: Okay. A follow-up question to
22 that, because we have a long coves that are in deep
23 valleys, has that impacted the power to that dock
24 because sometimes the sun doesn't get as, you know,
25 doesn't -- isn't as bright in those cove areas, how has

1 that worked here?

2 MS. SHORTT: I don't have a good answer for
3 that. It's something I can research and get back to the
4 committee on, give it some information. I have heard
5 that there are issues in different places, but that's
6 something that the committee could request some initial
7 information on and we can research.

8 MS. THOMAS: Madam Chairman, I would like to
9 have asked for that information.

10 MS. SHORTT: Okay.

11 MS. JAHNKE: And, Becky, I'm going to make an
12 assumption that you know exactly what she's asking for
13 so we don't have to clarify.

14 MS. SHORTT: Yes.

15 MS. JAHNKE: Okay. Very good. Very good.

16 MS. THOMAS: I'm curious as to the reason --
17 the reasoning behind the dock permit modification every
18 five years. That appears to me to be a long time. Is
19 that -- what is the reasoning behind that restriction?

20 MR. MCDANIELS: Becky, do you want to answer
21 that one?

22 MS. SHORTT: As part of this process, our
23 master plan team was tasked at looking at ways that we
24 can make our program more efficient, that we can
25 continue to operate at the same service levels for the

1 most part while still maintaining the same staff levels
2 as our permit program grew, and so as one of the cost
3 saving measures that we looked at was limiting the
4 number of inspections that we go out and do on an annual
5 basis. So putting a little bit more responsibility on
6 the permittee to get with the dock owners and community
7 docks and consolidate their requests.

8 MR. HUNT: Is there a -- is there a public
9 comment record that we would be able to look at from the
10 last round of comments?

11 MR. MCDANIELS: Are you referring to the last
12 round of the -- the draft release or the Master Plan?

13 MR. HUNT: Well, probably the management plan?

14 MR. MCDANIELS: Are those on the Web site?

15 MS. COBURN: Yes. All the public comments
16 that we have received, through scoping, through the
17 draft release both on the master plan and Shoreline
18 Management Plan, they are on our Web site, should be
19 appendices.

20 MR. COX: Another question. Would you
21 generally agree that most of these changes have
22 something to do with saving money and moving us toward
23 better stewardship of the lake, those are really the two
24 motivations for these changes?

25 MR. MCDANIELS: I would say those are two

1 primary motivations with the other one being safety
2 issues.

3 MS. THOMAS: I have another question about the
4 elimination of the remote service dock program. The
5 question specifically is that that is in the plan to be
6 removed one year from the signing of the plan but the
7 area then would not be converted to LDA. So am I
8 understanding it correctly that once that program is
9 removed, that those areas that were previously available
10 to be served by a remote service dock would not be
11 eligible for any type of permit?

12 MS. SHORTT: Yes, you're correct.

13 MS. THOMAS: Okay. Can we -- can you tell me
14 the reasoning behind that?

15 MR. MCDANIELS: Is it within a Marina Buffer
16 Area?

17 MS. SHORTT: It is within a Marina Buffer
18 Area. And so those areas were originally set up, it was
19 a pilot program that was started on Table Rock Lake back
20 in the '90s, and it was due to, at that time, from what
21 I read, it was due to public -- perceived public need
22 for boat docks next to communities within the Marina
23 Buffer Area. And so there was a plan come up with to
24 have these remote service docks to serve the
25 communities.

1 The rub came in when -- you know, because we're a
2 federal agency and those commercial facilities are open
3 to the general public, we started getting a lot of calls
4 and complaints because the marinas were leasing the
5 slips to people outside the community and there started
6 to be a lot of rub with people driving in and out to
7 access these boat docks.

8 And so in response to the public comment that they
9 didn't like the remote service docks and the fact that
10 it was a pilot program that was started on Table Rock
11 Lake, never adopted at any other Corps lakes, we wanted
12 to give a sudden set period to stop the program.

13 MS. THOMAS: But why specifically wouldn't we
14 convert that area to LDA since it was previously allowed
15 to be served by a dock?

16 MR. MCDANIELS: So I'll address that part.
17 That's certainly a recommendation that can be made. It
18 would have to be in light of the Marina Buffer Areas
19 being removed so that a Limited Development Area could
20 be placed in that area, which would potentially make
21 some changes within the master plan as well as the
22 Shoreline Management Plan, but that would have to be
23 considered as an offset from the public use development
24 to private development and changing that area from a
25 recreation marina type usage to a private exclusive use.

1 So that's the two sides that would have to be conflicted
2 in that proposal. So that would be something to
3 consider.

4 MS. THOMAS: I'll just -- the reason I'm
5 asking is, for example, in Kimberling City, there is an
6 area through this remote service dock program that would
7 be served by the Port of Kimberling or could be served
8 by the Port of Kimberling. But if that program is
9 removed, then those folks along that area have no -- no
10 method to ever gain a community dock or any type of
11 other dock. So we're basically just taking that out of
12 a possibility. So that would be my concern with that,
13 that program being totally removed and not replaced by
14 LDA.

15 MR. MCDANIELS: Okay. They would have the one
16 year to request and put in a remote service dock. So
17 they do have that opportunity, just so --

18 MS. THOMAS: Yeah.

19 MR. MCDANIELS: Just so we know.

20 MS. THOMAS: Yeah, the one year is fine. I'm
21 just thinking for future, ever, development of property,
22 where there are some existing docks, I mean, it's --
23 it's a commercial area. So it just seems like we would
24 be limiting that excessively if we weren't allowing some
25 type of remedy.

1 MR. COX: I own and operate two marinas, but I
2 do not utilize a remote service dock program, just
3 hasn't been the right opportunity. Could be in the
4 future. I've had some people ask from time to time.
5 And if we eliminated this designation forever, then that
6 wouldn't be -- that wouldn't be open in the future to
7 new owners, new things that are going to change over the
8 next few decades, it might be wise to look to maybe
9 addressing the limitations, frustrations with what's
10 happened in the past regarding the traffic flow and the
11 conflicts. Maybe that's something we could look into as
12 a committee to mitigate those impacts but still have
13 this opportunity to do a smaller remote dock if the
14 community needs one. So there might be a couple ways to
15 look at that.

16 MS. THOMAS: Mm-hmm, yes.

17 MR. COX: I do want to jump back on to the
18 boat dock electrical service because I think the job of
19 this community is to ask questions to truly try to
20 understand all the underpinning and decisions and maybe
21 -- we'd be doing a disservice if we didn't. I'm
22 interested in knowing the cost difference between a
23 typical 10-slip boat dock, I know because I'm in the
24 boat dock business what the cost is of powering the
25 traditional method, but it would be interesting if we

1 could bring by the next meeting a couple of cost
2 estimates on going to solar. I think it sounds
3 terrific, but I want to make sure we're not going along
4 with something that is prohibitively expensive and
5 ridiculously expensive because it's possible it is.

6 And if that's the case, if it's not possible on a
7 boat dock because of its location relative to the sun or
8 the size of the dock itself, then perhaps there's an
9 alternative and there could be a fee associated with
10 this. For example, if it's, you know, \$20,000 more to
11 go solar and there's a \$1,500 fee to the Corps to get an
12 exception to that and then that would fund the proper
13 inspections, that might be something we can look at.

14 I happen to know quite a bit about the
15 electrification of boat docks because I have a lot of
16 which have 400 to 600 amps of power; and it's something
17 that keeps me up at night because we're very concerned
18 about having electricity around the water. And there
19 are a lot of new technologies available with GFI and how
20 the electrical is run to the boat dock, i.e., keep it
21 out of the water, there might be some things we can look
22 into implementing to address the safety. So that's one
23 area in which I think the committee's going to gather
24 some more information.

25 MS. JAHNKE: Are there other questions or

1 points of clarification from committee members?

2 MS. THOMAS: Yes, I have another question.
3 Kevin's not surprised, I don't think. I always have
4 lots of questions.

5 The carrying capacity study and access opportunity
6 restrictions that are -- they have not changed from the
7 previous draft to this draft, maybe slightly to update
8 some numbers, but I guess my -- my question is, is
9 there, in those calculations, is there any consideration
10 given to that not every boat in every slip and in
11 parking space in every boat launch would be used at one
12 time?

13 MR. MCDANIELS: Yes. So when they do carrying
14 capacity studies, Beaver was the most recent that we had
15 done, but yeah, they all factor into it. They factor in
16 different, whether it's a weekday or a weekend or a
17 holiday, but if you look at the carrying capacity of
18 30,000, and we have done calculations by taking out
19 shallow waters, max at coves, et cetera, we're just over
20 the 30, maybe 31 -- 33,000 acres of useable water. So a
21 carrying capacity, if you think about 30,000 plus slips
22 or opportunities, if everybody was using them at one
23 time, you would have one boat per acre out there. So
24 think about your average residential house being half an
25 acre, maybe, yard or 3/4, that will kind of give you,

1 you know, think about the land and subdivision and
2 everywhere there's houses, there's boats.

3 So when we look at densities and we look at high
4 usage or medium usage or low usage, typically, on a
5 shoreline use permit for a private dock, you might get a
6 number that's closer to one to ten that's factored in
7 there. On a weekend at Table Rock, you're probably
8 looking at most of the boat parking spots being closer
9 to one to one. But those calculations are used to come
10 to an overall kind of maximum density of Table Rock,
11 we're targeting closer to one boat per ten acres in
12 usage, although most other lakes in the nation we see
13 trying to target closer to one to 16 or one to 18. So
14 by giving such a high number in that carrying capacity,
15 it's kind of an intentional, and we kind of have
16 referred to it in the past as managing towards red, when
17 you think about the red, yellow, green about how busy
18 and how dense the usage is, and red being very highly
19 used, you know, getting close to those safety thresholds
20 getting very congested, this plan is geared towards
21 managing to red, about making this closer to the
22 highest, pretty much recommended use of lakes across the
23 nation.

24 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

25 MR. COX: So on a percentage basis, where are

1 we? I know we have roughly 14,000 boat slips, but I'm
2 looking quickly to see how many boat launch splices we
3 have available.

4 MR. MCDANIELS: Trish, can you give us that
5 total?

6 MS. TANNEHILL: Pat, what were you wanting to
7 know?

8 MR. COX: What percentage of our capacity are
9 we currently at on --

10 MR. MCDANIELS: So total number of private
11 boat dock slips, marina slips, and boat ramp parking
12 spots.

13 MS. TANNEHILL: So based off the 2009 study,
14 it was close to one to -- one boat for every 14 acres, I
15 believe, is what we were at.

16 MR. COX: I see here we're about 67 percent
17 currently, right? So 21,000, we've got 30 something
18 thousand.

19 MS. TANNEHILL: Oh --

20 MR. MCDANIELS: Total number of slips on the
21 lake, commercial and private plus --

22 MS. TANNEHILL: 21,000.

23 MS. THOMAS: I guess my question is, maybe I
24 didn't -- and maybe I'm just not understanding this.
25 But my question is, so we have 21,000 slips and we have

1 so many numbers of parking spaces at boat launches,
2 which you would assume are boats in use. But in that
3 calculation, is there a percentage used to calculate the
4 number of boats actually in use because not all -- just
5 because someone has a slip, doesn't mean that the boat
6 is on the water running.

7 MR. MCDANIELS: Right.

8 MR. COX: Right.

9 MR. MCDANIELS: So with those numbers that
10 we've looked at, to get to the one to ten acres, the
11 assumption would be that like one out of every ten
12 private boat is in use at the same time, or I remember
13 numbers like one to four at the marinas at certain times
14 of the year are in use.

15 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

16 MR. MCDANIELS: But if you're looking at a one
17 to ten ratio, one boat, you know, going 50 miles an hour
18 within a ten-acre buffer, which is a theory calculation.
19 We know the areas closer to the dam are more congested
20 and there's boats closer. But you're actually looking
21 at an assumption of 3,000 -- 3,100 boats at any one
22 given time being used on the lake, which would calculate
23 to us giving the opportunity to have 31,000 boats stored
24 on the lake.

25 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

1 MS. SHORTT: So just to clarify, in the
2 Shoreline Management Plan in the draft, on page 30A, it
3 talks about in 2009, there was a boat study that was --
4 a boater use study that was completed on the lake. And
5 when they were out on the lake on a summer non-peak
6 weekend day in 2009, they counted, physically counted
7 2,090 boats on the lake. At that time there were a
8 total of 19,254 boat slips and boat launching ramp
9 parking spaces.

10 So we use that number and -- sorry -- extrapolate
11 it out what would be a 60 percent increase from that,
12 those two numbers, to figure out what our maximum
13 density should be on the lake based on that study.

14 MS. THOMAS: That -- that was my question,
15 though, is that looks like that assumes that all those
16 boats are in use.

17 MS. SHORTT: No. There were 2,090 boats in
18 use, and there were a total of 19,000 slips on the lake
19 at the time. So only a percentage of the boats were in
20 use from the slips that were in place. Only 2,000 of
21 those were in use. Does that make sense?

22 MS. THOMAS: I'm not sure.

23 MS. SHORTT: So we estimated in the draft
24 there, a 30,000 number, so the 30,000 threshold number
25 that we came up with for total boat slips and parking

1 lot -- or boat launch spaces, parking spaces, that the
2 total number of boats in use on an average summer
3 non-peak weekend would be 3,344 boats.

4 MR. COX: So taking ten percent of that.

5 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

6 MR. COX: Which I will say, that's a fair
7 allocation.

8 MS. SHORTT: Thank you.

9 MR. COX: I'm building a marina in Oklahoma
10 now, and we're a 16-acre lake. So I think that is very
11 reasonable. And I've read that study '09 numerous
12 times. I think it's extremely accurate. So that's one
13 thing that's a pretty good bedrock for -- in terms of
14 what's happening around the country.

15 MS. SHORTT: And the 3,344 boats, that would
16 be one boat for every ten acres.

17 MR. COX: Ten acres, yeah. Just assuming --

18 MS. SHORTT: A busy holiday weekend that's
19 going to be less because this is a non-peak summer.

20 MR. MCDANIELS: Less acreage.

21 MR. COX: And we have certainly had less than
22 2,000 on the lake.

23 I have a question about the ski course permits. Is
24 that a safety issue? Are those becoming a burden? Is
25 that something that we've had some difficulty managing?

1 Is there any possibility for people to put a short-term?
2 I mean, I know you have bench permits and such. But I
3 can understand not wanting something to be installed and
4 left there and just unattended, you know, potentially,
5 but to just say no, seems like it's quite a limitation
6 on recreation.

7 MS. SHORTT: Yeah. So a permit would only be
8 required for things that were going to be left out in
9 the lake permanently.

10 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

11 MS. SHORTT: So if there was a special event
12 application for a temporary permit, that's something
13 that we work with water patrol.

14 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

15 MS. SHORTT: If there wanted to be a weekend
16 event or something like that, but the ski courses that
17 are mentioned there were the ones that I want to say
18 either three or five currently on the lake that are
19 permitted to be for permanent use and haven't permitted
20 any new for many, many years. Not since in the 20 years
21 I've been here have we permitted a new one so it seems
22 like it must be something that's kind of going to the
23 wayside. So it's something we didn't think we needed to
24 continue.

25 MR. MCDANIELS: Okay. So Raley indicated six?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. RALEY: Yes.

MR. MCDANIELS: Correct? And any member of the public can use any permitted ski course out there?

MS. SHORTT: That's correct.

MR. MCDANIELS: And you can set up a temporary ski course for the day as long as you take it down at the end of the day --

MS. SHORTT: That's correct.

MR. MCDANIELS: -- before dark.

MR. COX: Okay. That's good. I'd like to see us just, let's put a sentence behind that, let folks know it's still available to them for the day. I think that's very reasonable.

And with regard to stairsteps, I understand mooring buoys, and that's the water patrol's domain in regard to, you know, these floating regulatory things like a mooring buoy or a -- a mooring buoy is actually attached to a boat and stays there permanently, and I understand that.

The stairsteps, this is regarding people installing things on the shoreline; is that right?

MS. SHORTT: Yes.

MR. MCDANIELS: Correct.

MS. THOMAS: Why would that not be allowed? What is the reasoning behind that?

1 MR. MCDANIELS: You want to do that one,
2 Becky?

3 MS. SHORTT: Sure. Twofold reason behind it.
4 For every set of steps or stairs that we outgrant on
5 public land, we take on a real estate instrument that
6 the Corps of Engineers have to administer. And so there
7 is a manpower issue at that. The other part of it being
8 the environmental concerns of creating a corridor that
9 goes down the lake, that those areas tend to start areas
10 of erosion.

11 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

12 MS. SHORTT: Hoping that when we place new
13 boat docks, we place them in areas where people can
14 access their boat dock without having to have steps and
15 stairs to access them.

16 MS. THOMAS: The language regarding the
17 vegetation modification permits has been changed in the
18 new draft. Would you just give us a little bit of
19 highlight on what you changed there, what that really
20 means for people?

21 MS. SHORTT: And, Dana, I'm going to look at
22 you to chime in because you -- on your presentation, you
23 had the two things and so I want to make sure that I
24 remember them correctly, the first one being that we're
25 not going to issue new permits for areas that cross

1 something that could potentially cause a danger. So we
2 don't want people mowing on the bluff area. We don't
3 want them to be crossing a major road, something that's
4 maintained by the government. We don't want people
5 riding their lawnmowers across the road to be able to
6 mow government land or if there is a ravine or
7 something, something that would potentially be a safety
8 hazard.

9 And, Dana, I see you moving. Go ahead, Dana.

10 MS. COBURN: I was just gonna add, if an
11 endangered species habitat is discovered, I know
12 recently on one of our other lakes we discovered a bald
13 eagle's nest and that was something that was brought to
14 our attention, actually, by an adjacent landowner. So
15 if something is discovered, there would not be a
16 vegetation modification issued or it could be specific,
17 site specific.

18 MR. MCDANIELS: And then the other change was
19 we were going to allow cedar trees to be cut up to three
20 inches instead of two as a result of the public
21 comments, and the two or three-inch measurement is now
22 taken at ground level instead of at DBH, which would be
23 four and a half feet high, which there is absolutely no
24 way for us to tell what that was after you cut it.

25 MS. THOMAS: And that's done -- they can do

1 that without a permit?

2 MR. MCDANIELS: No. They need a permit for
3 that.

4 MS. THOMAS: To cut cedars?

5 MR. MCDANIELS: Yes.

6 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

7 MS. SHORTT: And a quick point of
8 clarification on the electric policy, I said 2014.
9 Their policy was actually first signed in March 1st of
10 2013.

11 MR. COX: Do we have anybody on Table Rock
12 currently using solar?

13 MS. SHORTT: Yes.

14 MR. COX: Okay. I might get their contact
15 information. I just want to be more educated on this.

16 MS. SHORTT: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. MCDANIELS: So Pat, would you like us to
18 see if we can have somebody here to give you a
19 presentation on solar power like a solar power company
20 during the next discussion session in meeting 2?

21 MR. COX: I think I'll take this on, on my own
22 personal sidebar and just do some research, in advance
23 of the committee -- talk to some to see if boat dock
24 owners are using solar and take a look at some costs and
25 modifications and benefits. It sounds great; but I just

1 want to make sure we're not putting an undue burden, and
2 then if it's really not possible and if it's a burden on
3 the Corps for inspections and safety and so forth, maybe
4 there's some measures to be taken to mitigate that. So
5 there's a few options out there. I personally looked
6 into doing solar on our docks and it just isn't possible
7 to gain that kind of capacity without having a bank of
8 batteries and creating a whole range of new safety
9 issues.

10 MS. JAHNKE: Are there any other questions,
11 comments?

12 MR. COX: I have another question.

13 MS. JAHNKE: Okay.

14 MR. COX: With regard to the request for a new
15 boat dock, is there something you can provide the
16 committee that gives us the required information that an
17 owner needs to submit, for example, the justification
18 for the number of slips, do we still require folks to
19 submit documentation on who's going to be in the slip?
20 Is there an actual boat that's going to be allocated to
21 that slip? Because, as we know, there was quite a
22 cottage industry a few years ago where folks would get a
23 20-stall boat dock permit and then proceed to go sell
24 the slips at 20, \$30,000 apiece. And, unfortunately,
25 the Corps got zero of that and it was quite a little

1 entrepreneurial boom for developers around the lake.

2 MS. SHORTT: Bear with me. I'll have to look
3 in the Master -- or in the Shoreline Management Plan and
4 to make sure I get it correct.

5 MR. COX: And you can provide that -- you
6 know, just whatever that new application looks like, you
7 just provide that to the committee.

8 MS. SHORTT: It's on page 15 of the Shoreline
9 Management Plan, it talks about application process.

10 MR. COX: Okay.

11 MS. SHORTT: After the site approval, the
12 applicant provides the following, the shoreline use
13 application form, two printed and one electronic set of
14 engineered stamped plans for the facility, the dock
15 owner information sheet with name, addresses, boat
16 registrations for all slips, a copy of the current boat
17 registration for each new slip, boat length cannot
18 exceed the length of a slip. A boat with marine
19 sanitation devices are recommended to be moored in a
20 commercial marina which can provide appropriate sewage
21 pump out. A recorded dedicated easement for access and
22 parking with planning and zoning approval if applicable,
23 and -- and then if the LDA where they're going to place
24 the boat dock is in an area where there's a known
25 cultural site, there's a survey required to comply with

1 the ARPA Act.

2 MR. COX: Okay.

3 MS. THOMAS: How does that work with, you
4 know, there's been a major increase in the use of
5 vacation rental type properties over the last several
6 years, like Airbnb and HomeAway and Expedia, those type
7 of properties, how does that work with the property
8 owner who owns a vacation rental, using it as a vacation
9 rental and they have a slip; are the renters of that
10 property for however period of time, are they allowed to
11 use that slip?

12 MS. SHORTT: Short answer is no. Sorry. I
13 wasn't close enough. Short answer to that is no. Title
14 36, which is a Corps of Engineers-wide regulation, it's
15 36 US Code of Federal Regulations, part 327, one of the
16 conditions for a shoreline use permit is that the slips
17 may be used only by the owner of the slip.

18 MR. COX: Do we have any data that would, even
19 if it was rough, that would indicate how many slips that
20 are held in private hands are actually occupied
21 currently?

22 MS. SHORTT: I'm looking at Trish Tannehill
23 because she's our numbers guru, and she's shaking her
24 head no.

25 MS. TANNEHILL: No.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. SHORTT: Anything you want to clarify, Trish?

MS. TANNEHILL: It would have to be done at one moment in time to go out to the entire lake to see. We don't have those numbers.

MR. COX: You're right. I assume you don't.

MR. MCDANIELS: We did attempt to do that at Beaver Lake, and it is very difficult because you have to try to make that decision about whether that boat is out being used or whether that boat slip is vacant. But when they did that, they went along and they looked at things like cobwebs covering, you know, that would indicate that a boat had not just recently left there or that it had not been used. But that is a very difficult number to try to get a handle on.

MR. COX: Yeah. It's just interesting that we're using up our capacity as a lake and -- the public's capacity, I should mention, on, you know, some docks that have been put out there essentially, you know, to die that are unoccupied. There's really no mechanism, you know, for that, you know, for that to end at some point. You know, the fees are so low to have a boat dock. There's no motivation for folks to get the junk off the lake. And close by or within the area there might be a real need for that capacity to be

1 utilized by someone else.

2 MS. THOMAS: Is it still the case that 12
3 percent of the shoreline is available for development?
4 Is that still the number?

5 MS. SHORTT: Trish, I'll defer to you.

6 (No response from Ms. Tannehill.)

7 MS. THOMAS: When we were going through the
8 other draft or maybe the master plan, we were told that
9 it was 12 percent that was even available for
10 development and about 80 some percent of that was
11 actually developed. That's my memory so I don't know if
12 that's actually accurate.

13 MS. TANNEHILL: In the no action, there's 40
14 percent of LDA remaining. In the alternative 4, there's
15 approximately 35 percent.

16 MS. SHORTT: What's the total percentage of
17 LDA available?

18 MS. TANNEHILL: Oh, the total?

19 MS. SHORTT: Total LDA percentage.

20 MS. TANNEHILL: 12 percent, 12 percent, yeah.

21 MS. SHORTT: 12 percent of the lake is LDA,
22 and what percentage of that is used currently?

23 MS. TANNEHILL: 65.

24 MR. COX: So can we assume within that 12
25 percent LDA, that is where our private slips are

1 residing, correct?

2 MR. MCDANIELS: Correct.

3 MR. COX: Okay.

4 MR. MCDANIELS: With the exception, I guess
5 currently there's about 300 that are located outside of
6 LDA that the new plan will realign the LDA to put all
7 those docks back in. Those were either maybe placed out
8 due to a mapping error or something like that in the
9 past.

10 MS. THOMAS: Take that 65 percent up that's
11 currently being --

12 MR. MCDANIELS: Actually, it -- well, I guess
13 we would have to look at that, but we're actually moving
14 LDA to accommodate that. So I guess technically that
15 would increase the percentage. But we have LDA in areas
16 that cannot be developed because the adjacent property
17 blocks it from access. So some of those are being
18 moved, some of those you have an existing LDA area that
19 will be shifted left or right to accommodate those.

20 MR. COX: So just rough numbers, if we're at
21 13,500 private use slips and we're at 65 percent
22 capacity, so roughly 4,000 slips theoretically could be
23 added over the next --

24 MR. MCDANIELS: So when we look at capacity,
25 we need to keep an eye on that it includes all three

1 features; marinas, private docks and boat ramp parking.
2 We, as the Corps, are probably not going to be adding a
3 whole lot of boat ramp parking. We don't get funding to
4 do that, nor do we really have the staff, manpower, all
5 of that to increase those facilities. Marinas around
6 the lake can still look at adding slips. So if any of
7 those increase, that comes off of that total number as
8 we approach the capacity.

9 MR. COX: So --

10 MS. SHORTT: I was going to say, and that the
11 other thing that we look at in LDA to determine what's
12 the maximum number of slips that can potentially be
13 created on the lake, we have to look at if that LDA was
14 utilized to the maximum extent possible.

15 MS. THOMAS: Right.

16 MS. SHORTT: If all docks were 20-slip boat
17 docks, you know, spaced a hundred feet apart, how many
18 would actually fit? And Trish ran some numbers.

19 MS. THOMAS: If there were two slip docks,
20 four slip docks --

21 MS. TANNEHILL: We'll have to rerun the
22 numbers because those were back from '17. But we can
23 get those numbers still. They will be estimates, of
24 course.

25 MR. COX: We're at 21,000, and we can go

1 roughly to 30,000, let's call that 10,000, only 4,000
2 are allocated within LDA; and we're just assuming
3 percentage. And I know. It depends on the size of the
4 dock. There's theoretically 6,000 slips or boats, and
5 we're not adding boat ramps and parking. That's --
6 essentially would be more than double the current slips
7 in the marinas, which is just impossible to conceive
8 every marina doubling in size. So --

9 MS. SHORTT: I was going to say, Trish, can
10 you look at what our original alternative for -- or what
11 our no action, if we filled up all of our current LDA,
12 what our current numbers were?

13 MS. TANNEHILL: Our alternative 3 was 11,000
14 -- about 12,000 initial.

15 MR. MCDANIELS: In LDA?

16 MS. TANNEHILL: Correct.

17 MR. MCDANIELS: Correct. So that's what would
18 fit.

19 MR. COX: And that's using the same set of
20 numbers that were at 65, so that's the 12 percent?

21 MS. SHORTT: Mm-hmm.

22 MR. COX: Okay.

23 MR. MCDANIELS: But that would be assuming the
24 maximum-sized slip in every sized boat dock with maximum
25 number of slips at every possible location.

1 MR. COX: Got you.

2 MR. MCDANIELS: And that also takes into
3 account, if you have an LDA and there's a current dock
4 there that may be placed in a location that may not
5 allow the maximum number of boat docks to be put in
6 there. So we leave that up to the boat dock owners to
7 work out amongst themselves if they want to shift that
8 boat dock left or right a little bit to allow another
9 one to fit in.

10 MR. COX: Mm-hmm. I guess I'll continue the
11 questions. This committee was formed to explore and
12 also validate and hopefully better communicate what's
13 going to be the final implementation of shoreline plan,
14 and I think the motivation of the creation of the
15 committee was to address maybe three or four key issues.
16 Could you maybe provide that to the committee and what
17 you think, Kevin, is, these are the things, the sticking
18 points, if you will?

19 MR. MCDANIELS: So one of the primary sticking
20 points, I'll start with the easier one first, was the
21 no-wake buoy issue. So since that has happened, we had
22 some language put in the draft, no-wake buoys had to be
23 removed by a certain point in time. After those public
24 meetings and after having additional meetings with the
25 State of Missouri, that requirement is being removed.

1 We are still going to encourage that those buoys be
2 appropriately maintained, that they be kept a hundred
3 foot from the end of the dock, that they not be allowed
4 to migrate out into the middle of coves to essentially
5 block off huge portions of the lake or at least to give
6 the perception to the public that they are blocked off.
7 So that part has been removed.

8 In the draft mas -- or shoreline plan that was put
9 out, we did have a requirement that to be a new boat
10 dock owner on Table Rock Lake, you had to own an
11 adjacent piece of property where that dock would be
12 located. We have since removed that from this Shoreline
13 Management Plan. That is a requirement for many other
14 shoreline plans across the nation, including some of the
15 others in our district, but we will continue to allow
16 people who don't live at the lake to have private docks
17 at the lake.

18 The electric lines were a third issue. And
19 originally in the plan there was a date by which all
20 shore power had to be removed. So either underground or
21 overhead electric lines would have to be taken off of
22 the lake by a certain date and everybody would have to
23 convert to solar. As we have already talked about
24 before, new docks have been required to go with solar
25 for several years here, so what we did in this version

1 of the draft, we reverted back to that where if you have
2 an electric line, you can keep that electric line. We
3 would just continue with new boat docks having to go
4 solar.

5 And then the vegetation seems to continue to be a
6 public concern as far as, you know, how much of the
7 government property can be mowed or cut between a
8 residence and the lake.

9 MR. BENEFIELD: So Kevin, you're saying that
10 that made up the bulk of the public comments of the
11 issues?

12 MR. MCDANIELS: I believe it did. And I'll
13 let Dana comment because she's kind of been keeping
14 track of all those comments, but I think those were the
15 primaries.

16 MS. COBURN: Yes, I would agree.

17 MR. BENEFIELD: So I guess we will be taking
18 comments on the overall master plan also, what would the
19 comments -- what would those mainly consist of?

20 MR. MCDANIELS: So the master plan comments, I
21 think we have resolved most all of those. There were
22 probably a few individual landowners who wanted to be
23 able to do certain things behind their properties, but
24 in order to keep contiguous protected boundaries in
25 certain areas, that those maybe weren't approved. But

1 other than that, I'm not really aware of a lot of
2 issues, nor when we opened up the master plan public
3 comment period again, we essentially had no comments.

4 MS. COBURN: You're correct.

5 MR. MCDANIELS: So one thing, though, there
6 are changes that could be made to the shoreline plan
7 that may require a change to be made to the master plan,
8 but that will be something that the Corps team will have
9 to look at. So the marina buffer zone, that would be an
10 example of it. We would have to change the land
11 classification in the master plan as well as changing
12 the zoning in the SMP to create an LDA in an area like
13 that.

14 MR. COX: I have a new question. So one big
15 limiting factor in the utilization of your LDA is the
16 requirement to put a boat dock not to be more than one
17 third of the cove and have a hundred feet between the
18 docks. Is there a good -- some sort of precedent or how
19 did that come about that that number was used?

20 MR. MCDANIELS: So on the 100-foot spacing,
21 Becky mentioned the federal code of regulations which
22 talks about shoreline management and it talks about in
23 their maximum density which refers to spacing of boat
24 docks, typically 100 feet is relatively close to not
25 exceeding the 50 percent utilization of an LDA, just in

1 rough terms. But things like 100-foot spacing, things
2 like 1/3 cove width, 200 foot to a boat dock, a lot of
3 those things, I think really just developed years and
4 years and years ago when the first SMPs were started to
5 be developed across the country and they were adapted
6 from one plan to another plan. They're relatively
7 consistent, like the 1/3 cove width especially is
8 relatively consistent.

9 There are lakes that have less spacing of boat
10 docks. Typically, if they're not community boat docks
11 and there are two-slip boat docks where people enter,
12 you know, from the shoreline going straight out instead
13 of these big 20-stall boat docks where you've got
14 people, you know, entering in together. But that's
15 going to relate more to the density of the use of the
16 shoreline, and the 1/3 cove width is going to be more
17 about just the safety of, you know, boats traversing.
18 You've got boat docks and if they happen to be directly
19 across from each other and you start putting those boat
20 docks too close to each other, in essence, with state
21 law here, with the 100-foot no-wake zone, you can make
22 that into a no-wake cove very, very quickly and cut off
23 usage to the lake for the general public, or that cove
24 anyway.

25 Anything else to add?

1 MR. COX: To provide my perspective on that,
2 the marina industry standard for a fairway between boat
3 docks is 1.5 the length of the boat. So if it's a 30-
4 foot slip, then it's 45 feet. Generally, and with our
5 company, we try to aim more toward twice the length of
6 the slip to give more room and some ability to adjust.
7 So this, the 100 feet far out exceeds that.

8 Also, in the marina industry, you look to protected
9 areas, you look at places that are ideal locations for a
10 dock and that are out of the main channel, they're away
11 from boat traffic, again, more protected, and generally
12 you try to fit in or to accommodate as many slips as you
13 can in those prime areas. And you think about the lake
14 and total visitor experience, I think it's advantageous
15 to think about having boat docks back into coves where
16 they're not as visible, there's not as much traffic
17 around them. That may be something we can look at and
18 study further. I'm not sure we're utilizing our LDA as
19 we could. And if they're also benefit some of the other
20 motivations of the shoreline plan, something to
21 consider.

22 I know in our marinas, you know, we don't have
23 those limitations. And I have 600 slips a mile from
24 here and we generally have about two times the boat
25 length distance between docks, and in some instances the

1 dock itself is beyond one half of the cove and even
2 water fluctuations, it's manageable, it's fine. When
3 you have a higher density and someone's coming in on a
4 boat, they are going to adhere to boating laws where
5 they are forced to slow down. In some instances, if
6 there's a dual distance between docks and someone feels
7 comfortable enough, they can be ripping through a couple
8 boat docks that are two to 300 feet away, whereas if
9 everything was positioned back in a tighter format, it
10 would feel more like you were in a zone where you needed
11 to be going slower. So we can think about this. It
12 might convey a little more LDA space, going forward.

13 MR. MCDANIELS: So a couple of comments for
14 you as you continue to look into this. One is if you
15 look at Title 36, the federal government would have to
16 go through a rule making process to change that maximum
17 density.

18 The other thing is that in the master plan, the
19 area that your marina is located in is classified as a
20 high density recreational area, so that is designed or
21 set aside for a high impact, high use, very close. And
22 you are collect, the 1/3 cove width does not apply to
23 that. You can take an entire cove and as long as you
24 have safe ingress/egress, the marina areas are
25 completely idle speed usually --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

MR. MCDANIELS: But in the case of LDA and private boat docks, that classification in the Master Plan can be the low density recreational use, which has a different set of requirements for it, a different definition for it and, in essence, allows a different level of impact to that area. So that may be something just to take a look at those definitions and see how those lands are classified in comparison to each other.

MR. COX: So the district couldn't -- couldn't go with one half the cove. I mean, what kind of approval would we need if we said that's the new standard?

MR. MCDANIELS: So we've got a couple people wanting to talk. One half the cove, I don't know if that's in Title 36.

MR. BENEFIELD: I think Title 36 does state 1/3 of the cove.

MR. MCDANIELS: So both of those would have to go through the rule making process, and that would be a change to every shoreline program nationwide.

MS. THOMAS: More difficult than establishing this committee.

(Laughter.)

MR. COX: Is the 100-foot rule -- no wiggle

1 room there?

2 MR. MCDANIELS: Yeah, the 100 foot is not in
3 there. What's in Title 36 is 50 percent of the LDA.
4 And typically, like I said, as a general rule, 100 feet
5 tends to work out close when you look at anchorage point
6 to anchorage point. That's a mathematical calculation
7 that you're going to have to figure out based on how
8 many slips are in the boat, the direction, the
9 orientation, the length, the width, et cetera.

10 MS. SHORTT: The PDT did consider, there was a
11 suggestion, I believe, from the focus groups to consider
12 a shorter distance in between the boat docks, either 70
13 or 75 feet.

14 MR. COX: Yeah.

15 MS. SHORTT: And some of the considerations
16 that we looked at and decided not to change from 100
17 feet was that we didn't get a public comment requesting
18 that to change, that the 100 foot has seemed to work
19 relatively well for us at Table Rock. And we also look
20 at the differences between marinas and private boat
21 docks to where at a marina, there is one owner who is in
22 charge of adjusting all of the boat docks, and so if the
23 lake is fluctuating and under high winds, you know, if
24 you haven't maintained your boat dock and it swings into
25 one of your other boat docks, it's yours. But in the

1 private boat dock world, if you have a neighbor who's
2 not been totally responsible in taking care of their
3 boat dock, it can impact someone next to them. So that
4 additional space kind of alleviates some tensions for
5 neighbors.

6 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

7 MS. JAHNKE: As chair, I'm going to recommend
8 that we take a ten-minute break and then we'll come back
9 and see if you have any further questions before we end
10 this meeting. But we'll take a ten-minute break at this
11 time.

12 (A recess was taken.)

13 MS. JAHNKE: All right. I will call us back
14 to order. And one of the comments I heard was that,
15 indeed, I didn't say where I was from. I'm from
16 Springfield. I am a faculty member at Missouri State
17 University and currently serve as the dean of the
18 College of Natural and Applied Sciences.

19 So I have a question that I -- that's come up is we
20 have at draft environmental assessment that was done in
21 October of 2019. How often are those environmental
22 assessments done or how often is that updated?

23 MR. MCDANIELS: Dana?

24 MS. COBURN: Yeah. Any time there's a federal
25 action such as updating master plan or Shoreline

1 Management Plan, that is when we usually do an
2 environmental assessment and, if necessary, an
3 environmental impact statement.

4 MS. JAHNKE: So when was the last one done?

5 MS. COBURN: For the Shoreline Management
6 Plan, there is an active draft environmental assessment
7 that accompanies the Shoreline Management Plan. For the
8 2014 master plan, there was a 2014 environmental
9 assessment.

10 MS. JAHNKE: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. MCDANIELS: And previous to that was 1996
12 on the SMP?

13 MS. COBURN: Correct.

14 MS. JAHNKE: Since we've taken a break, are
15 there any other questions or comments from Committee
16 Members?

17 MR. HUNT: You might have the answer to this,
18 Pat --

19 MR. COX: Yeah.

20 MR. HUNT: I know you intended to do some
21 research on the solar thing. And I personally wouldn't
22 mind hearing it from maybe an installer and potentially
23 a dock owner who already uses solar to talk about the
24 issues.

25 MR. COX: Great.

1 MR. HUNT: Considering the management plan as
2 it stands. So that's my --

3 MR. COX: Okay.

4 MR. MCDANIELS: Okay. So we can I think
5 arrange for one to come, and probably when we get to the
6 discussion point in meeting 2, we can just have them do
7 a little presentation as part of the discussion and/or
8 you ask the questions.

9 MR. COX: Sure.

10 MR. MCDANIELS: And they are here to answer
11 questions to you.

12 MR. COX: That's a great idea.

13 MS. THOMAS: Great.

14 MR. MCDANIELS: So, Becky, if we can arrange
15 for one or two to be here to discuss.

16 MS. JAHNKE: Any other suggestions like that
17 from Committee Members?

18 MS. THOMAS: I -- I guess I just want to say I
19 appreciate some of the changes that were made in this
20 new draft. I think you listened to a lot of the
21 concerns. I look forward to hearing public comment at
22 the next, you know, upcoming meetings. But would you
23 explain the -- Kevin, would you explain the ethics rules
24 again of our discussion amongst ourselves and to the
25 public and the requirements therein for the federal

1 advisory committee?

2 MR. MCDANIELS: Yes. So I was actually going
3 to do that kind of in the --

4 MS. THOMAS: Never mind.

5 MR. MCDANIELS: The section 5. But yeah, as
6 part of the FACA law, there's a lot of very strict
7 requirements, one of which is that the committee is only
8 really to have public engagement in an open public
9 meeting, a forum such as this. They can receive verbal
10 comments at meetings number 2 and number 3, and we have
11 those set up for a three-hour time block, which will be
12 the maximum, two hour -- or two minutes maximum per
13 person to speak, and that's just to give the maximum
14 number of opportunities for the maximum number of folks
15 from the public to come and address the committee.

16 But otherwise, outside of that, these committee
17 members are essentially prohibited from engaging in one
18 on one conversations with members of the public, or
19 members of the press or Congressional delegation or
20 essentially anybody. So they're directed to send any
21 questions that they have to myself and Becky, as the
22 designated federal official and the alternate. Written
23 comments can be accepted at any point in time up until
24 that deadline, and we did establish that deadline so
25 that they had time to review all of those prior to

1 meeting 3, which is when they will make their final
2 recommendations to the district commander. The district
3 commander will not be here, but they will make those
4 recommendations and we will be putting that together in
5 a report.

6 The committee can also make recommendations at
7 meeting 2 or, like in the case of today, asking for a
8 specific group, person, entity to come and make a
9 presentation or comments to the committee. But
10 essentially, the avenues that you guys have and are
11 listed here, you can go to the Web site, you can access
12 the comment part there or provide comments. You can use
13 that e-mail. And I will note that it's impossible to
14 see, but between Table Rock SMP and FAC, there is an
15 underscore in this e-mail, so the little line at the
16 bottom, you have to have that in order for the e-mail to
17 reach them.

18 All public comments will be put out there for
19 everybody from the public to read and everybody to
20 review, so just be aware of that when you're commenting.
21 If you choose to include any personal information, that
22 will be -- and I'll look to my lawyer, but essentially
23 unredacted and put on to the Web site.

24 MS. RAY: (Nods.)

25 MR. BENEFIELD: Are they going to be put up at

1 the end or realtime?

2 MR. MCDANIELS: So I don't think that we have
3 the technology or maybe the -- the authority or whatever
4 the linkage is to go realtime, but I think that our
5 intent is every few days or within a week or so to put
6 the updated comments thereon to the Web site because
7 we're going to have to take each individual comment and
8 we'll probably kind of group those into documents or
9 make that into a running document so that we can add
10 those.

11 So I don't -- if an individual sends one at like
12 10:38 a.m., you're not going to see it at 10:39, but it
13 will be within a few days or so.

14 MR. BENEFIELD: That's what I mean by
15 realtime. I didn't mean realtime [laughter.]

16 MR. MCDANIELS: Yeah, you're not going to have
17 to wait until whatever date that is in February to get
18 however many comments. We'll continue to put those up
19 there periodically.

20 MS. JAHNKE: Great. Kevin, are there any
21 other announcements that need to be made at this time?

22 MR. MCDANIELS: So next meeting date and time
23 is January 23rd. It is here from 8:00 a.m. until 5:00
24 p.m. And just like this meeting, if we don't need that
25 entire timeframe, we won't use the entire timeframe, but

1 we are going to end promptly at 5:00 if we do go that
2 long.

3 That will be the one, again, where you can make
4 public comments. We're going to be starting out with
5 that. So with that two-minute maximum, probably 90
6 people will be about the max that would allow to
7 comment, so that will be first come, first serve.

8 Websites, everything else are here. And if there's
9 anybody from the media, the gentleman in the blue polo
10 shirt there is one of our public affairs guys, I don't
11 see the other one -- oh, right there in the sport coat;
12 they are available for questions and I think their
13 contact is on this sheet as well. Is it? Yep. Down
14 there at the bottom under BD. So you can contact them
15 if you're with the press.

16 But I believe those are the only announcements.
17 Becky, do you have any other announcements that we need
18 to make?

19 MS. SHORTT: No. I think we're good.

20 MR. MCDANIELS: Okay.

21 MS. JAHNKE: Okay. So Committee Members, one
22 last chance for questions or comments. Yes. Patrick's
23 got one, good.

24 MR. COX: Better pack a lunch. No.

25 [Laughter.]

1 So regarding this -- regarding the no new permits
2 issued for stairs/steps, in the past or currently, are
3 there accommodations made for folks with limited
4 mobility? And can we explain that and are we going to
5 be eliminating that?

6 MR. MCDANIELS: Deanna, are you prepared to
7 answer the legal responsibilities of the Corps in
8 relation to ADA and private facilities?

9 MS. RAY: I can. The Corps does not have to
10 provide access to private docks or allow private access
11 to docks under the ADA. We -- we do get a question a
12 lot, particularly with homes that are on bluffs and
13 people want access to the lakes and they want us to
14 allow a tram or some other way to allow a mobility-
15 challenged person to get down to the lake. But under
16 the ADA, that is not something that we have to allow.

17 MR. COX: We don't have to.

18 MS. RAY: Does that answer your question?

19 MR. COX: But should we? Have we done it in
20 the past?

21 MR. MCDANIELS: So what we have done in the
22 past is there are, I guess there is a program. Is that
23 what you call it? So there is the opportunity to get
24 some assistance to get down to the lake like with a golf
25 cart or some type of vehicle if you bring a note from

1 your doctor that shows a mobility impairment that would
2 require that.

3 As far as the -- the ADA part, what we have
4 historically not done or not allowed or not gone in the
5 direction of is putting in concrete sidewalks, pathways,
6 switchbacks, all of those types of ADA type facilities.
7 Those facilities are available in the public use areas
8 and variable in the marinas to provide access there. So
9 the AAB programs is the extent of what we have done in
10 the past. And if you have any further comments.

11 MS. SHORTT: In the Shoreline Management Plan
12 on page 40, it discusses ADA accessibility on the Table
13 Rock Lake and the plans, and no plans to change our
14 current policy to have a letter of permission to use a
15 golf cart or other ambulatory assistance vehicle to get
16 to boat docks for those who present the need for that.

17 We, from 2000 to 2017, we had a hard surface path
18 policy for the purpose of access to permitted docks when
19 the use of golf carts or other turf-tired vehicles are
20 impractical, but due to slope requirements the ADA
21 requires to consider something ADA accessible, there
22 were none of those created on the lake because no one
23 was able to meet the slope requirement without excessive
24 costs.

25 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

1 MR. HUNT: I have a couple of other thoughts
2 too. Knowing that we have a limited number of meetings
3 to discuss the topics to the starred items I have in my
4 notes. One is about the remote service docks. I didn't
5 know there was, do we need to ask for someone to come
6 talk about that at the next meeting or gather
7 information for us? I don't know if that was leaning
8 toward some sort of recommendation potentially, but do
9 we need more information that could be presented at the
10 next meeting?

11 MS. THOMAS: Maybe. I'm certainly not the
12 person that's the expert on that. But I just, I
13 question if we're going to remove one program and not
14 replace it with something that allows the public to
15 access what they previously would have been able to
16 access is a concern. I'm not sure who that person or
17 organization would be that would talk to us about that
18 or if that's just -- it would require more information.

19 MR. MCDANIELS: I think that when it comes to
20 remote service dock, the conversation you all are having
21 when this transcript gets posted, and that is an issue
22 that hopefully we will get comments from the public
23 either verbally here or in writing on either side in
24 favor to or opposed to eliminating those marina buffer
25 zones and replacing them with an LDA.

1 MS. THOMAS: I'm sorry. I don't think most
2 people understand that removing the marina buffer zone
3 means removing everything. They -- some property owners
4 I think believe if the marina buffer zone were removed,
5 then they would be able to have their own, you know,
6 private dock. But if you remove the LDA, they would not
7 be able to do that. So I think there was some confusion
8 maybe in the public through the last processes on that.
9 Because I think people spoke sometimes in favor of
10 removing the remote service dock program thinking that
11 that would free them up to do something with their
12 property, and it does not.

13 MR. MCDANIELS: You are correct. It would not
14 without an addition of an LDA into that area.

15 MS. THOMAS: Right.

16 MR. MCDANIELS: And a potential master plan
17 change.

18 MR. COX: Kevin, as you pointed out,
19 vegetation is really one of the -- it's probably the
20 main sticking point. It's the one that I have no
21 knowledge of and I don't know if any of the committee
22 members do, but can you describe, is there a -- what's
23 the scope of something like that? Is it you go down and
24 assess the property and say, okay, you can do this to
25 this area or this area or is there some formula that's

1 used?

2 MR. MCDANIELS: So I'll have Rodney address
3 how they do those specifically.

4 MR. RALEY: Yeah. Currently, when somebody
5 applies for a vegetative permit, an actual park ranger
6 will go out on site and meet with them and basically go
7 over all the parameters of the permit. As far as the
8 limitations, where, how far, you know, right now it's
9 200 feet from an ample structure. They go over the size
10 of trees, the type of trees, just basically do a
11 complete site inspection and meet with the person, so
12 let them know the dos and the don'ts.

13 MR. COX: So under these changes, everyone
14 that currently has a permit is going to be maintaining
15 that? Are we eliminating permits?

16 MR. RALEY: No.

17 MR. COX: What's the sticking point? Is it
18 that we change the tree size or --

19 MR. MCDANIELS: So the primary change right
20 now -- well, there's two things. One is that we did not
21 open it up to where you could mow everything all the way
22 down to the lake. That was a request that we had seen.

23 The other part of the change would be that for new
24 permits that if you come to a roadway, if you come to a
25 creek, a stream, a river, a rock bluff, some type of

1 natural barrier, that we would end the permit there even
2 if it was less than 200 feet away.

3 MR. COX: Got you.

4 MS. JAHNKE: Rob, you had a second one?

5 MR. HUNT: Yeah. The other kind of hanger is
6 the discussion about a mechanism for moving --
7 identifying and removing unused docks you brought up,
8 Pat. I don't know if there's more we need on that other
9 than just continuing conversation with the public or if
10 there would be someone from the Corps that can talk in
11 more detail about how that process has gone in the past.
12 I'm pretty ignorant of all this stuff. I'm not sure if
13 I'm barking up the wrong tree. But with so few
14 meetings, I would hate to keep repeating the
15 conversation.

16 MS. SHORTT: Would it be beneficial to have a
17 presentation on the boater use study that was done in
18 Table Rock Lake in, I believe it was 2009. That's where
19 we got our boater access numbers. And then also maybe a
20 presentation on the recent carrying capacity that was
21 done at Beaver Lake where they did some more in depth,
22 would that be maybe beneficial on this topic?

23 MR. COX: Yeah.

24 MS. SHORTT: Okay.

25 MR. COX: At what point does a boat dock go

1 away? Right now it's first in for life, no matter what
2 the dock's condition or whether it's being used. I
3 mean, you're talking about capacity and you got me
4 thinking decades down the road, and I think there should
5 be some mechanism.

6 MR. MCDANIELS: Yeah. So there is a public
7 law that we have to comply with that, in essence, and I
8 don't remember what the number is, Rodney, 89 something.
9 But we can get you the law number if you're interested.
10 But, in essence, if a boat dock is maintained and meets
11 all the conditions of the permit, that we, the federal
12 government, cannot, will not remove it. So that is
13 legislative requirement on the Corps of Engineers that
14 we have to comply with.

15 We do remove boat docks from lakes when there are
16 other violations. Whether they're associated with an
17 easement, whether it's a timber trespass, if you go out
18 and you cut down all the trees between your house on the
19 lake and then you go and spray herbicide, then we will
20 put in the recommendation that those boat docks be
21 removed and we have removed those in the past. But
22 typically it's some sort of a violation, and right now
23 I'm not sure that legally there is a remedy for removal
24 just for non-use of a boat slip as long as it's
25 maintained within the conditions, the irony of that

1 being that the regulation that authorizes boat docks is
2 very clear that it's strictly for the mooring of a boat.
3 It's not for a party structure, it's not for an
4 investment, it's not for whatever. It's for strictly
5 the mooring of a boat, which is part of the reason why
6 the program is designed the way it is. So I'm not sure
7 if that's helpful.

8 I share your concern with -- with them not being
9 used, but I also feel we probably don't have the
10 manpower to go out there and count the number of folks
11 that are actually using slips.

12 MS. JAHNKE: Okay.

13 MS. THOMAS: I have one other question that
14 I've just heard over the years talked about, and I think
15 that you have answered this before, but is it a true
16 statement that the Corps of Engineers has not -- does
17 not have the authority to mandate boat size on the lake,
18 other than enacting restrictions on slips and so forth
19 like.

20 MR. MCDANIELS: Yeah, I would say that we do
21 not have the authority to limit boat length, nor do we
22 have the authority, when it comes to boat wake, when you
23 look at other provisions or sections within 327 of Title
24 36, our ranger forest has the right to right to grant
25 citations for unsafe or destructive behavior, reckless

1 operation type things. But just strictly based on boat
2 size, weight size, et cetera, we do not have that kind
3 of regulatory or law enforcement authority. We don't
4 have law enforcement authority, period. We just have
5 regulatory authority and we write citations under that.

6 MR. COX: Do you happen to know offhand what
7 revenue you are producing or collecting on private slips
8 annually?

9 MR. MCDANIELS: So boat docks are \$30, whether
10 it's one slip or 20 slips, that's for five years. That
11 money goes to the treasury. It does not stay with the
12 Corps. If you have an electric line or stairsteps,
13 minor outgrant, the fee is what, Becky, 400, 500?

14 MS. SHORTT: \$505.

15 MR. MCDANIELS: \$505 for five years. So you
16 can kind of calculate that out what it costs for a slip
17 for five years in a 20-stall boat dock. That means that
18 you're -- the 2016 WIIN legislation does require the
19 Corps of Engineers to look at that fee structure. That
20 process is slowly kicking off and getting underway. I
21 can tell you that the last time that we did a study, it
22 cost us in the neighborhood of, depending upon, you
23 know, specifics, but on average, probably 800, \$850 to
24 issue a dock permit.

25 MS. SHORTT: Just to clarify, a boat dock that

1 has an electric line going out to it would be \$535
2 total, and then that fee increases if the boat dock has
3 additional amenities, for instance, if they also have
4 stairs or if they also have a road or a parking area,
5 those types of things, that fee does increase by the
6 number of amenities the boat dock has.

7 MR. COX: Mm-hmm. It's interesting how many
8 times we touch upon what a burden it is to have these
9 boat docks, and I think it's -- you know, being market
10 minded, it's no wonder. My customers pay between 100 to
11 \$500 per year to the state park for the space. So boy,
12 that creates a great win-win relationship because
13 they're making improvements, they're supporting their
14 efforts, but when you're upsidedown like this, it's
15 tough to be open at looking at folks' requests and so
16 forth when you really aren't being funded for it.

17 MR. MCDANIELS: Did you say 100 to 500 a year
18 or a month?

19 MR. COX: A year. That's the percentage that
20 goes on to the landlord. In this case, you all --

21 MR. MCDANIELS: That's what you give to the
22 state.

23 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

24 MR. MCDANIELS: Personally.

25 MR. COX: Mm-hmm.

1 MR. MCDANIELS: Got you. Understood.

2 MR. COX: And I'm not suggesting that's where
3 this is going. I'm just saying when there's a funding
4 source, you know, it's not quite a burden. It's so
5 cheap that the nos start coming out because it's a
6 burden to even look at something. But that would take
7 an act of Congress; is that correct?

8 MR. MCDANIELS: So technically, no. And I am
9 not the expert on this, but there are -- there's a
10 couple different avenues, but there is a rules making
11 process that can be gone through. We have definitely
12 talked to our senators and congressmen about that and
13 the Corps will continue to work through that. There are
14 other existing authorities through those real estate
15 licenses and agreements that we're looking at, too, but
16 from a higher headquarters perspective, that team needs
17 to go ahead and continue working through this to see
18 what the end solution is; but there are different laws
19 and regulations in place that do require that things
20 that benefit the individual as opposed to benefitting
21 the public at large must be paid for or the be
22 government must be made whole for those. So that's what
23 they're looking at there.

24 MS. JAHNKE: Anything else from our group
25 because we don't meet again until January. So we want

1 to make sure that we give everybody a chance to include
2 anything that you might want to think about now. The
3 good news is is that we have two opportunities for the
4 public comment and for us to get together before we make
5 final recommendations, so that will help and that gives
6 us some time to, you know, listen and more fully
7 understand. Is there anything else today?

8 MS. THOMAS: I don't know if this is required
9 in the open meeting, but the second meeting was
10 scheduled at a time that I cannot be here. I will be on
11 a trip. And I don't know if we need to officially
12 appoint a separate secretary or if that's just someone
13 else in the group that can take the notes, but I --

14 MS. JAHNKE: Yep. I think we need to have a
15 secretary. So could I have a volunteer of someone to be
16 secretary for our next meeting?

17 MS. HARRISON: Is this just the motions? Then
18 I can.

19 MS. JAHNKE: You're willing to do that?

20 MS. HARRISON: Yes.

21 MS. JAHNKE: Great. Thank you. Thank you so
22 much. And thanks for making that known so that we could
23 take care of that now.

24 If there's no further discussion, I would entertain
25 a motion to adjourn this meeting today.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. COX: So moved.

MS. JAHNKE: Is there a second?

MR. BENEFIELD: Moved.

MS. JAHNKE: All right. All those in favor,
say aye.

(All respond "aye.")

MS. JAHNKE: Opposed, same sign.

(No response.)

MS. JAHNKE: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(The foregoing meeting was concluded at 10:20
a.m. on Thursday, December 12, 2019.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF STONE) ss.

I, Beverly L. Nagle, Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that on December 12, 2019, that I was personally present at the taking of the proceedings as set forth in the caption sheet hereof; that I then and there took down in stenotype the proceedings had at said time; and that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct transcript of such notes so made at said time and place.

I do further certify that I am not related to, nor attorney for, nor employed by any of the said parties, nor otherwise interested in the event of said action.

Beverly L. Nagle, CCR