WATER MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS 2
EXISTING WATER MANAGEMENT PRACTICES 2
General Comments on Water Management Practices (General - Manual) 2
WATER MANAGEMENT SUGGESTIONS 20
Water Management Suggestions (General - Manual) 20
Balance Project Purposes (General - Manual) 44
Reduce Dependence on West Point (General - Manual) 48
Faster Reaction to Changing Conditions (General - Manual) 52
Monitoring (General - Manual) 52
Share the Pain (General - Manual) 53
Manage Reservoirs to Preserve Water Supply (Water Supply) 54
Lake Lanier - Reduce Releases & Withdrawals (General - Manual) 55
DEMANDS/NEEDS 57
Downstream Needs (General - Manual) 57
Future Water Needs (General - Manual) 63
Growth Management (Water Resources) 66
OTHER 66
Other (General - Manual) 66
Other (Water Resources) 82
Other (Water Resources - Mitigation) 85
Other (Outside Federal Authorizations) 87
CONSERVATION 87
Conservation (General - Manual) 87
Conservation (Water Resources) 88
Conservation (Water Resources - Mitigation) 91
ALTERNATIVES 92
West Point - Raise Winter Pool (General - Manual) 92
Maintain Full Pool at Lake Lanier (General - Manual) 97
Lake Lanier - Revise Rule Curve (General - Manual) 99
Management Triggers (General - Manual) 109
New Reservoirs (Water Resources - Mitigation) 111
Restore Natural Flow Regime (Water Resources) 114
Restrict Interbasin Transfers (Water Resources) 115
Desalination (Water Resources - Mitigation) 115
Avoid Dam Construction on Flint River (Water Resources) 116
Tennessee River (Water Resources - Mitigation) 117
Close Bob Sikes Cut (Water Resources - Mitigation) 118
Excavate Log Jam on East River (Water Resources - Mitigation) 119
Groundwater (Water Resources - Mitigation) 119
Eliminate Effects of Bird Islands in Apalachicola Bay (Water Resources - Mitigation) 119
Additional Uses for Existing Reservoirs (Water Resources - Mitigation) 120
Lake Lanier Pumpback (Water Resources - Mitigation) 120
Interbasin Transfers (Water Resources - Mitigation) 120
Restore Degrade Habitat (Water Resources - Mitigation) 120
Changes at West Point Lake (Outside Federal Authorizations) 121
Changes at Lanier (Outside Federal Authorizations) 132
Evaluate Alternatives (Outside Federal Authorizations) 149
Change Federal Policy (Outside Federal Authorizations) 150

WATER MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

EXISTING WATER MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

General Comments on Water Management Practices (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 5
Author Name: Paul Sconyers
Organization:

During our twenty some years of visiting the lake we have seen the application of the current USACE's water management policies, with fluctuating water levels. This comment is not meant as a criticism but, merely an observation. While we understand the concept of endangered species (mussels, sturgeon etc.) and the need for higher down stream water levels to float coal barges.

Comment ID: 12
Author Name: Donald Baker
Organization:

Lets' look at the inability to monitor Lake Lanier. The Corp couldn't tell that the lake dropped two feet because of a bad gauge. No back-up gauge? How about using the gauge God gave us in the form of eye balls. Everyone I know can tell if the lake drops two feet. This drop of course indicated to the Corp that water had to be taken from West Point Lake to fulfill the obligation of downstream water flow. Or how about the floods we have had, the cause stated by the Corp was the lack of gauges south of Atlanta on the river. Who designed the system? With a consistently full lake the increased revenue helps build the infrastructure in the area. Why keep trying to destroy it? So much for the Corp adhering to the stated objectives. It appears the some of the Mobile District Commanders think they are God and try to show everyone that they can do anything they please. All this does is place the local Corp in a position of defending some ridiculous policies. Now I have to look for a lake that is not Corp controlled to enjoy my retirement.

Comment ID: 23
Author Name: Mr. Tom and Chris Hunkele
Organization: Lakeside Fitness & Therapy LLC

Just so you do not forget just how poorly managed our West Point Lake has been - I've attached pictures of the lake in September of last year (2007) - - our precious lake was politically manipulated, with a vivid failure to use valid science and a dismal refusal to acknowledge the misuse and
mismanagement of our precious lake. Please, never allow this to happen again. Sincerely, Tom and Chris Hunkele

---

Comment ID: 25
Author Name: Lesley Cox
Organization:

It's the same issues that are important to me, that is the stream flow. The ecosystem, the health of the ecosystem maintaining water in the river and in the bay throughout the whole system. I think there's too many impoundments. I think that we need to compare the pre-dam flows with the post-dam flows and hopefully come up with a water needs assessment that we have been asking for 30 years, and we still don't have, and now we have less and less water. I was a member, a board member of the Chipola Basin Protective Group, and we called for these same studies during the 1980's. We had a dam removed on the Chipola basin, on the Chipola River so that the Apalachicola could get more water, and we are still hoping to keep the Apalachicola and bay as a productive ecosystem. I guess that's all.

Comment ID: 34
Author Name: Paul Stouffer
Organization:

Okay, while I was here I was talking to several of the people from the Corps of Engineers. They all want to talk about this year and how they're mandated, have to drain so much water out, and they're doing everything. But my concern was two years ago at the beginning of the drought. They drained us back knowing that our drainage area is so small. We were going to be the hardest lake to refill. And it just felt like from the very beginning they waited until it got to be a crisis to us before anybody started to really show any concern about Lake Lanier and the water drainage problems. And it feels like throughout this drought we're still in the worst of the drought compared to south Georgia and Florida and Alabama, and we're the ones that paid the highest price on all of that. And it just doesn't seem fair.

Comment ID: 36
Author Name: Tony Owens
Organization: MeadWestvaco

While the area surrounding Lake Lanier has indeed changed over the years, so have downstream communities and industries. While Lake Lanier and the metro Atlanta area have created a situation where they are now depending on the Corps to abandon the federal reservoir system's primary authorized purposes in order to support local growth and recreation, downstream users are depending on the Corps' continued maintenance of the system's primary authorized purposes, which would allow for their instream flow needs to be met, provide water supply and wastewater assimilation for both domestic and industrial water users, and protect the region's aquatic ecology. The Corps cannot and should not place the Atlanta area's desire for changes in the use and operation of these federal projects above downstream users' reasonable expectations that the Corps will comply with the federal laws establishing the primary purposes of these projects.

Comment ID: 49
Author Name: Stanley F. Cook
Organization: AL Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Dear Mr. Sumner: The Fisheries Section of Alabama's Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (ADCNR) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin Water Control Manuel Update Process. The ACF Basin extends from northeast Georgia to the Florida gulf coast, with 5 major dams and 8 smaller dams located in the basin. The 5 major dams are owned by the Corps of Engineers (COE). The projects were built for flood control, river navigation, hydroelectric power and recreation, with other purposes including water supply, water quality, and fish and wildlife enhancement. Through the construction and operation of these dams, the main-stem river systems have become regulated waters following guidelines established by the Water Control Manual of 195 I. Aquatic wildlife biologists have learned a great deal since 1951 concerning responses of aquatic ecosystems to habitat alteration in regulated systems. The water management policies of the past have often resulted in a degradation of the ecological integrity of a river ecosystem, which in the case of wildlife has lead to a decrease in biodiversity and species sustainability. To protect ecological integrity, we need to mimic components of natural flow variability, taking into consideration the magnitude, frequency, timing duration, rate of change and predictability of flow, and sequencing of such conditions. There are five riverine components to consider: hydrology, geomorphology, biology, water quality and connectivity. The solution will include a balanced approach to river corridor management. People value rivers for flood control, drinking water, navigation, municipal and industrial use, irrigation, hydroelectric power, sewage treatment, recreation, esthetics, fish and wildlife, and preservation for future generations. Securing appropriate flows for protection of fisheries, wildlife, cultural and societal resources requires the implementation of study plans that are guided by a balanced approach.

Comment ID: 55
Author Name: Brian Atkins
Organization:

To Whom It May Concern, These comments are submitted by J. Brian Atkins, Director of the Alabama Office of Water Resources, on behalf of the State of Alabama. The State of Alabama reserves the right to submit additional comments regarding the scoping process for the ACF Manual update. In 1990, the State of Alabama sued the Corps of Engineers over its operations and proposed operations of several federal reservoirs, including Lake Lanier, West Point Lake

and Lake Walter F. George (Lake Eufaula) in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin. The operations of these federal reservoirs have a substantial and profound impact upon numerous interests of our citizens. In the lawsuit over the ACF Basin, the State of Alabama claims that the Corps' management of the ACF System, particularly Lake Lanier, has violated and continues to violate federal law and regulations. Unless the Corps undertakes the revision to the Water Control Manuals in a manner that is consistent with federal law, including the recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, the current effort will not help resolve the long-running controversy over the ACF Basin. Instead, revised Water Control Manuals will generate additional conflict.

Comment ID: 62
Author Name: Gwen Criswell
Organization:

I am a native of Florida and understand the reasons why water is allowed to be carried to Florida. I have scalloped and fished Florida all over all my life. Florida has had its share of drought
conditions as well. However, a lake should never be allowed to reach the drastic low levels that Lake Lanier has experienced. It saddens me to see the lake in its current
condition. My hope is that we can reach a reconciliation to this situation in the very near future.

Comment ID: 68
Author Name: Dick Timmerberg
Organization: West Point Lake Coalition

It appears that the Corps has established the flood control authorization as THE primary purpose; and therefore created a subset of SECONDARY authorizations for Recreation, Sport Fishing & Wildlife Development, Hydropower, and Navigation.

What we observe is that the Corps operates West Point Lake specifically and the ACF system in general in a way that ignores the original, PRIMARY congressional authorizations as a group and focuses extensively on flood control as well as downstream and upstream demands that do not meet the purposes set forth by Congress. It appears that the Corps has established the flood control authorization as THE primary purpose; and therefore created a subset of SECONDARY authorizations for Recreation, Sport Fishing & Wildlife Development, Hydropower, and Navigation.

Comment ID: 71
Author Name: Steven J. Herrington
Organization: The Nature Conservancy

The challenges presented by several years of drought underscore the necessity to update the manual to balance the long-term economic and environmental needs in this important watershed. The Conservancy is a recognized global leader in environmental flow science for managed rivers and has extensive experience working collaboratively with the Corps and other water managers on revising reservoir operations. We respectfully offer the following recommendations as well as our expertise to assist the Corps efforts to define comprehensive, science-based environmental flow requirements as the agency develops the EIS and updates the water control manual:

Comment ID: 72
Author Name: Dan Kauffman
Organization:

lake is to low

Comment ID: 77
Author Name: Richard C. Wolfe
Organization: Troup County Board of Commissioners

In 1962 Congress authorized the project for 5 primary uses, which were, hydropower, sport fishing & wildlife development, general recreation, navigation and flood control. Today, nearly 26 years later we find ourselves with lake levels inadequate to meet its initial uses.

Rapid population and industrial growth in the area have prompted increased environmental concerns associated with lake levels, which are far below the minimum year round optimal level of 633-635 msl; Conditions of a low pool are extremely hazardous to those who use the lake for recreation and as a means of daily sustenance.

Comment ID: 83
Author Name: Steven Voige
Organization:

I feel water s/b released according to the percentage of average rainfall for the region. Period. Consider first the needs of the residents, commercial users and wildlife, then recreation, local property values and of course all other aspect. Lake levels should be managed more precisely. Only lowering pool levels when tropical storms or flooding weather front are predicted.

Comment ID: 99
Author Name: Kathy Robinson
Organization:

Equitable Distribution!

Comment ID: 104
Author Name: Roy Ogles
Organization:

Any plan rewarding Atlanta's, and Georgia's blatant misuse of our community resource will result in further mistrust of the Corps. It's time your federal leadership stopped counting voices and political favor, and starting action on behalf of the environment and the future.

Comment ID: 105
Author Name: Dr. Lois Sobody
Organization:

Please come into compliance with the TWO court orders

Comment ID: 117
Author Name: Claudetter Bolles
Organization:

I have watched the lake level fluctuate. Sometimes it's embarrassing. I have relatives that call from all over the United States and make jokes about do I have water in my lake. "Will we come and ride in your boat or sit in the boat in the mud?" And so it's kind of a laugh, what's going on with the lake, which is embarrassing to me. I have watched the recreational, the boats, the fishermen, with no place to go. I've watched the decline in the number of people. They're right outside my window

---

Comment ID: 121
Author Name: Jack Struble
Organization:

Please consider what is fair for all the citizens along the basin when rewriting the manuals for the future. Thank you

---

Comment ID: 126
Author Name: Mark and Charlene Powell
Organization:

We are following the Corps of Engineers plan closely since we are located on the Walter F. George Reservoir. We are aware of the drought/water usage situation of the Atlanta area but also feel they have been negligent in continuing to build and increase their population without making any provisions for their future need for water. This is a responsibility of the community to plan for the future and not think it will just take care of itself. We appreciate the Corp taking in consideration the severe economic impact it will have on communities located below Lake Lanier that depend on the Chattahoochee River. This is not about mussels. This is about

livelihoods and survival for communities hundreds of miles down river. We love the Chattahoochee and do everything we can to take care and protect it. I wish everyone had its best interest at heart. We have a resource that should not be taken for granted.

Comment ID: 130
Author Name: Ted Beason
Organization:

I take issue with the fact that we operate under a baseline with wider tolerances than other lakes in our basin. I would like to see a more reasonable way of identifying baseline numbers for all lakes in the basin so that West Point Lake is treated in a fair and equitable way.

Comment ID: 138
Author Name:
Organization:

The summer of 2007 was a disaster that doesn't need to happen again.

Comment ID: 172
Author Name: KELLY ANDERSON
Organization:

A good dose of common sense must be applied to this issue. Save the people not the mussels.

Comment ID: 174
Author Name:
Organization:

Return to managing the lake according to Congressionally authorized purposes.

Comment ID: 179
Author Name: Janice Grizzle
Organization:

Why can't we hold the water here when we have?

Comment ID: 183
Author Name: Tripp Penn
Organization:

The significant fluctuations in the lake levels have a serious impact on recreation, local economies and potentially water quality.

Comment ID: 199
Author Name: Johnny R Ashmore
Organization:

I believe that we need an update version of the water control manual, one that is more appropriate to the challenge that the area is currently facing.

I believe that this manual should be consistent with current needs of the basin and the lakes and rivers it governs .

Comment ID: 213
Author Name: Donna Garrett
Organization:

We are very concerned about how low the water was this time last year and if will ever be that low again. We also had dead mussels on the dry land at our house when the water was down.

There was only a 5-7 foot creek behind our house instead of 200 yards !!!

Comment ID: 217
Author Name: Lillian Ford
Organization:

Recreation is about the only lifeblood left in this area. So many small business in Troup County have suffered and failed without water. Why can't water remain in the lake year round. Water is used for electricity and the dam monitored if large amounts of rain fall the over flow could allow this water through. Allowing the water to flow through to an area the is not holding it but running on into the ocean makes no sense. Why were reservoirs never built on the Flint River?

Comment ID: 237
Author Name: Sharon Mitchell
Organization:

I ask that you return to managing the lake consistent with its Congressionally authorized purposes. Restore and maintain our recreational facilities and maintain our water quality.

Comment ID: 238
Author Name: Archie Mitchell
Organization:

I have lived on west point lake for the past 23 years. I have only witnessed two of those 23 years were the water remained clear and the lake stayed full throughout the summer season. thank you for those two precious years as they meant a lot to me and my family.

Comment ID: 240
Author Name: Jeff Todd
Organization:

the operation of the system this summer and fall, particularly the Corps ability to store more in WPL, has made a great impact on our ability to see the lake fulfill the authorized purpose of recreation.

We have serious questions as to whether the project is being operated to fulfill the project purpose of recreation, on the whole, and would like to see that aspect of our purposes given a higher priority in the water control plan.

Comment ID: 245
Author Name: Randy Nix
Organization:

We need to remove the gamesmanship from the process and use real science and common sense. I don't think any of the people up and down the basin want to destroy the environment, but there is a tremendous need to consider all stakeholders.

Comment ID: 264
Author Name: Coweta County Water Authority
Organization:

My concern last night no one seemed interested enough to know the answer. Is the update to the manual a full scale update or a band-aid approach?

Comment ID: 266
Author Name: Ralph Peery
Organization:

Return to managing the lake consistent with congressionally authorized purposes.

Comment ID: 271
Author Name: Carl C. Staley, Jr.
Organization:

I attended the public meeting in Marietta. Was impressed with the data shared and the demonstration. However, no one had an answer about the amount of water going through the system in excess of minimums required.

Comment ID: 273
Author Name: Kathleen Autry
Organization:

I stay at the home of my employer for months as he travels the world as a
biblical archaeologist. I dog sit for him at his home on the lake. I have seen it last year dry as a bone and I could walk clear across the entire lake. All the plankton, marine life, etc. died as the water was let out each day to go to Florida.
Some balance needs to be met here. I am from Texas and volunteering at the Antiquity museum and it is so hard to see fish dying because they are caught in a small pool and it just dries up on them and there is no place for them to go. It is one thing for nature to control wildlife but for man to destroy all this life and ruin the balance of ecology on purpose is very hard to understand. I hope you come to some understanding with the neighboring states that the water needs to be shared equally and not all sent downstream. Kathleen Autry

---

Comment ID: 276
Author Name: Michael Ellis
Organization:

I have lived in the area for almost 9 years. The control of the dam by the corp is extremely poor. A good example is when we flooded several years ago due to holding back the water levels of the dam. Since then we still see water levels in our area rise after heavy rains. When the Corp finally opens up the dam we see this water disappear.

The Corp needs to take a more proactive approach to the creeks that feed into the lake. Example is Long Cane Creek. This needs to be cleaned up and dredged out starting where it empties into the Lake going back. This is causing low areas to flood more than it used to. I have sent pictures of several areas to the Governors office in hopes of taking action against the Corp.

I understand the Corp is not responsible for doing the work. They are responsible for putting pressure on the local county to clean them up. Without this pressure the counties are not going to spend money they don't have to.

Comment ID: 295
Author Name: Kathy Nguyen
Organization:

The Corps must consider alternative operating plans to balance upstream needs with downstream needs before adopting a new Water Control Plan. There is enough water in the ACF River Basin to meet all reasonable needs, if the reservoirs are managed properly.

Comment ID: 303
Author Name: Robert G Fuss
Organization:

I live on Lake Lanier and I am in favor of raising the "full pool" level of the lake.

I also believe that part of the problem with the low level of Lake Lanier, is poor management of resources. A couple of years ago, excessive water was released from Lanier, due to a faulty gauge. At least that was the excuse. Anyone with good eyesight, could have determined that something was wrong, by looking at the shoreline.

Comment ID: 318
Author Name: Kim Sak
Organization:

I think that the size of the drainage basin is a critical factor in future management of the lake level and downstream. The drainage basin can't support the demands on it, and that should

have been obvious, but if it wasn't, it has to be now, and that that is really the ruling factor in all of this, in my opinion.

I would like to express my great dissatisfaction about the two-foot error in water release earlier this year, and how long it took the Corps to solve the problem. I don't know if what I hear is accurate or not but I have been told that people were calling the Corps and trying to tell them that the lake was dropping and that it took them a long time to react.

Comment ID: 340
Author Name: Beth Norred
Organization:

This is the first year in as many as 5 years that we actually had water in our lake to use for the summer The boat slips/ramps are partly unusable. The fish are barely none. The wildlife (osprey) are in danger due to Fluctuating levels endangering the babies. STUMPS are Terrible when levels are so Low.

We want our lake USEABLE not Drained.

Comment ID: 347
Author Name: Chris Rosendohl
Organization:

Thanks for keeping the water at full pool.

Comment ID: 351
Author Name: John and Helga Ray
Organization:

Thank you Corp for a beautiful lake this year "2008" keep it up!!

Comment ID: 353
Author Name: *Beverley Johnson
Organization:

Need to maintain a lake level so my don't won't break loose again.

Comment ID: 370
Author Name: Steve Katz
Organization:

As a resident on Lake Lanier and also in the greater Atlanta area, I am greatly concerned about how the lake has been managed. While we are clearly in some extreme weather circumstances in the area, it appears as though antiquated process, mistakes and politics - all controllable factors - have had at least as much impact.

I strongly advocate a complete revision of the policies/process used to manage the water levels in the lake; and for proactive leadership to ensure that we are managing to those revised processes, and that we are being logical and making exceptions to the process as needed.

The lake levels should be managed to a rational amount of fluctuation, keeping the water supply to Atlanta at safe levels, and allowing for the safety of the lake residents and users.

Comment ID: 373
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The current method for managing Lake Lanier is improper at best.

Comment ID: 386
Author Name: Ron condon
Organization:

I'm a lake Lanier resident and have been since 1989. What's become clear to me over time is that managing the lake level is no easy job. There are loads and loads of variables and without careful monitoring, maintaining the right lake level is a crap shoot. I don't have any specific comment other than to say that the Corp has to be a lot smarter in how it manages the lake, but you folks know that. There have been countless times (not recent) where water was released and wasted. In most cases this was only felt by residents and in lake recreation. The problem was "localized" and a contingent of Corp bashers was born. Recently, the lake level issue has gotten lots of publicity because of the drought conditions. We're at a critical point now and any unnecessary water going over the dam is costly. It's costly in lost drinking water, it creates watering bans and real estate values are affected. Let's do everything we can to keep that from happening or, at least, minimize it.

Comment ID: 399
Author Name: Jane Browder
Organization: lake property owner

Water needs to be maintained year round in the other basins downstream for improved management and downstream flow. We must stop the winter drainage of these basins.
All have recovered downstream from Lanier, but Lanier can't at the present time, when releases out measure inflow.

Comment ID: 400
Author Name: Chuck Hall
Organization: Lake Lanier Homeowners Assoc.

I believe that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has worked long and hard to preserve the shores of Lake Lanier. It is terrible to see it all go down the drain so to speak by leaving the lake down at these environmentally unfriendly levels.

Comment ID: 408
Author Name: Tim Watford
Organization: The Lake Lanier Association

This seems to make a great deal of sense. I have wondered why the lake levels at West Point, Eufaula and Seminole have been pretty much at full pool all year, yet the releases at Lanier continued unabated?? Because of flow volume and greater catch basin area, I would assume those lakes have the ability to recover far faster than Lanier. I also feel the endangered and threatened species angle is simply a way to tie the Corps' hands and force release. While I appreciate the idea, there comes a time when we have to choose man over beast.

Comment ID: 426
Author Name: Danny Lowery
Organization:

I would like to see the Army Corps of Engineers quit draining so much water out of Lake Lanier. When Florida got soaked with rain from hurricanes, GA got no rain and yet we released so much water to a flooded area. This makes no sense to me.

Comment ID: 428
Author Name: Jack Oliaro
Organization: self

The Chattahoochee River appeared full in Atlanta (which should assure the 750 cfs) but yet the lake was drawn down over 1000 cfs feet the next 2 days.

Comment ID: 440
Author Name: Kevin Herbert
Organization:

and higher "full pool" levels are needed.

Comment ID: 452
Author Name: James & Shannon Lince

Organization:

The lake's condition is unacceptable and must be addressed. Other lakes are at or near full pool so the rational of the corps for actions does not pass the common sense test.

Comment ID: 454
Author Name: Mike Harding
Organization:

We have got to all work together to save Lake Lanier with the politics, lack of rain, and poor management we have taken one of the most beautiful places and the most expensive real estate in Georgia and are destroying it along with the community. There has to be level ground where everyone gives in this situation. For us to be so depressed and the others in our system full and happy where is the justice - who cares for Lake Lanier?

Comment ID: 455
Author Name: Janace Harding
Organization:

It appears that the Corps of E has not been active in protecting the valuable asset of this lake by careful observational evaluation and initiation of actions required to protect this asset. This negligence together with the many errors by the Corp in this managed flow of water have worsened the crisis. It appears that the Corp does not have ready a method to respond to crisis of the lake and can not only function - business as usual. That has not been responsible. The Corps leadership of Lake protection has not been:
Relevant
Ready
Responsive Not
Reliable

We have zero confidence that you can or will manage this asset & its potential value.

Comment ID: 457
Author Name: Linda Mock
Organization:

Our commerce around Gainesville & Lake Lanier has been severely affected by the mismanagement of the water levels at Lake Lanier. First, we were told the gages were misread - now endangered clams - at what point does the water quality (drinking water especially) play into importance. Perhaps "simply" you could just move the clams, millions of people are dependent on healthy drinking water. Its a matter of just doing something (action) to resolve the problem. Bring back our water.

Comment ID: 487
Author Name: Melvyn & Gail Smith
Organization:

To Whom It May Concern: We have lived on Lake Lanier since 1977 and are seriously concerned with how the lake has been managed, or as some would insist mismanaged, and hope that serious management changes will be made going forward. We appreciate, and are as concerned as anyone, with environmental issues concerning, not only Lake Lanier, but all the other folks down stream, however it seems to us that as the use and demands on Lake Lanier have changed over the years, the inflexibility and aloofness of those managing the lake have been the driving force in bringing us to where we are today. We would request the following be a minimum starting point for the new manual:

Comment ID: 488
Author Name: Myrtle Figueras
Organization: Mayor of Gainesville

Dear Sir or Madam: The City of Gainesville is pleased to have this opportunity to comment on the proposed plan update referenced above. As you are aware, the current plan hasn't been updated in over fifty years. Since the last update conditions in the river basin have dramatically

changed. In the 1950's, the river system easily provided for the small human populations living within the river corridor. At the same time the Buford Dam enabled water flows to be controlled to ensure consistency in flow throughout. No longer was the Chattahoochee "wadeable" or "bursting its banks" at the mercy of Mother Nature. Today, with the addition of the West Point Dam, the river system provides water to some five million Georgians, supplies critical peak electrical power to the southeast, and provides fresh water to fuel a significant seafood industry in Apalachicola Bay. We are confident that a thorough review of all the available management alternatives will reveal that the river system can be managed such that all needs are met. Sound science and engineering study must prevail to determine how best to operate the river system in these changing times. We believe there is sufficient water for both upstream and downstream environmental, economic, and human needs. The system operations cannot continue utilizing an antiquated management plan with simple documentation of existing trends. It is critical a thorough investigation of all operational alternatives be done with today's updated conditions being considered. We at the City of Gainesville stand ready to help in your efforts in any way we can. Please do not hesitate to contact either our City Manger, Bryan Shuler, at 770-5356865 or Kelly Randall, Public Utilities Director at 770-538-2400. Sincerely, Myrtle Figueras, Mayor

---

Comment ID: 489
Author Name: John Mock
Organization:

My dad had a book titled "Don't Raise the Bridge, Lower the River". While I never read the book I have given its title much thought over my 60 years. To that point, what it really said to me was to think out side of the box. The water flow rate in the Apalachicola River is a very complex issue. Decisions made now will have effects, or perceived effects, on such things from oysters, mussels, fish, people, water supplies, power plants, tributaries, property values, commerce, etc. Passions and the stakes are high and no one wants to be the loser.

Comment ID: 496
Author Name: James & Martha Burwell
Organization:

As residents of Forsyth County, Georgia and owners of property on Lake Lanier, we are very concerned about the past and future management of Lake Lanier's water level.

Comment ID: 500
Author Name: Greater Hall Chamber of Commerce
Organization: Hall Chamber of Commerce

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must update the water control manuals for the ACF Basin .....including studies of science, technology and economic impacts.... with the most up-to-date factual information examining new and different ways of operating Lake Lanier and the other Corps projects in the ACF Basin. We must bring the operations of our water resources to the twenty-first century. Yes, we are still experiencing a drought. Yes, the local, state and national economy is suffering. Yes, we are seeing extreme fuel price fluctuation. These reasons stated are putting added pressure on Lake Lanier and its economic importance to this county and region. Today, Lake Lanier is more than 18 feet below full pool and dropping at a rapid rate. Businesses and citizens are suffering because Lake Lanier's waters are at record low levels.

Comment ID: 501
Author Name: Russell Landscape Group
Organization: Russell Landscape Group

The new Water Control Plan should not simply replicate existing past operations which have unnecessarily drained these reservoirs to low water levels. I am in hope that the Corp of Engineers will take the responsibility to study all possible alternatives to determine the most effective and best use of reservoir storage given current basin conditions. At present, 3 million residents in North Georgia rely on Lake Lanier and the Chattahoochee River as their sole source of drinking water. Just as important, Lake Lanier is the major resource that supplies water to Metro Atlanta's business and industry community, including my profession as a landscape contractor. The Green industry affords an 8 billion dollar annual economic impact to the state of Georgia.

Comment ID: 502

Author Name: Grier Todd
Organization: 1071 Coalition of Lake Lanier

1071 Coalition of Lake Lanier, we submit to the U.S. Army Corps of770.458.6311 Engineers (USACE) these comments on the scope of the review used to update the water control plan for the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint (ACF) Basin. The 1071 Coalition is a non-profit organization comprised of citizens, civic groups, businesses and other entities dedicated to maintaining water levels in Lake Sidney Lanier that sustain water supply, recreation, and economic prosperity through the advocacy of appropriate, science-based water releases necessary for the ACF river basin. We believe the Corps should study alternatives to the current operation plans rather than simply document existing practices. The plan should manage our water resources much more effectively according to project purposes. Through wise management of our reservoirs we believe there is sufficient water in the basin to meet the reasonable needs for municipal and industrial water supply with no adverse environmental impact on other users. The USACE should give more weight to the highest and best use of reservoir storage during periods of extended drought. Should Congressional approval be needed to implement the preferred plan resulting from this process, we believe such approval should be sought. The 1071 Coalition asks that the update of the water control plans consider the following:

Comment ID: 504
Author Name: Katheryn Dunlap
Organization: Metropolitan North GA Water Planning District

Dear Colonel Jorns: Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this crucial step of updating the Corps' water control manuals for the ACF Basin. The health and sustainability of Lake Lanier as a water supply source for over three million people is extremely important. We hope that the Corps will take this opportunity to truly update the water control manuals used to operate each of the Corps projects in the ACF and not just replicate the existing operations that have caused concern over the sustainability of Lake Lanier. The Corps must consider alternative operating plans to balance water supply needs and economic impact with downstream needs before adopting a new Water Control Plan. These alternative operating plans should be developed to manage the ACF Basin much more effectively and should be based on facts and sound science.

We believe there is enough water in the ACF Basin to meet all reasonable needs if the reservoirs are managed properly.

Comment ID: 505
Author Name: John and Jodi Wacho
Organization:

1) First and foremost, logic has to govern the release of water from Lake Lanier. This is obviously not part of the present plan, due to the fact the lakes in the ACF Basin below Lake Lanier are full or minimally below full pool, while Lake Lanier is almost 20 feet below full pool. This is not due to the drought or over use of water by the public in Georgia. When recent rainfall calculations are totaled, compared to the amount of water released, the Lake should only be down some 3-5 feet. This is due to mismanagement of the releasing of water. Look at what is going on downstream, not what the Manual says. If the downstream areas are full, decrease the outflow.

Comment ID: 512
Author Name: Will Daniel
Organization:

We must do whatever possible to restore lake levels in Lake Lanier.

Comment ID: 523
Author Name: Jack Griffeth
Organization:

The negative environmental effects of the Lake being so low seems to greatly outweigh the benefits of releasing the water. I hope the future management plan calls for Lake Lanier

remaining at or near capacity for the better good.

Comment ID: 524
Author Name: Palmer
Organization:

As an area resident I am very concerned with the management of Lake Lanier water resources. We should manage the lake resources hoping for the best rain conditions but planning for the worst.

Comment ID: 538
Author Name: George N. Slappey, DDS
Organization:

This is a workable thing, it just cannot be accomplished with 50 year old guidelines.....good luck and we need help badly and real soon.

Comment ID: 553
Author Name: Michael W. Briggs
Organization:

Why is water released from Lake Lanier when it is almost down 20 feet when the Levels of other Lakes South of Lanier(such as West Point only 5 feet down) have more water?

Comment ID: 554
Author Name: John Gundlach
Organization:

We don't have the luxury of a northern reservoir to fall back on in case our's runs dry, the southern reservoirs do and it's time to fill ours back up and use some of their waters if it is felt that the mussels and sturgeon need extra water.

Comment ID: 567
Author Name: Charles Bannister
Organization: Gwinnett County

In addition 33 CFR 222.5 (f) (4) states "Development and execution of water control plans will include appropriate consideration for efficient water management in conformance with the emphasis on water conservation as a national priority. The objectives of efficient water control management are to produce beneficial water savings and improvements in the availability and quality of water resulting from project regulation/operation. Balanced resource use through improved regulation should be developed to conserve as much water as possible and maximize all project functions consistent with project/system management. Continuous examination should be made of regulation schedules, possible need for storage reallocation (within existing authority and constraints) and to identify needed changes in normal regulation. Emphasis should be placed on evaluating conditions that could require deviation from normal release schedules as part of drought contingency plans (ER I 10-2¬1941)." We do not believe that the present Interim Operations Plan and its modifications follow this COE rule. We believe that had this rule been followed in developing the Interim Operations Plan, the COE could have met the downstream needs and preserved the storage in lake Lanier to a much greater extent than has been done in the last two years.

Comment ID: 568
Author Name: William E. Carrol
Organization:

1). The watershed drainage area for Lake Lanier comprises only six percent (6%) of the watershed area within the ACF basin; however it contains sixty four percent (64%) of the water storage capacity for the ACF basin. Therefore it is very evident that the Corps of Engineers has allowed a serious mismatch to occur while planning the location and construction of its several dams within the ACF basin. Too much is being expected from Lake Lanier to serve distant needs hundreds of miles to the south while not being able to adequately meet the needs of nearby Metropolitan Atlanta.

---

3). The Corps of Engineers is continuing to release more water from Lake Lanier than is being received into Lake Lanier. Thus the water level of Lake Lanier continues to drop to levels that have created a serious danger to the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Metro Atlanta.

Comment ID: 569
Author Name: Edward Close
Organization:

I believe that the Government has done a terrible job of managing the ACF Basin and Lake Lanier in particular.

Questions-why is Lake Lanier 18 feet down and the lower lakes almost full?

Comment ID: 574
Author Name: G. Eucle Vickery
Organization:

Historically, lake levels have run from a low of 622 to a high of 637.

Comment ID: 580
Author Name: Hugh Toles
Organization:

I understand the drawdown in the winter for flood control, and I understand about drought conditions, but what I could not understand was the inequality in the attempt to favor down stream areas. I can go along with what comes in must go out, but taking away what water we have in order to maintain someone else's water level doesn't make good common sense. What did the muscles and sturgeons do when there was a drought before there were any controls on the river system. I can understand the muscle and oyster farmers on the ACF river saying salt water intrudes up stream when the water level drops from up river. This would be a fact of nature even if there were no dams to control the flow.

Comment ID: 586
Author Name: Tim Duffey
Organization:

1. I fully agree that the operational purposes that were implemented on day one for the use of the dam and resulting lake should be adhered to as closely as possible.

Comment ID: 587
Author Name: Robert Tant
Organization: Columbus Water Works

We believe all of these concerns can be accommodated if the Corps understands the relationships among these discrete functions and operates the ACF system accordingly. It is of critical importance to CWW that the Corps pay greater attention to Chattahoochee River flows in the middle stretch of the river. Our FERC approved flows of 800cfs minimum, 1350cfs daily average and 1850cfs weekly average are critical and necessary to sustain the aforementioned projects and programs at Columbus and southward. These flows, for reasons unknown to us, are not being consistently met. Since June 24, 2008, our FERC flows have fallen short some 60% of the time for weekly averages and 10% for daily averages. These shortfalls came in spite of the Corps IOP modeling which states that the FERC flows will be met as long as West Point reservoir exceeds an elevation of 621.6 feet. This elevation has been met and significantly exceeded all summer. These occurrences certainly raise questions for CWW. Are these lapses due to a lack of attention by the Corps to this stretch of the river? Is there some other overriding consideration of which we are not aware? The Corps' ambivalent attitude concerning the FERC flows at disconcerting, especially since Crops documents state that all FERC flows will be maintained. Yet Corps representatives continue to state in public that there is no obligation to meet FERC flows. The Corps cannot continue to take these incompatible positions. We need some assurance from the Corps that the FERC flows at the Columbus gage will be observed and protected as called for in the IOP. We appreciate the Corps attention to these issues. Because of the above plans, CWW continues to be concerned that the Corps' focus seems to be isolated to only two points of flow in the ACF, at Peachtree Creek and the headwaters of the

Apalachicola. We have repeatedly asked that the Corps broaden their focus and give significant attention to the flows in the middle Chattahoochee River, especially during periods of drought and flooding. We believe that the cloud on the future growth of the Columbus area can be laid at the feet of the Corps due to its failure to operate the system consistent with the authorized project purposes.

Comment ID: 588
Author Name: Jay Fager
Organization:

Gentlemen, I'd like to take this opportunity to voice my concerns regarding the management of West Point Lake, which is located in west central Georgia. The lake level should never drop below 930 ms!. At this level, the lake could be utilized safely all year long.

If the amount of water released from West Point Lake and other upstream reservoirs, exceeds what is coming into the basin from the surrounding water shed, it is obvious that the water levels up and down the length of the basin will be impacted in a negative way. The battle for water rights and its' usage has been unresolved for way too long. It is time for the Corp to exhibit leadership, and seek a solution to the problem as quickly as possible.

Comment ID: 590
Author Name: Erin Cathy
Organization:

Of course, I know it was a drought, but that didn't explain why all our water collected had to be released downstream.

Comment ID: 613
Author Name: David Herndon
Organization:

Effective water management of Lake Lanier is critically important to the water consumption needs of Atlanta and cities further downstream. Similarly, water management policy must take into account the environmental impacts of restricting or increasing the flow of water in the Chattahoochee basin.

Comment ID: 618
Author Name: Barry Smith
Organization:

A drought should impact all facets of the water management system. Over the past two years, the most severe impact is on the Lake Lanier Water Levels while the river and lakes downstream did not see near the lake level declines.

Comment ID: 619
Author Name:
Organization:

You have destroyed the lake. How does such inept management happen and how is it allowed to continue? the maximum flow from this body of water should be 1.5 or 2 times the inflow for days at a time, not 20-50 times the inflow for months at a time.

Comment ID: 620
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association of County Commissioners of GA

The Association County Commissioners of Georgia (ACCG) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the U.S. Anny Corps of Engineers' planned update of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin's Water Control Manual. We commend the Corps for taking this initial step in updating the outdated ACF plan and sincerely hope that the plan can ultimately be revised to reflect current realities of population growth and water usage in Georgia, Alabama and Florida -something the Interim Operation Plan and its revisions has failed to do.

Updating the plan should include new methods of forecasting runoff and modeling to ensure that the Corps' ACF reservoirs, particularly Lake Lanier, are allowed to reach full pool no later than June 151 of each year and are as full as practical during drought conditions while still meeting downstream, legally-required flows. While Lake Lanier has 63 percent of the storage capacity in the system, it is fed by only 6 percent of the ACF's drainage basin. Considering how much longer it takes to refill Lake Lanier and the detrimental impacts recent severe droughts have had on this reservoir, it should not be drawn down using composite storage rule curves for the entire system or to create artificially-high, non-science-based flows to protect mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River.

Comment ID: 621
Author Name: Ann Alexander
Organization:

Once upon a time Lake Lanier. Now it looks like it has been strip mined. This did not happen because of drought. Dead mussels. Who cares? Thousands from tree line to water.

Comment ID: 656
Author Name: Tom Stratton
Organization:

Lake Lanier has to be a valuable resource in and of itself, not just a holding tank to fill downstream lakes.

Comment ID: 669
Author Name: Blair Anderson
Organization:

Please give more weight to the current overall water release scheme that is currently in place. I would think as most residents do, that the potential negative affects of this "new" policy of continual release at these low levels is completely non-sensical or in better terms, unreasonable. The needs of the people and the many residents surrounding such a 'once' beautiful lake far outweigh the needs of fish life, mussels. When water levels go down further aren't we endangering our own Lake's water life endangering the fish that live here as well as the safety and value of lake residents property?? ..let alone possibly cutting off water supplies to 12 million+ people?

I am sure you have heard these comments before and hope that you are now not rolling your eyes as you read yet another letter from a taxpayer inquiring about what is going on with current policy. Please take these comments, feedback seriously. The responsibility you have at the Corps is great. I appreciate the great responsibility, and yes, respect it greatly. As most people, I cannot fathom all the complexities that go into your management duties. Most of us out here are not asking you to re-invent the wheel of how the Corps does things. I think if you had the ear of some of us and wanted to more strategically curtail responses/letters/inquiries of what the heck is going on, a refinement of your communication is what is in order. Maybe you are doing everything right. I wouldn't know because your(the Corps) bureaucratic communication has not hit me. Is there any possibility that the Corps can communicate clearly what it is currently doing, what it has been doing in the past, what has changed since 2006/2007 full pool lake levels? Maybe open and straight talk about where you, the Corps are at, will help justify what you are doing, why you are doing it, why it is not a catch-22, and why/how the lake level will come back. All Georgia Americans/taxpayers are reasonable and support their federal and state run agencies when things are well explained and appear justified. Helping our neighbors in trouble (compassion)is a good thing but there comes a time when those that help (their resources) start to end and the extent of help (the reaching out and giving) must end. Compassion overload has set in with the mussels and the other states that are screaming for Georgia's Lake Lanier water. What about us in Georgia who plan on relying on this water as humans? Haven't we helped out enough down stream from Lanier? If it isn't enough, tell us why it isn't enough and we may support the continued policy. If you can't reasonably justify what you are doing to the people (citizens) whom are paying for your services/offices/resources/salaries maybe it is time to change your policy to a policy that does reasonably justify what is happening to Georgia's resource. I take seriously the word reasonably and do not feel I have enough information to justify to my neighbor why the lake is where it is at with water levels. Does that seem right to the Corps directors? If there is some link to a reasonably worded update on where the Corps policy is on water management specific to our great Lake Lanier? I would as well as many of my

neighbors would love to see it. I request this as I have an interest in this as I am an adjacent landowner indirectly paying for the corps oversight.

Nothing helps greater in understanding than communication.

If someone can respond great, if not, fine...

Comment ID: 678
Author Name: Lake Lanier Land Owner
Organization:

Our lake continues to drop lower and lower. It amazes me that it cannot be stopped! What is going on? Why do we have to let it out?? Does anybody use common sense?

DO NOT LET ANYMORE WATER OUT OF LAKE LANIER!! STOP the flow.

Comment ID: 680
Author Name: John Tierney
Organization:

Regarding management of the Lake Lanier water level, the drought is serious and everyone recognizes that. However, for future consideration to prevent the dramatic reduction in the water levels that, in themselves, create unnecessary economic and financial impact, we suggest the following:

Comment ID: 685
Author Name:
Organization:

We bought a house on the lake in 1999.
Out of the 10 years we have owned property on the lake it has only been full 2 years. It is outrageous that this lake has been so poorly managed in the past and present. Lets get politics out and start using common sense and restore this lake to where it was intended to be...full!

Comment ID: 687
Author Name: Tim Newton
Organization:

I understand the demands of our limited basin but don't quite understand why the output can not equal the input (less evaporation) regarding our water supply. Should be simple mathematics. If the lake was not in place, the lower basin would not get any more water than what is available in the two major river sources. We could plan for a worse case event and drop the lake 4-6 feet for flood control but this should be the extent of how low this lake should be.

Comment ID: 698
Author Name: Ann Langley
Organization:

We are or at least were in danger of running out of water! In Atlanta! This is ludicrous when we have access to this large body of water but send it down to states that are not in need. The fact that this has not be resolved is totally irresponsible on the part of all involved parties.

Comment ID: 699
Author Name: Joel A. Ramsey
Organization:

I am going to be very blunt and honest with you. We have lived here for 4 years, 2 of which our boat dock is sitting on the dirt. We also have a home in Florida - believe me they have plenty of water. Please update the 50-year water manual that Jackie Joseph has been trying to update for years. Let's deal with the hear and now, not archaic and ridiculous burearacy. I am paying high taxes on water property, but no water. I am paying taxes on a boat I cannot use. At some point, I am going to have to stop paying taxes. Please expedite your solution.

Comment ID: 703

Author Name: Allen DuPont
Organization:

As a homeowner living on Lake Lanier, I have been extremely disappointed with the Corps' mismanagement of the lake in the past few years. As it currently stand, the lake is in a desperate situation and is expected to reach a new record low in the coming weeks. Action must be taken as soon as possible to revise the current Water Control Plan to prevent the lake's currently dismal condition from ever happening again in the future.

Comment ID: 704
Author Name: Allen DuPont
Organization:

My husband and I have lived on Lake Lanier for the past 10 years. In that time, we have enjoyed the Corps' management of our precious lake; However, I have been extremely disappointed with the Corps' mismanagement of the lake in the past few years.

As it currently stands, the lake is in a desperate situation and is expected to reach a new record low in the coming weeks. Action must be taken as soon as possible to revise the current Water Control Plan to prevent the lake's currently dismal condition from ever happening again in the future.

Comment ID: 749
Author Name: Charles Cataldo
Organization: Arris Group

Please consider the huge importance of Lake Lanier when you update the Water Control Manual for this resource. The many citizens of North Georgia rely heavily on this valuable resource & we hope with great anticipation that the Water Control Manual will be updated to keep the water level in this lake to be no more than 10ft. below full pool. This is our main water supply & we just can't prioritize oyster fishing for a given geographical region over the running water needs of so many people in Georgia. Please consider also the fact that the southern end of the basin has received much more rain the past year than the northern part of the basin in N. Georgia. Thanks for taking my comments.

Comment ID: 773
Author Name: Walter Anderson
Organization: City of Berkeley Lake

This is an outdated mandate that fails to incorporate system-wide needs and requirements. Glad that a new manual is being produced!

Comment ID: 778
Author Name: Philip Burton
Organization:

While one could write a book on the dynamics of the ACF basin and the need for new rules and management practices I would like to briefly point out just a few of the reasons the priorities and current management of the ACF must change.

Comment ID: 778
Author Name: Philip Burton
Organization:

While 50 plus years ago the project purposes where warranted and had merit but those purposes and needs have changed and the management must adjust and have greater and more flexibility to react to the needs that the ACF basin serves. Lanier alone supplies water to over 60% of Georgia’s population along with the smallest water shed of only 1040 square miles. The comments above may seem too basic in nature but touches in a broad sense the absolute need for a change in the current management and the mismanagement of our lakes during times of drought under the current management plans and authorized purposes and the changes of this basin over the last 50 years.

Comment ID: 780
Author Name: Davenport, Robert
Organization:

Presently with the lake being 20 feet below full pool presents numerous negative attributes including safety due to submerged or projecting objects, un-sightly shoreline, and lake accessibility issues from both current dock permits and in operable ramps. I understand the effect of drought but see no reasonable explanation for why downstream stakeholders in the basin should receive the benefit of our impoundment capacity. In my view, the downstream basin should only receive a portion of the actual throughput the lake receives from natural resources. Downstream FPS flow should not be more than the inflow Lanier receives. We appreciate your management of our precious resources and pray you will determine a more appropriate plan that is scientifically based and maintains a navigable, safe, recreational resource on Lanier.

Comment ID: 797
Author Name: Greg
Organization:

Mismanagement of the water levels through the droughts has all but destroyed the lake.

Comment ID: 801
Author Name: Harald Sundal
Organization: Boater/Brokerage

It is appalling that we started out with the lake level several feet below normal due to errors on the corps part in having incorrect water levels, indicated versus actuals.

It is my belief that failure of many of the businesses is a direct result of your actions or lack of action.

I have been boating on Lake Lanier for a few years now after moving from Martinez, GA where I used Clark's hill. I have been deeply disappointed in the way that You have handled and managed the level of Lake Lanier.

WATER MANAGEMENT SUGGESTIONS

Water Management Suggestions (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 6
Author Name: Heinz J. Mueller
Organization: EPA

EPA Region 4 supports the inclusion of the following issues in the ACF Manual Update:

A section on current project operations, as well as an historical review of how these have been refined over the years.
O A summary of operational changes necessitated by drought contingency requirements and the new data that supports such changes.
A section with updated data reflecting current basin conditions.
O A section with proposed new environmental requirements for meeting water quality standards, and a section on how compliance with all endangered species laws and fish spawning needs will be accomplished.
A section on procedures to be used for capturing and using real-time data provided by additional gages. This should include information on the proposed new gauging stations, and a discussion of why these sites were selected.
O A section with the results of the most recent computerized modeling used to evaluate project operations.
A section on the proposed improved streamlining of data exchange between agencies, in particular with the EPA Region 4 Water Protection Division.

EPA Region 4's NEPA Program Office recommends that the Mobile District address and fully document the following issues in the EIS for the updated ACF Water Control Manual. Adverse impacts from any proposed action should be avoided, minimized, and/or mitigated.
The Mobile District should address and fully document the effects from any proposed action(s) (e.g., revisions to various lake levels, discharge changes in average daily flows, etc.) on any threatened or endangered species.

EPA has concerns with the consequences of any major changes to conservation storage at three important lakes in the ACF system. It is our understanding that (when full) the values are currently: 62.5% -Lake Lanier (with only 6% of the drainage area above Chattahoochee Gage); 17.6% -West Point; and, 14% -W. F. George.

EPA Region 4's Water Protection Division offers the following scoping comments on the proposed WCM Update and the EIS:
EPA encourages the inclusion in the EIS of a discussion that connects management plans to reallocation of water storage. Of special interest are the effects of management plan changes on discharge rates (including velocities) and river elevations (including volume).

Comment ID: 20
Author Name: Janet G. Llewellyn
Organization: Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Federal Register notice announcing the scoping process, it is Florida's understanding that the Corps intends to close the public comment period on November 21, 2008, and complete a scoping report by December 31, 2008. As the Corps is aware, all the ongoing litigation between the Corps and the States of Florida, Alabama and Georgia, and various interested stakeholders concerning the Corps' operation of federal reservoirs in the ACF Basin has been consolidated in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida. (2) That court has announced its intention to render important, and possibly determinative, decisions within the next few months. The Corps must ensure that the judicial determinations in any such ruling are incorporated into this manual revision process.

In this case, the Corps must prepare a new master manual that includes the water control plans for the various facilities and the reservoir regulation schedules that dictate operations. The master manual must clearly describe not only the relative priorities of each of the ACF reservoirs, but also how those priorities and additional uses and demands will be accommodated. One of the most important elements of the new manual must be a Drought Contingency Plan that includes a logical sequence for identifying when drought contingency actions must be initiated and describes the nature and justification of those actions.

To date; the Corps' actions have focused on just two elements of operation at the upstream reservoirs: 1) minimum flow from Woodruff Dam, and 2) maximum fall rate in the Apalachicola River. The NEPA process must evaluate nil the various Corps operations throughout the ACF reservoir system that result in the flows observed below Jim Woodruff Dam. As reflected in the Corps' regulations, the master manual must clearly describe all these decisions, particularly in the water control plans and their reservoir regulation schedules, so that all parties can easily understand the Corps' proposed action and that action can be reasonably evaluated under NEPA.

Comment ID: 30
Author Name: Joseph Parrish
Organization:

You redo your water control plan, and trying to balance the needs between the whole entire basin from north to south as it flows into Apalachicola Bay, and all of the detrimental effects that the low flows are having on Apalachicola Bay and all points in between.

Comment ID: 36
Author Name: Tony Owens
Organization: MeadWestvaco

2. The Corps Must Acknowledge and Address the Middle Portions of the ACF River System. While various needs in North Georgia and the Apalachicola River have dominated the discussions regarding the ACF Basin over the past few years, Congress authorized and

instructed the Corps to build and operate the ACF reservoirs substantially for the benefit of those located in between. For example, as explained in more detail below, Congress authorized the three storage reservoirs, including Lake Lanier, to support navigation and hydropower production below the fall line. Further, West Point is specifically authorized not only for hydropower and navigation, but also for flood control, fish and wildlife recreation, and general recreation for those in the La Grange area. As the Corps develops revisions to the ACF water control manual, it must ensure that its operations serve the communities and businesses of the ACF River System's middle regions, such as MeadWestvaco. a. MeadWestvaco Depends on the Corps' Provision of Adequate Flow. MeadWestvaco chose to locate our facility in Phenix City with the expectation that the Corps would continue to operate the ACF reservoirs according to the laws authorizing their construction and operation. We spent millions of dollars building infrastructure based on the assumption that flows sufficient to serve the federal water projects' purposes would provide enough water for our needs. We also hoped and expected to reap the benefits associated with river transport of fuel and bulk products. Not only has MWV acted in reliance on the Corps' lawful operation of the ACF reservoirs in the past, but we are counting on adequate flows for our future survival. MWV urges the Corps to explain in the revised manual and the environmental documentation how it intends to account for the needs of the communities and industries located in the middle and lower portions of the ACF River System, including MeadWestvaco. b. The Corps Must Continue to Provide Agreed-Upon Flows in the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River. As TRWDA points out, in recent years, representatives of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia have attempted to develop a mutually agreeable allocation of water in the ACF River System. In that context, on July 22, 2003, the three governors signed an agreement which set flow parameters, including the following: • "On the Chattahoochee River above its confluence with Peachtree Creek, a flow of 750 cfs will be maintained on a daily basis, with the understanding that the State of Georgia is entitled to a variable flow regime that requires no less than 650 cfs in winters...." • "On the Chattahoochee River at Columbus, Georgia, a flow of 1350 cfs will be maintained on a daily basis at all times, and a flow of 1850 cfs will be maintained on a weekly basis provided that the top of the storage pool in West Point Reservoir is above 621.6 feet." • "On the Chattahoochee River at Columbia, Alabama, a flow of 2000 cfs will be maintained on a daily basis." • "On the Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, a minimum flow of 5000 cfs will be maintained on a weekly basis at all times...." Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Initial Allocation Formula for the ACF River Basin, ~ 4 (July 22, 2003) (emphases added). Those flow figures were to be included in any allocation formula agreed to by the parties, and they were "intended to be met by the combined actions of maintaining water uses consistent with the allocation formula, and by the Corps operating the federal reservoirs consistent with the allocation formula." Id. (emphasis added). In revising the manual, the Corps should develop operations to meet those parameters as agreed to by all three states. TRWDA's comments call the Corps' attention to the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee flow requirements, namely, 1350 cfs daily and 1850 cfs weekly at Columbus, Georgia, and 2000 cfs at Columbia, Alabama. We believe those flow levels are generally sufficient to meet the lawful, authorized purposes of the ACF River System. They also correspond to the flows that are necessary to meet our facility's operational needs. c. The Corps Cannot Rely on Flint River Flows to Meet Apalachicola River Needs to the Detriment of the Flows in the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River. Recently, as TRWDA points out, increased flows from the Flint River have contributed to the Corps' release of flows from Woodruff to provide for 5000 cfs at Chattahoochee. Like all stakeholders in the basin, MWV is grateful for any inflow that helps meet needs within the system. However, the Corps must not rely on Flint River flows to meet Apalachicola River requirements to the detriment of the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River communities and MWV. Contributions from the Flint River should provide no basis to reduce flows in the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River below levels necessary to support authorized project purposes, as well as the needs of MWV and other industrial and municipal water users in that area of the river. As noted below, the primary purposes of the ACF reservoirs include hydropower, navigation, flood control, recreation, and so on. Those purposes have no meaning except in the context of the communities served by the ACF River System. Most of those communities are located at various points along the Chattahoochee River. The Corps' ability to fulfill the reservoirs' purposes for the benefit of the communities located along the river from Dothan, Alabama to Gainesville, Georgia, depends exclusively on conditions in the Chattahoochee River. The Flint River has absolutely no effect at any point on the Chattahoochee River above the influence of the Jim Woodruff Dam. MWV agrees with TRWDA that because Flint River conditions are independent from Chattahoochee River conditions, there is no logical basis to alter operations at Chattahoochee River projects to the detriment of Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River stakeholders in response to conditions in the Flint River Basin.

3. The Corps Must Operate the ACF Projects for Their Authorized Purposes. As TRWDA points

out, several statutes provide authority for the Corps' initial construction and subsequent operation of the ACF reservoirs. Any revision to the water control manual for the ACF River System must comply with those laws as well as the Corps' regulations. As TRWDA states, the reservoirs' primary authorized purposes are as follows: • Lake Lanier: Hydropower, downstream navigation, and flood control. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-525, 60 Stat. 634, 635 (1946) (referencing H.R. Doc. 80-300 (1946».
• West Point: Flood control, hydropower, fish and wildlife recreation, general recreation, and navigation. Sources: Pub. L. No. 87-874, 76 Stat. 1173, 1180, (1962) (referencing H.R. Doc. No. 87-570 (1962).• Walter F. George: Navigation and hydropower. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-14, 59 Stat. 10, 11, 17 (1945) (referencing H.R. Doc. No. 76-342 (1939»; Pub. L. No. 79-525 (referencing H.R. Doc. 80-300); Resolution of House Public Works Committee (May 19, 1953). • George W. Andrews: Navigation. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-14; Pub. L. No. 79-525; Resolution of House Public Works Committee (May 19, 1953). • Jim Woodruff: Navigation and hydropower. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79¬14; Pub. L. No. 79-525. The laws cited above are the primary sources of the Corps' authority with respect to the ACF reservoirs. They provide the legal basis pursuant to which the Corps operates the ACF reservoirs. To demonstrate compliance with applicable laws and authorities, MWV urges the Corps to provide a clear explanation of the primary authorized purposes for each reservoir in the revised manual and in the environmental documentation, and to operate the reservoirs for those purposes. b

b. The Federal Action Is Reservoir Operation for Authorized Purposes. Like TRWDA, MWV urges the Corps to include in its environmental documentation a clear explanation of the federal "action" which the Corps is evaluating for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act. That action should be defined as the operation of ACF reservoirs according to their authorized purposes. Events leading to the development of the Interim Operations Plan ("IOP") and Revised Interim Operations Plan ("RIOP") illustrate our concerns. Like TRWDA, in our view, the Corps never clearly defined the action which was the subject of a consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") under the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"). Under ESA Section 7(a) (2), federal agencies are required to consult with FWS to insure a proposed action does not (1) jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or (2) destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a) (2). If the action would cause jeopardy or adverse critical habitat modification, FWS is authorized to propose reasonable and prudent alternatives and reasonable and prudent measures. However, in this case, the federal action constituting the basis for consultation was never clearly defined. Rather than presenting to FWS its standard operating procedures under the authorizing statutes, the Corps entered into open-¬ended negotiations with FWS and developed what amounts to a freestanding conservation agreement for the Apalachicola River only. The resulting RIOP now inappropriately drives operations for the rest of the system. MWV urges the Corps not to repeat that model as it revises the manual. The Corps should begin by setting forth a set of operations that fulfills the authorized purposes of the reservoirs, according to the primary legal authorities.

The Corps should begin by setting forth a set of operations that fulfills the authorized purposes of the reservoirs, according to the primary legal authorities. To the extent manual revisions allow for alternative operations -such as operations to serve secondary project purposes or to comply with the ESA and other federal laws -the Corps should allow such alternatives only on the following terms: (1) Any alternative that differs from optimal operation of the reservoirs for primary authorized purposes should be clearly identified as such. (2) The need and/or legal basis to deviate from operation of the reservoirs for optimal fulfillment of the primary authorized purposes should be clearly explained. (3) The Corps should clearly explain applicable limitations on any deviation from operations for primary project purposes, such as a time limit and the circumstances under which the Corps will restore primary operating parameters.

4. Maintenance of FERC Flows in Accordance with Current IOP and RIOP. It is of critical importance to MWV that the Corps maintain FERC-approved flows of 800 cfs minimum, 1350 cfs daily average and 1850 cfs weekly average. Despite the fact that these flows are required in the current IOP and RIOP, they are not being maintained consistently. The IOP states that these flows will be maintained as long as West Point reservoir exceeds an elevation of 621.6 feet. As the Columbus Water Works points out in its comments, although West Point exceeded this level all summer, since June 24, 2008, instream flows have fallen short of this required weekly average approximately 60% of the time and have fallen short of the daily average approximately 10% of the time.

Comment ID: 37
Author Name: Carol A. Couch

Organization: GA EPD

It should be noted that the issuance of water withdrawal permits from Lake Lanier and the withdrawal and consumption of water from the ACF Basin are state
and local actions, not federal actions, and therefore should not be addressed within the scope of connected, cumulative, and similar federal actions. The Corps has no authority to make decisions on matters of water supply planning and must defer to the State of Georgia on such issues. Water supply withdrawals (or the lack thereof) and the consequences of them should be examined, however, as impacts of the proposed federal action.

B. Alternatives Analysis The three types of alternatives for the Corps to consider in the scoping process "include: (1) No action alternative. (2) Other reasonable courses of actions. (3) Mitigation measures (not in the proposed action)." 40 C.F.R. § 1528.25(b)(2008). During the scoping the process, the Corps is only required to examine alternatives that are both reasonable and feasible. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. National Resources Defense Council, 435 U.S. 519,551 (1978). Thus, alternatives to be considered are those that a) meet the purpose and need of the proposed action, b) address regulatory concerns, c) are available and capable of being implemented, and d) are prudent and feasible. The federal projects in the ACF Basin were authorized to fulfill a variety of important purposes. On top of this, the Corps has obligations to comply with the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and other federal environmental laws. The Corps is thus presented with a multitude of potential alternatives for how to operate the system. Below is a discussion of particular issues that the Corps should take into account in developing its alternatives analysis. 1. No Action Alternative CEQ guidelines indicate that in situations involving potential changes to ongoing federal actions, as would be the case here, the "no-action" alternative is interpreted to mean "no change" from the current management direction or level of management intensity. 46 Fed. Reg. 18026, 18027 (March 23, 1981). Where a natural resource has been altered by construction or operation of a project over time, it would be "a useless academic exercise" to consider as the no-action alternative returning the resource to its earlier unaltered state. See id.; see also American Rivers v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 201 F.3d 1186, 1200 (9th Cir. 2000). For decades, the Corps has operated Lake Lanier to meet evolving industrial and municipal water supply needs. The Corps has not finalized any action to
Reallocate storage to water supply. From the standpoint of operations for water supply, this state of affairs would be the no-action alternative. To operate according to water supply needs that existed at some time in the past would require new action on the part of the Corps and thus would not constitute "no action." Doing so also would not represent a reasonable or feasible alternative, thus, it should not be considered as any alternative, including the "no-action" alternative. The Corps should coordinate with state and local interests to analyze water demands at Lake Lanier over the past several years and determine the most accurate and appropriate measure for current water supply requirements. Although the Corps is currently making releases from the Woodruff project pursuant to the RIOP, the RIOP is not likely the most appropriate choice for the no-action alternative for the entire ACF system due to its interim nature. Because the Corps has consistently described the RIOP as a plan for operations that would only continue until the WCM update process was complete, and because the Corps has also maintained the position that the RIOP was not itself a change to the existing water control manual, the Corps has never conducted a careful study of the RIOP's long-term impact on the ACF system as a whole. Therefore, even if the RIOP is used as the no-action alternative, the Corps must conduct a detailed study on the RIOP's long-term effects.

Instead of merely documenting current operations, the Corps must develop and analyze alternatives that will make the most efficient use of the water resources within the ACF River Basin. In considering alternatives to its current operations, Corps should not limit its consideration to only those alternatives that the Corps believes are entirely
within its current authority. Doing so could cause the Corps to overlook what could be a manner of operation that represents the highest and best use of these federal projects. The purpose of the WCM update process should be to develop operations that make the highest and best uses of the federal infrastructure and natural resources within the ACF system. If the Corps determines that the best use of those resources is not currently within the Corps' authority, the WCM update process should include an analysis of how the Corps can obtain the necessary h . authority (1) To assist in the development of operations that make the best use of the water resources within the basin, the State of Georgia provides below several possible alternative operations that should be considered by the Corps as part of the process: 1 Georgia believes that the Corps has the authority to operate Lake Lanier to meet Georgia's projected year 2030

municipal and industrial water supply needs. Nothing herein should be interpreted as a suggestion by Georgia that further Congressional authorization is legally necessary to reallocate additional storage to municipal and industrial water supply. a. Reallocation of Storage for Water Supply The Corps should consider the formal reallocation of storage in the federal reservoirs to meet current water supply needs and projected future water supply needs. As discussed above in Section I.C., numerous water supply studies have concluded that the Chattahoochee River/Lake Lanier system is the most economically viable and environmentally protective alternative for meeting the water needs of the region. Georgia is confident that any objective and thorough economic or environmental analysis would conclude that the highest and best use of Lake Lanier is to meet municipal and industrial water supply needs and to coordinate such operations with releases to maximize to the extent possible the other purposes for the reservoir. No study of alternatives for a Water Control Plan that will guide future operations would be complete without an analysis of alternatives that assure storage for Georgia's present and future water supply needs through formal reallocation of storage. The Corps also should take a careful look at any reallocations in storage at West Point Lake and Walter F. George reservoir that might be needed to meet future water supply needs in Georgia. b. Rule Curve Changes at all Projects in the ACF Basin The Corps should consider possible changes to the rule curve operations at all of the federal ACF Reservoirs to maximize available storage and optimize operations for all project purposes. While continuing to provide adequate flood control protection, the Corps should analyze whether different rule curve configurations would result in the more efficient operation of the system as a whole. Possible changes that may be considered include raising the top of conservation, reducing the winter draw-down, and making adjustments to the shoulders of the rule curve to change the rate of the winter draw-down or the spring re-fill. The potential beneficial effects of these changes may be most pronounced at Lake Lanier. c. Different Methods for Optimizing the ACF System The Corps should not limit possible alternatives to only those that mimic the manner of operations described in the RIOP. Instead, the Corps should consider alternatives to current operations such as the concept presented by the Atlanta Regional Commission ("ARC") and its consultant, Hydrologics, Inc. in January of 2007. The ARC proposal demonstrates that alternant methods of operations can meet downstream needs while maximizing total storage within the ACF system. The WCM update process provides the Corps with an excellent opportunity to explore options such as the ARC proposal that may not have been possible under the prior operations manuals. d. Optimal Operations for Meeting Endangered Species Needs The RIOP should not be considered as the primary alternative for meeting the needs of endangered species below the Jim Woodruff Dam. When the Corps introduced the original IOP in March of 2006, the Corps made clear that the IOP would only remain in place pending the completion of the WCM update process. Therefore, that Corps has never considered the IOP as a mode of permanent operations. It may be that the Corps should consider portions of the current RIOP to be a possible alternative in the WCM NEPA process. However, it should be only one of several alternatives considered. In determining the mode of operations necessary to support endangered
species, the Corps should consider the actual needs of the species and not arbitrary flows, such as 5,000 cubic feet per second ("cfs") at the Chattahoochee gage, that have become the excepted norm over time. Maintaining a flow of 5,000 cfs in the Apalachicola River during dry times can expend a vast amount of water. In 2007, augmentation by the Corps to maintain a 5,000 cfs minimum resulted in a loss of roughly 850,000 acre-feet of storage throughout the ACF system. The Corps' operating plans should always maintain the ability to reduce flow below 5,000 cfs during serious and prolonged droughts. Another concern with the RIOP relates to the flows required during the spawning season of the Gulf sturgeon. Under the RIOP, from March through May, when Composite Storage is in Zones 1 and 2, the Corps would be unable to store water in the system until Basin Inflow exceeds 16,000 cfs. Based upon the best scientific and technical information of which we are aware, maintaining a flow of 16,000 cfs, when water otherwise might be added to composite storage for use in the drier parts of the year, appears to be unnecessary and wasteful. There is no evidence showing that the success of Gulf sturgeon spawning varies according to the amount of spawning habitat below Jim Woodruff Dam. Even if there were, there is no evidence to suggest that the amount of habitat inundated at a flow of 16,000 cfs is optimal or even preferable to lower flows. The Corps should consider the best available science and data in devising a flow regiment that will both benefit the Gulf sturgeon and provide adequate opportunities to increase storage in the ACF system. As an alternative to merely focusing on minimum flows, that Corps should also consider other options for improving the habitat of endangered species in the Apalachicola River and Bay. One particular concern has been the inundation of floodplains along the river. Scientific research has made clear that reduced+M80 floodplain inundation has been caused more by channel degradation than by any reductions in the quantity of flow in the river. The U.S. Geological Survey ("USGS") has

documented the effect of channel degradation in the Apalachicola River, which has substantially lowered the bed of the river in key places. As a result of the lowering of the channel, it now takes much more water to achieve any given river stage. Therefore, to improve habitat conditions for endangered species in the Apalachicola River, the Corps should consider options for repairing and reversing channel degradation in the river. Another factor to be considered in improving species habitat on the Apalachicola River is the Chipola Cut-off. The Chipola Cut-off is a man-made cut-off from the Apalachicola River that has resulted in large diversions (at least 25
- 34%) of the flow of the main stem of the river. This diversion plays a role in the dewatering of various sloughs and side channels that may support endangered mussel species. To improve this aspect of habitat for endangered species, the Corps should consider halting or limiting the current diversion of fresh water caused by the Chipola Cutoff. The buildup of sediment in the Apalachicola River also contributes to the dewatering of habitat areas such as Swift Slough. Sedimentation can result in the raising of sills over which water must rise to inundate those areas. The Corps should explore ways to remove sediment from the head of affected areas such as Swift Slough so that those areas receive water during lower flow periods. Various stakeholders in Florida have also expressed concerns related to salinity in the Apalachicola Bay. As with the habitat concerns discussed above, river flow is only one contributor to potential salinity issues in the bay. There are many other natural and man-made contributors. The Corps should not consider releases from storage in the ACF system as a viable measure for significantly affecting the salinity of the Bay. The Corps should consider other options for altering man-made contributors to the salinity of the Bay. As one example, the Corps should study ways to solve problems created by Sikes Cut in St. George Island, which is a major contributor to salinity in the bay.

C. Modeling Representatives from the Corps have indicated that the Corps intends to use the HEC-ResSim modeling platform to evaluate operations and alternatives for its projects in the ACF River Basin as part of the WCM update process. The HEC-ResSim model will replace the use of the HEC-5 model for the ACF system. The Corps developed the HEC-5 model as part of the now-defunct ACF Compact negotiations between the States of Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. During the Compact process, stakeholders within the three states worked with the Corps and reached agreement on the inherent assumptions within the HEC-5 Existing Conditions Model. Modeling experts with the Georgia Environmental Protection Division ("EPD") have reviewed the HEC-ResSim model for the ACF Basins and noted several instances in which the HEC-ResSim model is inconsistent with the established and agreed upon assumptions of the HEC-5 Existing Conditions Model. There are also examples of apparent errors in the HEC-ResSim model. Prior to employing the HEC-ResSim model to evaluate operations to the WCM, the Corps should first provide an explanation for these discrepancies and correct
apparent errors, which are discussed briefly below. The most significant issue related to the Corps' HEC-ResSim model for the ACF Basin is that the HEC-ResSim model places certain water withdrawal and wastewater discharge points in the wrong location along the Chattahoochee River. As a result, the HEC-ResSim model underestimates the release from Lake Lanier necessary to meet the 750 cfs minimum flow requirement on the Chattahoochee River at Peachtree Creek. The current HEC-ResSim model has the City of Atlanta's water intake located below Peachtree Creek, when that intake is actually just above Peachtree Creek. Similarly, the model indicates that two wastewater returns from the Cobb County/Marietta Water Authority are above Peachtree Creek when they are actually below that point. Because of these errors, the HEC-ResSim model's predicted flow in the Chattahoochee River at Peachtree Creek is
greater than what would actually occur. Therefore, the predicted release from Lake Lanier necessary to meet the 750 cfs flow requirement at Peachtree Creek is less that what is actually needed. Because the Corps will need to release more water from Lake Lanier than what is predicted by the model, the actual elevation of Lake Lanier under a given set of conditions will be lower than what is predicted by the HEC-ResSim model. There also appear to be discrepancies between the HEC-5 and HEC-ResSim models regarding certain physical characteristics of some of the projects in the ACF Basin that are operated by Georgia Power. As an example, for the Barletts Ferry project, there is a discrepancy between the amount of storage available in the project at particular elevations. At an elevation of 510 feet, the storage used in the HEC-5 model is 3,500 acre-feet less that the storage used in the HEC-ResSim model. At the Morgan Falls, Walter F. George, and Jim Woodruff projects, the two models differ as to what tailwater elevation will result from a given release. The tailwater elevation determines the generation head available at that project.

Comment ID: 41
Author Name: Denise Deal
Organization: Greater Hall Chamber of Commerce

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must update the water control manuals for the ACF Basin .....including studies of science, technology and economic impacts.... with the most up-to-date factual information examining new and different ways of operating Lake Lanier and the other Corps projects in the ACF Basin. We must bring the operations of our water resources to the twenty-first century.

Comment ID: 43
Author Name: Students of River Basin Management
Organization:

The River Basin Management course of Florida State University submits the following: We recommend that the following suggestions are incorporated into the manual: 1) Define the parameters of successful reservoir management. *If this includes the use of a baseline, the Corps must define and justify the
baseline chosen. Baseline should be protective of the ecological integrity of the Apalachicola River and estuary.

3) Evaluate the reservoir zone levels consistent with current and future conditions and modify if necessary (conservation pool, zone 1, 2, etc.). 4) Revise the reservoir release trigger. *The manual needs to deal with the issue of increasing withdrawals in the upper basin and how they affect downstream interests. The current trigger is based on net basin inflow and does not account for affects of increased consumptive
withdrawals on downstream interests. The trigger should consider both net inflow and water lost to consumption. The plan should be revised so that increased consumption translates into lower reservoir levels instead of lower releases.

5) The Corps should incorporate the SOP and the IOPIEOP in the new Water Control Manual to ensure consistency in management in the absence of a specific allocation formula.

8) The "balancing" of the reservoirs in the ACF Basin needs to be defined and should be equitable.

2) Incorporate adaptive management. *Regularly review the Water Control Plan. (every 2 years?) *Incorporate ongoing court decisions and state negotiations into the Manual. *Monitor and study the basin. Use research to evaluate whether the plan is meeting the metrics of what is acceptable. *Issue periodic reports on how well the Corps is meeting the intent of the process. *If the Manual does not meet its intended purpose, the Corps should assess why and report to the public.

3) The Water Control Plan must be viewed as a set of guidelines to help clarify the day-to-day regulation of the ACF river basin.

I also appreciate that the Water Control Manuals that are ultimately developed through this process should not overly constrain the Corps of Engineers and that water managers need some degree of flexibility to react to the conditions in the basin. Since the focus is on process at this time, I would like to state that it is important for the Corps of Engineers to develop a rational and understandable process for an update of the Water Control Plan. The Corps needs to clearly define exactly what criteria will be used to distinguish between an acceptable alternative approach and an unacceptable alternative and what metrics will be used to measure these criteria. And, these criteria and metrics need to be transparent, understood and accepted by the public. At a minimum, the safe yield for various reaches of the basin needs to be defined. Examples of other criteria could include defining the rule curve and top of flood pool for each of the storage reservoirs and management policies regarding storing water in the flood pool. Similarly, the Manual should define what are acceptable flows in the Apalachicola River not only in terms of magnitude of flow, but also duration of low flow events, frequency of low flow events, rates of change of flow and time of year of flow events. Defining the criteria for
evaluating alternative approaches and the metrics to measure these criteria should be one of the first steps- taken by the Corps in developing the Manual.

Comment ID: 44

Author Name: Steve Leitman
Organization:

An important part of defining the criteria for the Water Control Manual will be defining the environmentally sustainable flows for the Apalachicola River. There must be a link between acceptable flows and the ecological health of Apalachicola River and its estuary. Unfortunately, this number cannot be defined simply by looking it up in a book or using the recommendation of an individual expert. I would suggest instituting a process similar to what was done on the Savannah River and to work with the Nature Conservancy's environmentally sustainable flows program. I recognize that my comments should focus on what is within the Corps' authority to control. However, the issue of depletions from consumptive withdrawals raises an interesting paradox. Although the Corps does not necessarily have authority over water consumption in the basin, water depletions do affect the management of the ACF reservoir system. The current Revised Interim Operating Procedure uses "local inflow" as a trigger to define reservoir releases during extreme low flow events. The local inflow trigger is a net local inflow trigger, not gross. My concern with this approach is that net
local inflow not only accounts for streamflow into the reservoir, but also includes consumptive depletions and evaporation from the reservoirs. Consequently, if consumptive demands and/or evaporation increase substantially in the future, this will decrease the local inflow and the response of RIOP is to lower releases when certain prescribed thresholds are exceeded. Therefore, the RIOP operational guidelines provide no incentive for upstream interests to conserve water or constrain their consumptive demands. If additional water supply reservoirs are built and this results in increased evaporative losses, the decline in local inflow will lead to the reduction in downstream flow. To develop equitable water management practices for all water users, the use of local inflows as a trigger for reservoir releases should be changed to a methodology that more accurately reflects depletions from the system and provides a mechanism for management actions that address reductions throughout the basin. Downstream interests should not be required to totally shoulder the burden of increased depletions by upstream interests. Quite simply, this is not equitable. I have heard it stated by the District Engineer that the Corps of Engineers allocates storage space, not water in the storage space.

Another important task which should be included in the Water Control Manual update is an assessment of required federal flow commitments under current statues and regulations. For some reason this was never done as part of the ACF Compact and Allocation Formula discussions and studies. In addition some questions which should be examined during the update process concerning the reservoirs include: • What are the tradeoffs of revising the rule curve at any of the storage projects between increasing the volume of the storage pool and increasing the flood risk and would such changes be advisable? • Are the current zone elevations at the reservoirs optimal or should they be revised? Current zone elevations should not be considered sacrosanct, but should be evaluated. • What metrics should be used to define various stages of entering into and out of drought and flood periods and how should release rules change during these hydrologically distinctive periods.

Comment ID: 45
Author Name: Gail Carmody
Organization: Fish and Wildlife Service

Dear Col. Jorns: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is responding to your September 19, 2008, notice (73 FR 54391) soliciting scoping comments about updating the Master Water Control Manual (WCM) for the Corps' reservoir projects in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. We submit the following comments to assist you in identifying the resources and framing the operational alternatives that you will consider in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this action. These comments represent input from our Alabama, Florida, and Georgia Ecological Services Field Offices. Our authority to comment on this action derives from the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq). It is our understanding that the WCM will specify the storage and release schedules for all five projects in the ACF system of federal dams and reservoirs: Buford Dam/Lake Lanier, West Point Dam/West Point Lake, Walter F. George Dam/Lake Eufaula, George W. Andrews Lock and Dam, and Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam/Lake Seminole. The WCM serves as the primary policy and guidance document for the Corps' water management decisions in the basin, including decisions necessitated during times of flood and drought. We have reviewed the notice announcing the intent to prepare an EIS (73 FR 9780),

the notice announcing the public scoping meetings (73 FR 54391), and the various materials pertaining to the update that are posted on the Mobile District's website. Several Service personnel attended the public scoping meetings. The proposed action is consistently labeled as an "update" of the WCM, but the nature of the update, i.e., how it may depart from current operating rules, is not yet specified. During a conference call with federal agencies on October 9, 2008, the Corps' EIS contractor said that the update would not consider changes in operations that would require changes in Congressional authorizations for the projects or a re-allocation of reservoir storage. While this statement defines a general boundary in principle for the scope of the update, it does not reveal which water management variables are subject to change and to what degree. The relationship between current operating rules and Congressional authorizations is not documented in the materials that have been made publicly available for this scoping process. Therefore, our first scoping comment is to request a summary of the current operating rules for each project, an explanation of their basis in Congressionally authorized purposes, and a description of how much discretion the Corps has to change the rules. We recommend posting such a summary on the District's website for use by other agencies and the public early in the WCM update work schedule. At minimum, the summary should list storage amounts, if any, that are allocated to, and releases that are designated for, the various authorized purposes at each project with appropriate documentation and narrative explanation. For example, the current rule curve for West Point implies an amount of storage available for flood control for several months a year. For other project purposes, the Corps operates the system using the multiple zone rule curves and makes discretionary releases for purposes of navigation, hydropower, water quality, infrastructure, and protected species. The balancing of the discretionary releases is not always clear to the outsider. Compiling information on storage allocations and discretionary uses of storage allows the public to consider whether any other way of operating for the flood control purpose would be consistent with the Congressional authorization. Without such information, the logic of the current operating rules is not apparent to the public, which makes meaningful participation in the scoping process more difficult. We believe that disseminating such information will also serve to diffuse the controversy that has so frequently visited ACF water management issues in recent years.

The Service encourages the Corps to facilitate a comprehensive process for determining how ecological and social benefits could be increased by modifying the operations of the ACF federal dams. We recommend folding into the WCM update a thorough evaluation of project-related flow regime alterations and the potential benefits of restoring features of the pre-project flow regimes. The approach described by Richter and Thomas (2007) would be very useful for this WCM update.

Consumptive Water Demands -- Similarly, the Corps should consider the impacts of increasing consumptive water demands in the basin. This is not an alternative, per se, but is a variable that an analysis of operational alternatives should incorporate along with climate-driven hydrologic variability. The EIS should quantify the relationship between increasing consumptive demands in the ACF Basin and the benefits from various project purposes. For example, what is the highest sustainable minimum release from Woodruff Dam if consumptive demands increase by 25, 50 or 100 percent? To consolidate and report important data about the basin, the EIS should document the volume of storage that has been either contracted for water supply or has been proposed in each project and any limitations due to hydrologic conditions of meeting the contracts.

Comment ID: 50
Author Name: Charles Krautler
Organization: Atlanta Regional Commission

. The Corps Must Consider All Reasonable Alternatives Although the Corps has never formally announced the alternative operating plans it is considering, we are extremely concerned by reports that the Corps merely intends to update its existing manuals to reflect existing operations. It would be truly disappointing if the update process were to devolve in this manner into a paper exercise that will have no lasting effect on conditions in the basin going forward. Such a pre-ordained and limited process would do a great disservice to all those who rely upon the Corps and its management of the water resources of the ACF River Basin, and would fall far short of meeting the Corps' obligations under NEPA. The new water control plan must not simply replicate existing operations.

Comment ID: 51

Author Name: Billy V. Houston
Organization: Tri Rivers Waterway Development District

The Corps Must Operate the ACF Projects for Their Congressionally Authorized Purposes.
a. The Corps Should Acknowledge the Statutory Authorized Purposes for the ACF Reservoirs. Congress enacted several federal statutes which provide the Corps' authority for its initial construction and subsequent operation of the ACF reservoirs. Any revision to the water control manual for the ACF River System must comply with those laws as well as with the Corps' regulations. TRWDA understands the federal reservoirs' primary Congressionally authorized purposes to be as follows: • Lake Lanier: Hydropower, downstream navigation, and flood control. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-525, 60 Stat. 634, 635 (1946) (referencing H.R. Doc. 80-300 (1946)). • West Point: Flood control, hydropower, fish and wildlife recreation, general recreation, and navigation. Sources: Pub. L. No. 87-874, 76 Stat. 1173, 1180, (1962) (referencing H.R. Doc. No. 87-570 (1962)). • Walter F. George: Navigation and hydropower. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-14, 59 Stat. 10, 11, 17 (1945) (referencing H.R. Doc. No. 76-342 (1939)); Pub. L. No. 79-525 (referencing H.R. Doc. 80-300); Resolution of House Public Works Committee (May 19, 1953). • George W. Andrews: Navigation. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-14; Pub. L. No. 79-525; Resolution of House Public Works Committee (May 19, 1953). • Jim Woodruff: Navigation and hydropower. Sources: Pub. L. No. 79-14; Pub. L. No. 79-525. The laws cited above are the primary sources of the Corps' authority with respect to the ACF reservoirs. They provide the legal basis for how the Corps should operate the ACF reservoirs. To demonstrate compliance with these applicable laws and authorities, TRWDA urges the Corps to provide a clear explanation of the primary Congressionally authorized purposes for each reservoir in its revised manual and in the accompanying environmental documentation.

3. The Corps Must Acknowledge and Address the Needs of the Middle Portions of the ACF River System. Water shortages in North Georgia and endangered species in the Apalachicola River have dominated the public discourse on ACF operations in the past two years, due to the drought in the Southeast. However, Congress authorized and instructed the Corps to build and operate the ACF reservoirs substantially for the benefit of those located in between those two ends of the ACF River System. For example, as explained above, Congress authorized the three storage reservoirs, including Lake Lanier, primarily for navigation support and hydropower production below the fall line. West Point is subject to Congressional authorizations for additional purposes, namely, flood control, fish and wildlife recreation, and general recreation for those in the La Grange area. As the Corps
develops revisions to its ACF water control manual, it must ensure its operations serve the communities and businesses of the ACF River System's middle regions.

Communities in the Lower Portions of the Basin Depend on the Corps' Provision of Adequate Flows. Communities and businesses located and grew in cities like Dothan, Eufaula, and Phenix City, Alabama, and Bainbridge, Columbus, and La Grange, Georgia, with the full expectation that the Corps would operate the ACF reservoirs according to the laws authorizing their construction and operation. Those communities spent millions of dollars to build public works projects as well as infrastructure including the Eufaula Inland Dock, the Phenix City Inland Dock, and the Columbia Inland Dock in Alabama and the Port of Columbus and Port Bainbridge in Georgia. Those facilities made it possible for local communities to sell and ship agricultural, silvicultural and mineral
products in bulk and to receive large deliveries of fuels and fertilizers by barge. Companies including TRWDA members Georgia Pacific, MeadWestvaco and Southern Nuclear Company sited and built major industrial facilities on the Chattahoochee River based in large part on the federal commitment that flows sufficient to serve the Congressionally authorized purposes would provide for their industrial cooling and discharge assimilation. They also expected to reap the benefits associated with barge transport of fuel and bulk products provided by a reliable navigation channel. Not only have these communities and businesses acted and invested in reliance on the Corps' lawful operation of the ACF reservoirs in the past, but they are counting on adequate flows for their future survival. Industry and commerce will continue to grow in southeastern Alabama and southwestern Georgia with adequate flows and channel maintenance. Several new economic opportunities which depend on flows in the Chattahoochee and Apalachicola Rivers have recently been developed or are under serious consideration. The Corps and the cities of Columbus, Georgia, and Phenix City, Alabama, have been working on a river restoration project involving the removal of two small, historic dams to improve habitat and create a whitewater recreation course. Riverway South—an organization extending across all three ACF states—is actively promoting eco-tourism, and its success

depends on the assurance of a safe and reliable navigation channel from Columbus, Georgia, south to the Gulf of Mexico. Longleaf Energy Associates has a permit to site a new energy production facility on the Chattahoochee River in Early County, Georgia, and the company plans to begin construction next year. Several projects which include marinas or other river-based recreational opportunities have recently opened, are under development, or are in serious consideration, including a new marina which recently opened in Bainbridge, Georgia; the Trail's End Resort and Marina on Lake Seminole; a proposed new marina near the National Infantry Museum in Columbus, Georgia; a proposed marina and nature trail in Quitman County, Georgia; and a kayak venture proposed for Chattahoochee, Florida. Without adequate flows and safe and reliable navigation, these opportunities for economic growth and business development will be subject to difficult challenges. TRWDA urges the Corps to explain in its revised manual and the accompanying environmental documentation how it intends to provide for the needs of the communities and industries located in the middle and lower portions of the ACF River System.

The Corps Must Continue to Provide Agreed-upon Minimum Flows in the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River. As you know, in recent years, representatives of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia attempted to develop a mutually agreeable allocation of water in the ACF River System. In that context, on July 22, 2003, the three governors signed an agreement which set flow parameters, including the following: • "On the Chattahoochee River above its confluence with Peachtree Creek, a flow of 750 cfs will be maintained on a daily basis, with the understanding that the State of Georgia is entitled to a variable flow regime that requires no less than 650 cfs in winters. . . ." • "On the Chattahoochee River at Columbus, Georgia, a flow of 1350 cfs will be maintained on a daily basis at all times, and a flow of 1850 cfs will be maintained on a weekly basis provided that the top of the storage pool in West Point Reservoir is above 621.6 feet." • "On the Chattahoochee River at Columbia, Alabama, a flow of 2000 cfs will be maintained on a daily basis." • "On the Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, a minimum flow of 5000 cfs will be maintained on a weekly basis at all times. . . ." Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Initial Allocation Formula for the ACF River Basin, ¶ 4 (July 22, 2003) (emphases added). Those flow figures were to be included in any allocation formula agreed to by the parties, and they were "intended to be met by the combined actions of maintaining water uses consistent with the allocation formula, and by the Corps operating the federal reservoirs consistent with the allocation formula." Id.
(emphasis added). The license issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the Middle Chattahoochee Project, a privately owned, run-of-river project located between West Point reservoir and Columbus, Georgia, includes flow targets which depend on the Corps' releases from the West Point Dam upstream. Those targets reference the same flow levels for Columbus, Georgia, which are included in the tri-state agreement. Specifically, the targets are 1,350 cfs daily average, 1,850 cfs weekly average, and 800 cfs instantaneous when the Corps provides flows at or above those levels or, when the project's inflow is less than those levels, outflow equal to inflow. See 109 FERC 62,246, at Article 402 (2004). In revising its manual, the Corps should develop its operation plan to satisfy the flow parameters agreed to by all three states. TRWDA in particular calls the Corps' attention to the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee flow requirements, namely, 1,350 cfs daily and 1,850 cfs weekly at Columbus, Georgia, and 2,000 cfs daily at Columbia, Alabama. We believe those flow levels are generally sufficient to meet the
Congressionally authorized purposes of the ACF River System. They also correspond to the flows that are necessary to meet the water supply and water quality needs of Columbus Water Works, as well as the operation of industrial facilities on the Chattahoochee River, including those facilities operated by Georgia Pacific, MeadWestvaco, and Southern Nuclear Company.
The Corps Should Not Rely on Flint River Flows to Meet Apalachicola River Needs to the Detriment of Flows in the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River. Recently, increased flows from the Flint River have contributed to the Corps' release of water from Woodruff Dam to provide for the 5,000 cfs minimum flows at Chattahoochee. Like all stakeholders in the basin, TRWDA is grateful for any inflows that help meet system needs. However, the Corps must not rely on Flint River flows to meet Apalachicola River requirements to the detriment of the Middle and Lower
Chattahoochee River communities. Contributions from the Flint River should provide no rationale for the Corps to reduce flows in the Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River below those levels necessary to support Congressionally authorized purposes and industrial and municipal needs. As noted above, the primary Congressionally authorized purposes of the ACF federal reservoirs include hydropower, navigation, and flood control. The Corps' ability to fulfill the reservoirs' purposes for the benefit of the communities located along the ACF River System

from Dothan, Alabama, to Gainesville, Georgia, depends exclusively on conditions in the Chattahoochee River. The Flint River has absolutely no effect at any point on the Chattahoochee River above its confluence with the Chattahoochee just above the Jim Woodruff Dam. Because Flint River conditions are independent from Chattahoochee River conditions, there is no logical basis to alter operations at the Corps' Chattahoochee River projects to the detriment of Middle and Lower Chattahoochee River stakeholders in response to conditions in the Flint River.

Comment ID: 52
Author Name: V.M. Perry, Jr.
Organization: Lake Lanier Association

Modify the RIOP if it is to be Used as a Basis for the WCP Lake Lanier is at its lowest point in history for this time of year, and the Corps projects it to fall to its lowest level in history in early December, 2008. Currently, the water flowing into the Lake from the Chattahoochee and Chestatee rivers is running at the third percentile, and both rivers have been flowing at or near their record lows for much of 2008. All of this paints a bleak picture for Lake Lanier in the coming months. That picture is made even bleaker by a number of the provisions of the RIOP implemented on June 1 of this year. We believe a number of the changes in Corps operations since the inception of the IOP in 2006 are severely detrimental to Lake Lanier and the interests of our members. In particular, the LLA is concerned that a number of features of the RIOP that are deleterious to Lake Lanier will form the basis for revisions to the WCP. From 1989 until 2006, the Corps operated the ACF according to its draft WCP of 1989. That plan generally ensured that Lake Lanier would refill to the maximum extent possible by June 1 every year. The series of Interim Operating Plans instituted in 2006 dramatically changed the focus of the Corps' ACF operations by subjugating the refilling of Lanier to downstream concerns, many of which were not authorized purposes or intended benefits of the construction of Buford Dam. We wish to express our opposition to utilizing those provisions (embodied in what is now the RIOP) as the basis for revisions to the WCP, as more specifically detailed in the comments denoted by bullet points below. • Minimum Discharge The RIOP requires minimum releases equal to or greater than basin inflow (BI) under many conditions, and minimum releases of greater than 50% of BI under virtually all but the highest BI levels. This contrasts with the statement on page 2 of the RIOP proposal that, "Except when basin inflow is less than 5,000 cfs, the minimum releases are not required to exceed basin inflow" (emphasis added). Requiring releases to at least
equal BI provides no opportunity for refilling of reservoirs, and this provision applies in all but the months of December through February. Limiting storage to substantially less than 50% of BI under all but the highest BI levels seems to unnecessarily restrict the ability of the reservoirs, and especially Lake Lanier, to recover or at least stabilize in times of drought.
We question the need for such high minimum releases, because they appear to create an unnecessary risk of preventing the reservoirs – and especially Lake Lanier –
from refilling not only in drought conditions but even when BI is relatively plentiful. We also question allowing the highest rate of storage only when BI reaches 39,000 cfs in Zone 3, especially when the BI level for such storage in Zones 1 and 2 is 34,000 cfs. The Lake Lanier Association requests that the new WCP be designed to allow storage of a much greater percentage of available BI in all Zones, in order to ensure that Lake Lanier will remain at or near the top of its conservation pool whenever possible and refill as quickly as possible. The statement on page 2 of the RIOP proposal also underscores the Corps' failure to reduce the minimum required flow of 5,000 cfs except under conditions in which Lake Lanier will already be well down into Zone 4. Because Lake Lanier contains the vast majority of all storage in the system, composite storage is likely to reach Zone 4 (or the Drought Zone) only if Lake Lanier is already in Zone 4. Because Lake Lanier refills so slowly, it may well remain in Zone 4 long after the composite storage level reaches higher Zones, a condition that exists today. Lake Lanier got into this situation in part because of the requirement of a minimum flow of 5,000 cfs under the original IOP. The EDO wisely allowed for a reduction in the minimum required flow, and while the RIOP
does include the option of a minimum flow of 4,500 cfs when composite storage is in the Drought Zone, the new WCP should incorporate an even lower minimum required flow that is based on the actual requirements for realizing the original intended benefits of the system's facilities. If the system is going to be managed without specific provisions that reflect the unique needs of Lake Lanier (addressed below), then the WCP should include at least the option of implementing that minimum required flow in higher composite storage Zones. Without that flexibility, Lake Lanier will almost certainly be disproportionately impacted in drought situations in order to meet the current minimum required flow.

Apalachicola Minimum Required Flow Primarily, we are concerned about operations during droughts. In this regard, the RIOP focuses on the 5,000 cfs Minimum Required Flow (MRF) at the Chattahoochee Gage. During the fall and winter of 2007, Lake Lanier's level was precipitously reduced at a rate greater than 4,000 cfs specifically to achieve this minimum flow. We believe the MRF was created arbitrarily by the Corps to support, in the wording of the WCP, "downstream industrial users." (See, 1989 draft WCP at 12.) There are no "industrial users" downstream of JWLD that are authorized purposes of the ACF or that provide intended benefits as established by the River and Harbor Acts of 1945 and 1946 or the
Flood Control Act of 1944. In the fall of 2007, a Corps spokesman suggested that the 5,000 cfs was initially established to accommodate Plant Scholtz, a coal-fired power plant owned by Southern Company. It should be noted that, as a non-hydroelectric plant, Scholz was not an intended beneficiary of the construction of the ACF facilities. Yet even accepting the proposition that Plant Scholz should be accommodated, Southern Company has publicly acknowledged that 2,000 cfs would suffice for that plant's water requirements. The Corps should therefore reduce the minimum required flow in the new WCP to 2,000 cfs until and unless it documents greater operational flow requirements that were recognized as benefits under the original authorizing legislation for construction of the ACF facilities. In times of drought, Lake Lanier is the source of last resort for flow augmentation to meet the MRF, and subjugating the specifically-identified benefit of recreation on Lake Lanier to such unauthorized users is unlawful. The operational philosophy espoused by the RIOP of meeting the 5,000 cfs MRF until Composite Storage is at the
Drought Zone is antithetical to the Corps' philosophy for the last 50 years of ensuring that Lake Lanier refills by June 1 of each year. The objective of ensuring that Lake Lanier remains as close to full pool as possible throughout the year is the only one that truly serves all the operational purposes and benefits of Lake Lanier. We acknowledge that the RIOP reduces MRF from 5,000 cfs to 4,500 cfs, but that provision applies only when the composite storage level is in the Drought Zone. Under that provision, the reduced flow rate would have occurred for only two weeks in November, 2007. At that time, Lake Lanier was already within a few feet of reaching its lowest level in history. The small reduction in flow accomplished by that provision would
have lasted only two weeks and then would have ended, actually draining Lake Lanier even faster in December. The Lake Lanier Association requests that the new WCP incorporate specialized management provisions for maximizing storage in Lake Lanier, and a scientifically- and legally-supported minimum required flow at higher composite storage levels.

Comment ID: 55
Author Name: Brian Atkins
Organization:

In light of the expected ruling by the court handling all of the litigation over the ACF system, Alabama believes that the Corps should ensure that the rulings on that litigation are taken into account in the manual update process. Indeed, the Corps should suspend the manual update process until the rulings are issued.

To satisfy the Corps' obligations under Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act, we believe the Corps must focus on the authorized purposes of Lake Lanier (hydropower, navigation, and flood control) and establish a scope for the manual update that addresses five objectives. First

the Corps should assess whether any changes in the baseline conditions are necessary to comply with existing laws and regulations, including laws and regulations designed to protect the environment. Fifth, the Corps should analyze any proposed modifications to the baseline and other legal requirements to develop the proposed operations

Under no circumstances should the Corps base the critical yield analysis of the reservoirs on the entire conservation storage pools and then adopt an operational scheme that prevents the use of any portion of such storage. The bottom of the conservation pool at Lake Lanier is set at 1035' MLS and the critical yield calculation assumes that the conservation pool is exhausted. Limiting releases from Lake Lanier to prevent the lake from going below an elevation well above 1035' MLS establishes an artificial barrier that was never authorized or approved by Congress. As the Corps is keenly aware, the State of Alabama has a significant interest in the operations of the federal reservoirs in the ACF Basin. The Corps' operation of these
reservoirs has a direct and substantial impact on the quantity and quality of water flowing into

Alabama. Any effort to update the water control manuals and the master manual should proceed in a logical and stepwise manner and should start with a calculation of the critical yield from each reservoir. Without determining how much water is available from each reservoir during critical times, it is impossible to evaluate potential modifications in the operations of these reservoirs and to determine whether such operations are authorized by law. The Corps has a significant responsibility in protecting water quality and the environment downstream of its projects. A detailed review of the operations and proposed operations under existing environmental rules and regulations needs to be a significant part of this exercise.

Finally, the Corps' operations should not protect uses of the water stored in these reservoirs that have not been authorized by Congress. In choosing between releases and retention, the Corps must consider the authorized purposes of the reservoir and not make its decision based upon what it believes to be politically feasible. The Secretary of the Army assured Alabama's congressional delegation that the update of the ACF water control plan would involve a complete, top-to-bottom, "clean
slate" review of the ACF system. Alabama expects that the Secretary's assurance will be fulfilled, and the issues raised in this letter must be fully addressed in order for the assurance to be met.

Comment ID: 66
Author Name: Wilton Rooks
Organization:

1. Result in increased storage in the reservoirs when water is available rather than release so much of it into the Gulf of Mexico. I believe there are operating rules that will achieve this as well as meet the minimum required flow into Apalachicola River. The new ResSim modeling software should be used to maximum advantage to develop these new operating rules. The rules developed under the HEC-5 model are inadequate to do the job that is required. Other modeling software such as OASIS have developed these rules for the ACF. They should either be accepted or rejected for sound reasons rather than ignored.

2. The water control plan should be flexible enough to adapt to changing conditions.

4. The water control plan should not stop at the Woodruff Dam for control purposes. If the oysters and endangered species are to become a basis for operational decision making then factors in the Apalachicola River and Bay that effect those elements should be included in the control mechanism. Require Florida to block Sikes Cut and to remove the straightening that has occurred in the Apalachicola River that was done for barge traffic convenience.

7. Fully commit to adding two additional feet to the full pool of Lake Lanier when water is available to do so. This is a small investment with a tremendous value. I am sure the necessary appropriations can be found to achieve this. In summary it is recognized that during droughts everyone will suffer from lack of water, but the basis
for the water control plan should be to look ahead to the future consequences of the operational rules that are established. Lake Lanier for example will be lower this year because of the discharges last year than it was last year. Unless the water control plan adopts the view that all of the reservoirs must recover prior to June, the reservoirs will lose their ability to provide water when and as it is needed. Lake Lanier will continue to achieve lower lows each year unless its replenishment is seen as a targeted goal.

6. The Corps should request appropriations to remove the constraints imposed by the Woodruff Dam that result in water being removed from the reservoirs. During droughts this removal is very costly to all of the reservoir water users.

Comment ID: 68
Author Name: Dick Timmerberg
Organization: West Point Lake Coalition

We ask that, as an alternative to current operations, action zones be considerably narrowed and/or reduced to a range varying no more than three feet with a level never lower than 633 MSL- except for dire emergency. This basically puts the lake in the category of a "run of the river lake" with a constant stabile elevation to meet the Congressional authorizations for the project. This also puts the action zones/rule curves in line with Lake Lanier whose rule curve

only varies one foot and with Lake Walter F George whose rule curve only varies two feet!

Comment ID: 70
Author Name: David McLain
Organization: Riparian County Stakeholder Coalition

Secondly, the work product, the Water Control Manuals themselves:
It would be simpler and quicker for the Corps to accept the current Revised Interim Operations Plan (RIOP) with minor modifications as the updated Water Control Manual. After all, the RIOP has gone through a" Biological Opinion" review by the US Fish and Wildlife Service already. However, the RIOP and the Biological Opinion were limited to consider the impact of the reduced downstream flows on four (4) endangered species – 3 mussels and the Gulf Sturgeon. A "biological opinion" so constrained did not consider the impact of the drastically reduced flows on the health and productivity of the coastal fisheries and the NOAA-approved Coastal Zone Management plans, nor on the proper natural functioning of the floodplain, and the health and productivity of the downstream eco-system itself. Options like incorporating enforceable demand management and reduced consumption, must be incorporated in the Corps' existing and proposed contracts with upstream water users to ensure sustainable freshwater flows. These are critical missing components in the current RIOP. On a basin of interstate waters, such as the ACF, these water contracts between the Corps and the variety of users of water stored in Federal reservoirs must incorporate safeguards for downstream users of these interstate waters, and not be limited to upstream needs alone.

Finally, the Water Management structure for the ACF:
The management objective for the interstate waters of the ACF Basin should be the identification, construction and enforcement of a water budget that recognizes and balances the competing needs of all riparian users. No such record of in-stream flow requirements for the ACF as a sustainable resource now exists. Fundamental inequities now exist in the water management structures and laws of the riparian states, and States' rights in managing the waters of their states is, and can remain, the governing management structure for waters that rise and fall in a single state. But the management of the surface waters of the interstate ACF basin must be managed by joint agreement. Over 18 years of negotiation, mediation, and litigation have failed to achieve that objective. That failure will persist so long as an objective, scientifically valid assessment of the in-stream flow requirements of all users has been completed and institutionalized. The Corps' updated WCM can be a critical tool in achieving the interstate water management objective. An updated WCM that is not grounded in the firm foundation of objective scientific water needs assessment sustains an unacceptable status quo and exposes the Corps to attack from multiple, competing users, including the Congress. An investment in empowering and funding such an assessment of in-stream flows for the ACF as part of the WCM/EIS process is highly recommended.

An updated WCM that is not grounded in the firm foundation of objective scientific water needs assessment sustains an unacceptable status quo and exposes the Corps to attack from multiple, competing users, including the Congress. An investment in empowering and funding such an assessment of in-stream flows for the ACF as part of the WCM/EIS process is highly recommended.

Comment ID: 76
Author Name: Allen Boyd
Organization: U.S. Congress

In sum, the updated Water Control Manual for the ACF System must establish a scientifically-based and equitable distribution of the waters of the ACF System. This can be achieved in a manner which sustains the health and productivity of the Apalachicola River, floodplain, and estuary.

Comment ID: 108
Author Name: William McCalley
Organization:

1. Lake Lanier should not be drawn down below a 1,066 water level except in an extreme drought, and then only for drinking water.

Comment ID: 109

Author Name: Sylvia and Wayne Hunter
Organization:

We need to establish a policy of filling the lake during the spring and having an “in equal out” policy for lake management.

Comment ID: 116
Author Name: Tommy Mike
Organization:

I look forward to new regs that really focus on current issues and things that we need to do to not worry about antiquated regulations like barge traffic downstream, etc.

Comment ID: 183
Author Name: Tripp Penn
Organization:

Please, please consider the impact on this region in making future lake management decisions.

Comment ID: 189
Author Name: Joel Upchurch
Organization:

the action zones on West Point Lake should be changed to meet the rest of the lakes on the basin there isn't a logical reason that we should have such dramatic fluctuations

---

Comment ID: 297
Author Name: Jackson
Organization:

Balancing input and output flows and only releasing to match water usage downstream (and still require conservation) appears a more sustainable way to manage the resource for both water needs of North Georgia, the border areas of Georgia, Alabama and Florida, and recreation etc. on the Lake.

Comment ID: 299
Author Name: Jeffery Daigrepont
Organization:

I would like to see the Corps consider releasing less water out of Lanier on days when there is significant rain south of Lanier. Even if the cut back in only for ONE day, this would help our lake recover. Right now most of the lakes south of Lanier are at full pool or better. Now would be our best shot at pulling Lanier out of this.

Last year it was mid-spring before the reductions were considered. If we can do something NOW, (while there is less demand) we will have more opportunity to get caught up. Lanier is at the very top of the basin and has the least amount of watershed and needs the most help right now. Like others, out economy depends on having water.

The current manual does not appear to consider rivers south of Lanier that add water into the ACF basin. This water should off-set what is required from Lanier.

Comment ID: 313
Author Name: Peter Edwards
Organization:

When one looks at the basin maps, it pops out very clearly that the real issue that we need to be addressing is the fact that the Flint River Basin is not being used as was part of the original design for the ACF River Basin and the projects that have been built on the basin since its inception back in the '50s.
When you compare the 6 percent of the total basin that Lake Lanier retains or has available to it, and the 53 percent that's included in the Flint River Basin, you basically come up with a nine-to-one ratio of potential contribution to supply all of the needs of the tri-state area. And we know for a fact that the only storage facility at the end of the Flint River Basin is Lake Seminole, and

we also know that Flint River has the ability to supply much more storage than Lake Lanier ever could in order to help assist the supply to all three states.
So I would suggest that the Corps, while it cannot plead to Congress to include new dams, works, or whatever for the Flint River Basin, that they would be abandoning their engineering effort if they omit the issue that part of the original design for the ACF Basin was to include multiple dams on the Flint River. And that issue should be strongly involved and heavily documented in whatever engineering studies and updates to the water manuals that the Corps intends to take upon with this current effort and in the future. Because that, I suggest, would be the long-term solution to this Tri-State Water Wars, and once and for all provide a solution that can be accommodating to all three of the states going down the road in the future.

Comment ID: 366
Author Name:
Organization:

That said, it's seems pretty simple, to limit the outflow to the inflow when the water level reaches a certain level. I realize there are minimums to dilute the Atlanta discharge. But with today's technology Atlanta could do a much better job of cleaning what they release, therefore reducing the outflow.

Comment ID: 368
Author Name: Jimmy Wilbanks
Organization: City of Dacula, GA

Unfortunately, we and our sister citizens from Alabama and Florida haven't faced up to the facts that if
Buford Dam were not in place, each of us would only be able to use the water that falls on us and in the basins that serve each area.

Lake Lanier's inlet basin is unusually small, and Georgia hasn't received it average annual rainfall of around 50 inches per year in a long while.

The overriding principle that the Corps of Engineers should follow in releases from Lanier is that no release should be larger than the water from the basin provides.

In drought each citizen should be concerned with how a federal agency decides who gets what water. We in Dacula have a vital interest in this situation and have expressed this to our federal senators and representatives. We will continue to do so.

Comment ID: 380
Author Name: Susie Gajewski
Organization: Sugar Hill City Councilwoman

Lake Lanier was originally created as a recreational reservoir. Since its creation more and more cities, counties and states have made claims to this water source. Please take a look at ways to reduce the release of water while informing some regions that they may need to look into their own reservoirs for the future.

Comment ID: 396
Author Name: Eric Techo
Organization:

My only question should be simple to answer - why do we send more water down stream than the amount of water that comes into the lake? If Lanier was gone, West Point was gone etc., what did the mussels do during the last great drought? I think we need to stop worrying about other species and follow nature's plan. What comes into the lakes go out of the lakes, period!

Comment ID: 397
Author Name: Cile Gierhahn
Organization: Lakefront Homeowner

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow LL to retain water up to full pool. This would allow sharing downstream when needed without such punishment to GA.

Comment ID: 412
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association County Commissioners of Georgia

Updating the plan should include new methods of forecasting runoff and modeling to ensure that the Corps ACF reservoirs, particularly Lake Lanier, are allowed to reach full pool no later than June 1st of each year and are as full as practical during drought conditions while still meeting downstream, legally-required flows. While Lake Lanier has 63 percent of the storage capacity in the system, it is fed by only 6 percent of the ACFs drainage basin. Considering how much longer it takes to refill Lake Lanier and the detrimental impacts recent severe droughts have had on this reservoir, it should not be drawn down using composite storage rule curves for the entire system or to create artificially-high, non-science-based flows to protect mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River.

Comment ID: 419
Author Name: Jayne Olderman
Organization:

4. The ACF Water Control Manual should and address and recognize the following issues for Lake Lanier:
a. Drought conditions
b. Lake Lanier's small basin area
c. Requirements for downstream water quality
d. Requirements for downstream water supply

Comment ID: 436
Author Name: Judy Waters
Organization:

The regulatory operation of Lake Lanier needs to be revised according to available data that can protect the levels of Lake Lanier and accomplish the same protective areas downstream.

We beg the Corps to consider the regulatory changes necessary as presented by Pat Stevens @ Atlanta Regional Commission.

I serve as a Citizen Member for Gwinnett County on this board.

My experience comes from 14 years as Gwinnett County Commissioner & City of Snellville Council

---

Comment ID: 444
Author Name: Patsy Street
Organization:

I watched the water transfer demo and want to know with Lake Lanier getting more & more sediment by the dam, causing tupperware H20 to look higher because of dirt space. Why aren't we taking advantage of this draught and cleaning the lake basin & having the volume increased while the water is down. I have heard earthen dams have a 50 yr. lifetime and how are (we/you) thinking of helping extend life of Lake Lanier.
Thanks you.
--
Why aren't we taking advantage of this draught and cleaning the lake basin & having the volume increased while the water is down. I have heard earthen dams have a 50 yr. lifetime and how are (we/you) thinking of helping extend life of Lake Lanier.
Thanks you.

Comment ID: 460
Author Name: Peter Collins
Organization:

*Corp should drudge to get more capacity

Comment ID: 464

Author Name: Nat Hancock
Organization:

I just want to be sure the Corp is operating Lake Lanier in such a manner to maximize lake levels and still meet minimum standards of competing interests. I also want to feel sure that the other competing interests stands are truly their minimum requirements.

Comment ID: 483
Author Name: Steve Warlick
Organization:

Here are the questions I have If minimum or no water was released, how long would it take to get to full pool? Shouldn't there be a level at which no water could be taken out? Say 1060 ft.

Comment ID: 489
Author Name: John Mock
Organization:

If we are going to solve the problem we first need to look at the issued holistically. How can we retain the right amount of water in Lanier and not negatively effect the others who have an interest in the water. It will take agreement, coordination and cooperation between all the parties. It will require a pyridine change -from this is the way we have always done it to what is needed by whom, when and what can we do to make that happen even if it requires change. I offer the following as starting points: 1. Develop can-do covenant, 2. Develop a water need schedule, a. Gulffish spawning, b.Water level periods required to relocate the muscles to accommodate reduced water flow rate c.Power plant/grid needs d.Recreation, e. Transportation.

Comment ID: 494
Author Name: Tom Oliver
Organization: Hall County Government Board of Commissioners

Therefore, we are confident that a thorough review of all the available management alternatives will reveal that the river system can be managed such that all needs are met. Sound science and engineering study must prevail to determine how best to operate the river system in these changing times. We believe there is sufficient water for both upstream and downstream environmental, economic, and human needs.

Comment ID: 495
Author Name: Christopher Seeley
Organization:

2) Every effort should be made to refill Lake Lanier ASAP. There is no excuse for letting ANY water out of Lanier during a period of heavy precipitation in the northern Georgia area. Runoff into the Chattahoochee River south of Buford Dam should more than fill any requirement for the municipalities downstream of the dam. Minimum outflows should be the policy during periods of moderate and light precipitation.

Comment ID: 497
Author Name: Terri Johndahl
Organization:

Please accept this letter of sincere concern about the current state of management of the ACF River Basin and the pending update of the Water Control Manual. This manual has gone far too long without an update and it is critical that it be updated to reflect today's needs on both ends of the river basin. Specifically: Outflows from Lanier reservoir should not exceed inflows. This should replicate the environment that any downstream habitat would experience if the Buford Dam had not been built. This is pretty customary for management of western U.S. reservoirs and should be considered here.

Comment ID: 501
Author Name: Russell Landscape Group
Organization: Russell Landscape Group

Dear Sirs/Madams: As a concerned citizen and business man, I am submitting support for updating the current water control manuals which govern federal reservoirs (Lake Lanier and Lake Allatoona) that serve Metro Atlanta. I believe that the Corp should update future reservoir operations and not simply make edits to a plan that documents existing operations. The updated water plan needs to make strong changes to ensure all operations are managed wisely. The new Water Control Plan should not simply replicate existing past operations which have unnecessarily drained these reservoirs to low water levels.

I additionally encourage the Corp to consider alternative operating plans to balance upstream needs with those downstream before adopting a New Water Control Plan. The ACF River Basin is sufficient enough to meet both regions water needs if managed properly. After all, the entire Metro Atlanta region currently uses less than 2% of water in the ACF Basin. As a citizen of this great area, I encourage you to consider a New Water Control Plan that accommodates withdrawals consistent with projections contained in the Metro North Georgia Water Planning Districts Water Supply and Conservation Plan. Thanking you in advance I remain Sincerely, William E Russell Ph-D President/CEO Russell Landscape Groups, Inc.

Comment ID: 502
Author Name: Grier Todd
Organization: 1071 Coalition of Lake Lanier

3) A primary objective of the water control plan should be to refill the Lake by June 1 of each year.

4) The water control plan should focus on retaining storage at the top of the basin in order to augment flows at critical times. ,

6) The plan should recognize Lake Lanier should not be the faucet for the entire basin when it is only fed by a garden hose (small watershed).

Comment ID: 505
Author Name: John and Jodi Wacho
Organization:

2) The Water Control Manual for Lake Lanier should be adaptive and flexible to meet the ever changing water needs due to climatic changes and population growth. If outflow needs to be determined on a daily basis then the Manual should reflect that. Full pool at 1073 feet above sea level, and minimal levels, that should only be allowed to drop to 12 feet below full pool, should be set and reviewed at certain intervals. No one person or entity should operate on the basis of '"just because the Manual states that", especially if that Manual is dated and does not reflect the changing times. A thinking, logical mindset must be put into action in controlling the outflow and full pool and minimal levels of Lake Lanier. This is a very valuable resource, and should be treated as such.

Comment ID: 532
Author Name: Jim Geist
Organization:

I would personally request that at some level, above our current level that the amount of water released be limited to the amount of water coming into the lake. If the lake did not exist, that is all the water that would be available. Needs in excess of this should be meet from additional storage capacity.

I don’t think that any of what I have written is new, but at the end of the day is there any other long term solution, other then a meaningful increase in our storage capacity?

Comment ID: 555
Author Name: John Gundlach
Organization:

I feel that the waters being released from Buford Dam should be dramatically reduced during times of rain, since there is plenty of runoff into the Chattahoochee River.

This should be a part of the water management update.

Comment ID: 567
Author Name: Charles Bannister
Organization: Gwinnett County

The EM II 10-2-3600 3-3 d. (3) states in the second sentence "The studies may be used to simulate the regulation of projects on a foresight rather than hindsight basis by using derived or synthetic forecasts of project inflows." Therefore, we highly recommend that you use the methods of hydrological forecasting developed by the United States Geological Survey and recommended to you by the Atlanta Regional Commission. We also incorporate in these comments the letter to Mr. Curtis M. Flakes of your office and Ms. Gail Carmody of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service dated May 29,2008 (enclosed).

We believe that the technical expertise exists, if properly utilized, that would enable the Mobile District to craft a Water Control Plan that meets all of the needs of the basin and allow the reservoirs to be full or near full each spring in order to allow the system to be able to provide drought sustainability when needed as required by the COE Engineer Regulation II 10-2-1941. Such conservation of storage serves the public interest and sustains the environment and population dependent on this vital resource. In summary we strongly urge the Mobile District to seriously consider the methodologies suggested by the Atlanta Regional Commission and its consultant, Hydrologics, Inc. for alternate methods of operating the system. Hydrologics has shown that alternate operating scenarios can meet all downstream requirements and at the same time maximize reservoir storage during the wet season to ensure that we have the maximum storage on hand in the spring of each year, particularly in lake Lanier, to provide for water conservation, drought contingency and the needs of fish and wildlife, recreation and environmental improvement/protection of lake Lanier and the downstream basin.

Comment ID: 568
Author Name: William E. Carrol
Organization:

5). Obtaining additional drinking water for Metropolitan Atlanta from the Tennessee River or from other sources must be found within the not too distant future. The Corps of Engineers should direct its efforts to accommodate this end result. Please refer to the letter which is attached for a more detailed discourse regarding my views on this matter.

The demands upon Lake Lanier for drinking water, flood control, recreational needs, and other similar needs from Metropolitan Atlanta already exceed the capacity of Lake Lanier. Surely the health, safety, and welfare of the people of Atlanta outweigh any effects that lower releases from Lake Lanier may have upon some clams and sturgeons. Releases from Lake Lanier must be reduced immediately and the lake allowed to refill back to its normal elevation. Serious studies must be undertaken to evaluate the benefits of raising the normal full pool level of Lake Lanier to 1073, building other dams for water storage north of Atlanta, and implementing conservation measures. All of these measures must be undertaken.

Comment ID: 571
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

Inputs for the Water Control Manual for the ACF 1). Build flexibility into the manual so that the COE can be more pro-active & less reactive. (Quit going by an old manual-change it!) 2). Have pre-set intervals for manual review & updates. (Don't let the manual get so outdated that chaos occurs forcing change.)

Comment ID: 606
Author Name: William A. Cooper
Organization: Cobb Chamber of Commerce

Rather than document existing practices, the USACE should consider alternative operating plans to balance water supply needs with downstream needs.

Comment ID: 630
Author Name: Art McGovern

Organization:

4. The ACF Water Control Manual should address and recognize the following issues for Lake Lanier:
a. Drought conditions
b. Lake Lanier's small basin area
c. Requirements for downstream water quality
d. Requirements for downstream water supply

Comment ID: 650
Author Name: Scott Vandewiele
Organization:

Please prioritize LAKE Lanier when making decisions about Water Control.

Comment ID: 667
Author Name:
Organization: lake Lanier association

WITHDRAWALS COMMENCERATE WITH LAKE LEVEL FOR MAXIMUM CONSERVATION.

Comment ID: 672
Author Name: David Volpe
Organization:

Lake Lanier is an absolute mess and disgrace, totally mismanaged beyond the lack of rain impact!

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 673
Author Name: Masry Jean Volpe
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 674
Author Name: Michael Volpe
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 675
Author Name: Jennifer Volpe
Organization:

Please change your management criteria for Lake Lanier to incorporate the following principles. Property damage on the lake from low levels and lack of water for Atlanta are paramount and need to be reversed.

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 676
Author Name: Evelyn Volpe
Organization:

Lake Lanier and its residents deserve better. Lake management has been poorly executed with

resulting lack of water for Atlanta and property damage on the lake to docks, boats, businesses, etc.

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 677
Author Name: Kristie Myers
Organization: Lake Lanier Resident

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 680
Author Name: John Tierney
Organization:

- Please mandate that full pool be achieved no later than June 1st during the rainy season such that summer drought patterns are proactively addressed to alleviate any negative impact.

Comment ID: 684
Author Name: MICHAEL MC-KEITHEN
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach
full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 723
Author Name: Jim Aspinwall
Organization:

Floods only happen every 50 years or so. Send Fl. water on an as needed basis instead of directed flows by the manual. In other words, decrease flows when it rains in the south of the dam.

Comment ID: 755
Author Name: Will Poston
Organization:

The original mandate of the 1950's should be amended to allow Lake Lanier to refill itself from the water flowing into the basin and when after reaching the full pool level again, then allow the water coming in to the lake to flow down stream as it would have normally without a water shed. The demand for water in this area is much greater than when the lake was built in the 1950's.

I believe that people are much more important than the mussels downstream. These mussels will survive just as they would have without letting all the water flow down stream. The mussels will adapt.

Our very survival is threatened without the necessary water that the Atlanta area needs. All the water sheds below us are full. Why isn't this water allocated to accommodate this crisis for the Atlanta area?

Comment ID: 763
Author Name: James H. Phillips
Organization: Middle Chattahoochee Water Coalition

Fresh looks at the entire process to be accomplished to ensure all needs of the river basin are considered.
That what if analyses are conducted to determine how additional reservoirs adding additional storage volumes would benefit the entire river basin.

Comment ID: 771
Author Name: bruce longshore
Organization: na

I suggest the water released from Lanier would be dependent on the rainfall down stream and the release of water is slowed when rainfall exceeds the input from the water basin.

Comment ID: 788
Author Name: David Vaughan
Organization:

Recognize that all of the problems that Lanier has suffered, and continues to suffer, are magnified on the north end of the lake. The reductions in the lake level have eliminated many acres of the north end of the lake, and made many more unusable, all without substantial contribution to the volume of water that is available for use or discharge. Moreover, the adverse impacts on recreational use, safety and aesthetics are far greater on the north end. Special attention should be paid and special measures undertaken to address the specific needs of the north end of Lanier.

If there is no other practicable way to protect the north end, split the lake by building another dam at or near Browns Bridge. Maintain the water level of the new Little Lake Lanier at a constant level of 1071, and any additional water that is available could be discharged into the main lake and managed there.

Balance Project Purposes (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 2
Author Name:
Organization:

While I appreciate the many competing interests at play in management of the ACF system, and while I live very near West Point Lake, I realize that no part of the system should be sacrificed for the benefit of another element. I feel that many upstream consumers are hypocritical in their viewpoint of how the system should be managed, and motivated almost exclusively by self-interest (primarily financial).

Comment ID: 30
Author Name: Joseph Parrish
Organization:

You redo your water control plan, and trying to balance the needs between the whole entire basin from north to south as it flows into Apalachicola Bay, and all of the detrimental effects that the low flows are having on Apalachicola Bay and all points in between.

We understand that we are in a drought, but we also understand that this is a federal system of reservoir that we're paying for by everybody in the United States, and it should be operated as such. To operate it as such you should take into account everything that has happened from top to bottom and how the economies and the natural environment is being impacted as to terms of how you operate the systems that you are currently operating.

Comment ID: 70
Author Name: David McLain
Organization: Riparian County Stakeholder Coalition

Finally, the Water Management structure for the ACF:
The management objective for the interstate waters of the ACF Basin should be the identification, construction and enforcement of a water budget that recognizes and balances the competing needs of all riparian users. No such record of in-stream flow requirements for the ACF as a sustainable resource now exists. Fundamental inequities now exist in the water management structures and laws of the riparian states, and States' rights in managing the waters of their states is, and can remain, the governing management structure for waters that rise and fall in a single state. But the management of the surface waters of the interstate ACF basin must be managed by joint agreement. Over 18 years of negotiation, mediation, and litigation have failed to achieve that objective. That failure will persist so long as an objective,

scientifically valid assessment of the in-stream flow requirements of all users has been completed and institutionalized. The Corps' updated WCM can be a critical tool in achieving the interstate water management objective. An updated WCM that is not grounded in the firm foundation of objective scientific water needs assessment sustains an unacceptable status quo and exposes the Corps to attack from multiple, competing users, including the Congress. An investment in empowering and funding such an assessment of in-stream flows for the ACF as part of the WCM/EIS process is highly recommended.

Comment ID: 134
Author Name: Randy Nix
Organization:

A fair and balanced plan needs to be developed for the basin without political pressures.

Comment ID: 196
Author Name: Matthew walker
Organization:

2) lake levels- one of the original intents of the lake was to provide flood control, again as the population increases, the demand for water is increasing, these minimum levels need to be revisited and addressed. I am constantly hearing about the mussels and sturgeons down stream. I sympathize with him, however, in years past (prior to the dams), when the river ran dry (during drought conditions), I doubt seriously too many people were concerned about the wildlife. I believe that part of the equation should be to maintain a mass balance of whatever enters the lake is allowed to leave the lake.

Comment ID: 205
Author Name: Rocky Millenbine
Organization:

Many people do not notice all the different dams/lakes below West Point Lake. I personally think we need to think more about the individuals from all these areas and not just about the boat dock owners around West Point Lake. If we did the concern would be about releasing enough water to supply all these areas and having enough flood storage to prevent future flooding of the areas down stream of West Point Lake.

Comment ID: 224
Author Name:
Organization:

Over all, as a local resident to West Point Lake, I am proud to say that I can see the bigger picture. I realize that there is more to West Point Lake than just docks and looking pretty. As West Point Lake is currently managed, with the fluctuating lake levels, it provides so many benefits to ALL of its purposes. The lake provides homes and forage for wildlife in the lake and downstream, aids navigation, provides recreation to approximately 3 million people per year, maintains water quality, but most of all, provides safety and security for those living downstream.

Comment ID: 245
Author Name: Randy Nix
Organization:

All interests need to be considered and evaluated fairly with no one allowed a trump card at everyone else's expense.

Comment ID: 273
Author Name: Kathleen Autry
Organization:

I stay at the home of my employer for months as he travels the world as a biblical archaeologist. I dog sit for him at his home on the lake. I have seen it last year dry as a bone and I could walk clear across the entire lake. All the plankton, marine life, etc. died as the water was let out each day to go to Florida.

Some balance needs to be met here. I am from Texas and volunteering at the Antiquity museum and it is so hard to see fish dying because they are caught in a small pool and it just dries up on them and there is no place for them to go. It is one thing for nature to control wildlife but for man to destroy all this life and ruin the balance of ecology on purpose is very hard to understand. I hope you come to some understanding with the neighboring states that the water needs to be shared equally and not all sent downstream. Kathleen Autry

---

Comment ID: 287
Author Name: Raymond Newman
Organization:

I know that there are other needs for water downstream but I feel that this lake could be better managed to provide for both our needs and theirs.

Thanks for the opportunity to hear the comments that you gave at the meeting. I just hope that you will hear and act on some of the comments that we the people of this area are making.

Comment ID: 292
Author Name:
Organization:

As a boater and a resident the water in Lake Lanier is VERY important for recreation and our supply of fresh drinking water.

Comment ID: 295
Author Name: Kathy Nguyen
Organization:

The Corps must consider alternative operating plans to balance upstream needs with downstream needs before adopting a new Water Control Plan. There is enough water in the ACF River Basin to meet all reasonable needs, if the reservoirs are managed properly.

Comment ID: 369
Author Name:
Organization:

I have a boat on Lanier, and look forward to the day when high water returns , but I do not believe that water levels should be kept high for the sake of esthetics and for the benefit of the lake property owners at the expense of endangered species down river. Water conserving measures are working in the Atlanta area and it is good for people to learn how to do so.

Comment ID: 371
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

* The Corps must consider alternative operating plans to balance upstream needs with downstream needs before adopting a new Water Control Plan. There is enough water in the ACF River Basin to meet all reasonable needs, if the reservoirs are managed properly.

Comment ID: 373
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

his imbalance should be rectified in the new operating plan which should reflect a more equitable methodology of operation.

Comment ID: 374
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The operation of the ACF system is not equitably balance.

Comment ID: 381

Author Name: Bob Boyd
Organization: Resident/ Homeowner

As an Atlanta-born person who enjoyed Lake Lanier from the 1960's it is an unfair travesty that the Corp made secret deals to manipulate the management of Lake Lanier waters. The original stated purpose of building Lanier was for FLOOD CONTROL,POWER GENERATION, AND RECREATION. After Atlanta experienced a huge building boom during the 1980's (without much planning or control) the local and State officials decided that Lanier needed to be used to support the continued unchecked development of the tri-county Atlanta area. Lanier was built by FEDERAL TAX MONEY and Florida and Alabama have as much right to the water from the Chattahoochee River as Georgia.

Do the FAIR thing and manage the watersheds in a manner that is really equitable.

Thanks you, Bob Boyd

Comment ID: 412
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association County Commissioners of Georgia

We commend the Corps for taking this initial step in updating the outdated ACF plan and sincerely hope that the plan can ultimately be revised to reflect current realities of population growth and water usage in Georgia, Alabama and Florida something the Interim Operation Plan and its revisions have failed to do.

--
The Association County Commissioners of Georgia (ACCG) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers¨ planned update of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basins Water Control Manual. We commend the Corps for taking this initial step in updating the outdated ACF plan and sincerely hope that the plan can ultimately be revised to reflect current realities of population growth and water usage in Georgia, Alabama and Florida Ж something the Interim Operation Plan and its revisions have failed to do.

ACCGs greatest concern is that the Corps current update effort would be aimed only at documenting existing operations along with identifying attendant issues and needs. As this approach will do little to enhance the operations of the Corps reservoirs in Georgia, we respectfully urge your consideration in updating reservoir operations, making changes to improve the balance among project purposes. Such a revision is long overdue and is absolutely necessary in order that Georgia can successful conduct its own statewide water management planning by having more certainty as to the yields of the federal reservoirs in our state.

Comment ID: 574
Author Name: G. Eucle Vickery
Organization:

[5. Maximize positive impact.]

Comment ID: 609
Author Name: Paul Kelman
Organization: Central Atlanta Progress/Atlanta Downtown Improvement District

] The new Water Control Plan must not simply replicate existing operations, which have unnecessarily drained Lake Lanier and placed millions of people and thousands of businesses at risk. Alternative operating plans must be developed that will manage our water resources much more effectively. The purpose of updating the Water Control Plan is not simply to prepare a report but to make changes to reservoir operations to improve the balance among project purposes. There is sufficient water in the basin to meet reasonable needs for municipal and industrial water supply without causing harm to the environment or to other users if, but only if, the reservoirs are managed wisely.

Comment ID: 620
Author Name: Jerry Griffin

Organization: Association of County Commissioners of GA

As this approach will do little to enhance the operations of the Corps' reservoirs in Georgia, we respectfully urge your consideration in updating reservoir operations, making changes to improve the balance among project purposes. Such a revision is long overdue and is absolutely necessary in order that Georgia can successful conduct its own statewide water management planning by having more certainty as to the yields of the federal reservoirs in our state.

We believe that such an update is within the discretion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and that the Corps has the responsibility to more adequately determine the highest and best use of this reservoir's storage given the current conditions within the basin. Thank you for your time and consideration on this most critical matter. Jerry R. Griffin, Executive Director

---

Reduce Dependence on West Point (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 67
Author Name: Jeff Lukken
Organization: Mayor of LaGrange

Our observations, and those of the stakeholders who surround, use and rely on the lake, is that the project has been
used as, using the Corps terms, "the workhorse" of the basin. Nowhere in the Congressional authorization does Congress empower the Corps to take the resources at
West Point and to use them exclusively for purposes other than those set by Congress. The system had been operated for many years without West Point Lake. Yet because the
Corps found less development and population in the early years of development surrounding the lake, and by using the justification that it could refill the West Point
project quic1dy, it thought it could utilize the water there to address other purposes. Over the years we have seen the Corps focus on addressing flow needs:
• for thermo electric power plants lying south on the Chattahoochee and on the Apalachicola,
• to compensate for losses from consumptive use
• by making releases to provide supplemental waters on the Apalachicola from flows lost to agricultural and consumptive use on the Flint
• to provide for waste assimilation needs for communities lying south of West Point that fail to adequately clean their waste water
In the process the Corps has ignored the specific and primary authorizations for the West Point project to address needs it felt where important elsewhere, thus sacrificing the
specific primary authorized purposes set by Congress. Two key operational standards have, more than any other, empowered the Corps to
operate the lake in this manner.
1. The Corps operates West Point Lake in a manner that assures only flood control is a primary authorized use, and all other purposes are relegated to a lesser
importance. They have established a winter pool of 625-628 MSL, well below the initial recreational impact level of 632.5 set by the Corps as the level at which
recreational use becomes compromised. Contrary to the Congressional authorizations, recreation and sport fishing and wildlife development are
sacrificed- almost in their entirety- to meet this one purpose during the winter months. All the while the Corps refuses to adapt its management practices to
adequately utilize flood storage capabilities between 633 and 641 MSL in the lake. By the Corps' own admittance, West Point Lake alone can not stop downstream flooding. Such a goal would be impossible. At least 2 more lakes were to be developed above West Point Lake that were never authorized or built to adequately support that operational goal. Thus, attempting to manage a project for
a task for which the lake was never capable of fulfilling, has had a devastating impact on the communities surrounding the lake.
This is a major error in current operations and alternatives must be developed to assure West Point Lake is operated with recreation as the Primary purpose established by Congress.

Comment ID: 68
Author Name: Dick Timmerberg
Organization: West Point Lake Coalition

The West Point Lake Coalition and the stakeholders who surround, use, and rely on the lake

believe strongly that the resources at West Point Lake have been and continue to be utilized, as the Corps terms it, "the Workhorse" of the ACF basin. Nowhere in the Congressional authorization does Congress empower the Corps to take the resources at West Point and to use them exclusively for purposes other than those set by Congress. The system had been previously operated for many years prior to the development of West Point Lake.
However, because the Corps found less development and population in the early years of development surrounding the lake, and by using the justification that it could refill the West Point project quickly, it consistently took the lake level up and down like a yoyo and utilized the water there to address other purposes.
Over the years we have seen the Corps focus on addressing flow needs as follows:
• for thermo electric power plants lying south on the Chattahoochee and on the Apalachicola Rivers
• to compensate for losses from consumptive use
• by making releases to provide supplemental waters on the Apalachicola from flows lost to agricultural and consumptive use on the Flint
• to provide for waste assimilation needs for communities lying south of West Point that fail to adequately clean their waste water
In the process the Corps has ignored the specific and primary authorizations for the West Point project to address needs it felt were important elsewhere, thus sacrificing the specific primary authorized purposes set by Congress.
Two key operational standards have, more than any other, empowered the Corps to operate the lake in this manner. The Corps has operated the project as if only flood control was a primary authorized purpose, with what they have established as a winter pool of625-628 MSL, well below the initial recreational impact level of 632.5 and the secondary recreational impact level of 630 MSL set by the Corps, levels where they recognize recreational use becomes compromised. Contrary to the Congressional authorizations, recreation and sport fishing and wildlife development are hugely sacrificed to meet this one purpose during the winter months. All the while the Corps refuses to adapt its management practices to adequately utilize flood storage capabilities present in the lake between 633 and 641 MSL. By the Corps' own admission, West Point
Lake can not stop downstream flooding. It never could! At least 2 more lakes were needed above West Point Lake that were never authorized or built to adequately support that operational goal. Consequently, managing West Point Lake in an attempt to guarantee flood protection has had a devastating economic impact on the communities surrounding the lake. No one can guarantee flood protection; Mother Nature, at some point, will always win. People and businesses who and which live and operate in flood plains do so at their own risk.

Comment ID: 69
Author Name: Jeff Brown
Organization: Troup County Chamber of Commerce

Our observations, and those
of the stakeholders who surround, use and rely on the lake, is that the project has been used as, using the Corps terms, "the workhorse" of the basin. Nowhere in the Congressional authorization does Congress empower the Corps to take the resources at West Point and to use them exclusively for purposes other than those set by Congress.
The system had been operated for many years without West Point Lake. Yet because the Corps found less development and population in the early years of development surrounding the lake, and by using the justification that it could refill the West Point project quickly, it thought it could utilize the water there to address other purposes.
Over the years we have seen the Corps focus on addressing flow needs:
• for thermo electric power plants lying south on the Chattahoochee and on the Apalachicola,
• to compensate for losses from consumptive use
• by making releases to provide supplemental waters on the Apalachicola from flows lost to agricultural and consumptive use on the Flint
• to provide for waste assimilation needs for communities lying south of West Point that fail to adequately clean their waste water
In the process the Corps has ignored the specific and primary authorizations for the West Point project to address needs it felt were important elsewhere, thus sacrificing the specific primary authorized purposes set by Congress.
Two key operational standards have, more than any other, empowered the Corps to operate the lake in this manner.

---

1. The Corps operates West Point Lake in a manner that assures only flood control is a primary authorized use, and all other purposes are relegated to a lesser importance. They have established a winter pool of 625-628 MSL, well below the initial recreational impact level of 632.5 set by the Corps as the level at which recreational use becomes compromised. Contrary to the Congressional authorizations, recreation and sport fishing and wildlife development are sacrificed- almost in their entirety- to meet this one purpose during the winter months. All the while the Corps refuses to adapt its management practices to adequately utilize flood storage capabilities between 633 and 641 MSL in the lake. By the Corps' own admittance, West Point Lake alone cannot stop downstream flooding. Such a goal would be impossible. At least 2 more lakes were to be developed above West Point Lake that were never authorized or built to adequately support that operational goal. Thus, attempting to manage a project for a task for which the lake was never capable of fulfilling, has had a devastating impact on the communities surrounding the lake.
This is a major error in current operations and alternatives must be developed to assure West Point Lake is operated with recreation as the PRIMARY purpose established by Congress.

Comment ID: 150
Author Name: James murchison
Organization:

west point lake should not be singled out to be the largest contributor to the maintenance of the whole system. this could be done much more efficiently.

Comment ID: 223
Author Name: Dr. George M Henry
Organization:

Lake West Point carries much too great a burden for managing the downstream flow toward Lake Seminole and Florida, as Lake Lanier suffers from the triple woes of low inflow, severe managerial errors in 2007, and Atlanta's unrestrained growth and inadequate water planning. The Southern Company lakes along the Chattahoochee should be required to participate in the maintenance of downstream flow also. West Point Lake cannot do it all.

Comment ID: 231
Author Name:
Organization:

There is no reason that West Point Lake should be utilized as the workhorse"" of the basin to supplement all of the needs. West Point Lake should have priority and all lakes on the basin should be considered in the overall flow management."

Comment ID: 259
Author Name: Randall Norred
Organization:

West Point Lake has been misused during droughts. Even when rainfall below us is greater that what we receive, we are still sending water down stream. Other lakes below West Point That are not managed by the Corp never deviate.

Comment ID: 272
Author Name: Marsha Woodward
Organization:

I appreciate what the corp is doing to try and help with our lake. West point Lake Was built primarily for recreation for Troup County and for flood control for West POINT. We bought our land and built a small house just for our retirement, to be able to fish and enjoy the water to the fullest. I understand all about the drought we have had for the past few years but fail to understand why we have to be denied our water just to satisfy our neighboring states. Alabama has plenty of water running thru it, they could build more reservoirs and use their water for electricity and what else. Florida needs to understand that the natural flow from the incoming

rivers is only so much, and stop bickering about what we have worked to store to take care of the people here in Ga.

Comment ID: 575
Author Name: Dolly Martin
Organization:

4). Manage Lake Lanier and the rest of the basin in such a way that West Point Lake is not sacrificed for their wants or needs.

Comment ID: 576
Author Name: Dave Marting
Organization:

4). Manage Lake Lanier and the rest of the basin in such a way that West Point Lake is not sacrificed for their wants or needs.

Comment ID: 577
Author Name: Brenda Harris
Organization:

4). Manage Lake Lanier and the rest of the basin in such a way that West Point Lake is not sacrificed for their wants or needs.

Comment ID: 578
Author Name: Billy Harris
Organization:

4). Manage Lake Lanier and the rest of the basin in such a way that West Point Lake is not sacrificed for their wants or needs.

Comment ID: 580
Author Name: Hugh Toles
Organization:

I understand the drawdown in the winter for flood control, and I understand about drought conditions, but what I could not understand was the inequality in the attempt to favor down stream areas. I can go along with what comes in must go out, but taking away what water we have in order to maintain someone else's water level doesn't make good common sense. What did the muscles and sturgeons do when there was a drought before there were any controls on the river system. I can understand the muscle and oyster farmers on the ACF river saying salt water intrudes up stream when the water level drops from up river. This would be a fact of nature even if there were no dams to control the flow.

Comment ID: 589
Author Name: Lee and Ann Cathey
Organization:

Please do not look to West Point Lake so much as a "working lake" for the downstream water reservoirs or the saving of the obscure species of urchins who have survived for thousands of years up to the present. We are thankful for the good, common sense approach that we see taking place now.

Comment ID: 640
Author Name: Isabelle Knight
Organization:

Also, Corps forced owners of beautiful Troup County land to sell and give up their property for the lake. It is wrong to leave it ugly and unsightly due to sending our water to the Gulf. Congress did not give as a reason for development of this lake that it was to be a "workhorse" to provide water elsewhere - Reasons for building were Recreation, flood control and conservation.

Faster Reaction to Changing Conditions (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 797
Author Name: Greg
Organization:

We need faster reaction to situations. No time for sit around and have lots of studies. Not advocating blind actions but the people in the Sr. Management positions should be there because of ability to make logical, rapid choices.

Monitoring (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 6
Author Name: Heinz J. Mueller
Organization: EPA

The current Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) request for flow reductions in the Chattahoochee River relies upon a series of predictive models that make statements about flows and how changes in these can be expected to affect water quality measures. EPD proposes monitoring of several identified flow related sensitive endpoints, and identifies a procedure of notification when certain conditions exist that would require flow change based upon new information. EPA suggests that employing this same type of concept in other areas would greatly enhance the ecological sustainability of the aquatic systems affected by construction, maintenance and operation of federal projects with the ACF watershed basin.
We appreciate the opportunity to provide these scoping comments on the Proposed Water Control Manual Update and Environmental Impact Statement for the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) River Basin. Should you have questions, feel free to coordinate with Ntale Kajumba of my NEPA staff at 404/562-9620 or at kajumba.ntale@epa.gov or Paul Gagliano, P.E., at 404/562-9373 or at gagliano.paul@epa.gov. Duncan Powell of Region 4's Water Protection Division can be reached at 404/562-9258 or at powell.duncan@epa.gov.

Sincerely,
Heinz J. Mueller, Chief NEPA
Program Office. Office of Policy and Management

Comment ID: 339
Author Name: mike forster
Organization:

Can you provide Atlanta with the equipment to provide real time water flow past their intake rather than the 24hr after the fact current situation? I know that it would seem to be their cost to update but there doesn't appear to be any enthusiasm on their part to provide you with timely, accurate flow data.

Updating all measuring equipment on the ACF will allow you to release exactly what is needed rather than the current situation which seems to rely on computer models and non real time information from inaccurate gauges.

Our chief concerns are water quality and quantity.

It would seem that in order to reach the optimum solution, there needs to be a "clean sheet" approach where all the parties (individuals, organizations, cities, counties, states & feds) sit down at the table and develop a new plan from scratch that takes into account all of the development that has happened, is planned and the various needs and wants, along with the realities and constraints. Tweaking here and there between lawsuits seems a plan to fail...

--
It would seem that in order to reach the optimum solution, there needs to be a "clean sheet" approach where all the parties (individuals, organizations, cities, counties, states & feds) sit down at the table and develop a new plan from scratch that takes into account all of the development that has happened, is planned and the various needs and wants, along with the

realities and constraints. Tweaking here and there between lawsuits seems a plan to fail...

Comment ID: 386
Author Name: Ron condon
Organization:

I'm a lake Lanier resident and have been since 1989. What's become clear to me over time is that managing the lake level is no easy job. There are loads and loads of variables and without careful monitoring, maintaining the right lake level is a crap shoot. I don't have any specific comment other than to say that the Corp has to be a lot smarter in how it manages the lake, but you folks know that. There have been countless times (not recent) where water was released and wasted. In most cases this was only felt by residents and in lake recreation. The problem was "localized" and a contingent of Corp bashers was born. Recently, the lake level issue has gotten lots of publicity because of the drought conditions. We're at a critical point now and any unnecessary water going over the dam is costly. It's costly in lost drinking water, it creates watering bans and real estate values are affected. Let's do everything we can to keep that from happening or, at least, minimize it.

Comment ID: 412
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association County Commissioners of Georgia

Updating the plan should include new methods of forecasting runoff and modeling to ensure that the Corps ACF reservoirs, particularly Lake Lanier, are allowed to reach full pool no later than June 1st of each year and are as full as practical during drought conditions while still meeting downstream, legally-required flows. While Lake Lanier has 63 percent of the storage capacity in the system, it is fed by only 6 percent of the ACFs drainage basin. Considering how much longer it takes to refill Lake Lanier and the detrimental impacts recent severe droughts have had on this reservoir, it should not be drawn down using composite storage rule curves for the entire system or to create artificially-high, non-science-based flows to protect mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River.

Comment ID: 412
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association County Commissioners of Georgia

In summary, ACCG urges that any new Water Control Plan not simply tweak or replicate the Corps existing operations. Instead, alternative operating plans must be developed using modern inflow forecasting and modeling to meet the agreed upon performance measures that will manage our shared water resources much more effectively both now and into the future.

Comment ID: 620
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association of County Commissioners of GA

Updating the plan should include new methods of forecasting runoff and modeling to ensure that the Corps' ACF reservoirs, particularly Lake Lanier, are allowed to reach full pool no later than June 151 of each year and are as full as practical during drought conditions while still meeting downstream, legally-required flows. While Lake Lanier has 63 percent of the storage capacity in the system, it is fed by only 6 percent of the ACF's drainage basin. Considering how much longer it takes to refill Lake Lanier and the detrimental impacts recent severe droughts have had on this reservoir, it should not be drawn down using composite storage rule curves for the entire system or to create artificially-high, non-science-based flows to protect mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River.

Share the Pain (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 18
Author Name: Jack Bernzott
Organization:

Legitimate downstream needs have to be addressed, but only after a water rationing program is

in place. The downstream mind set that others must guarantee their economies is valid only after they help themselves. The Chattahoochee watershed is very limited, and it will be years before Lanier can meet today's flows. In the meantime the local economy is taking enough of a hit.

Comment ID: 92
Author Name: Lawrence Durden
Organization:

MR. LAWRENCE DURDEN: I am a property owner in Walter F. George, and all I want -- my comments would be we just want our fair share of Alabama -- for Alabama to get their fair share of the water without others taking it all and putting us in a dangerous situation. If it's one drought, then let it affect everybody.

Comment ID: 486
Author Name: Jim & Judy Foster
Organization:

After 50 years of growth, it is about time the Corp reviewed this plan. There must be restrictions on the amount of water withdrawn from Lake Lanier, other reservoirs built along the River Basin to meet the demands and more prudent use of the water that is released. With the great demands, Lake Lanier should be allowed to fill beyond full pool during the rainy season and withdrawal should be reduced during times of draught! All communities benefiting from the Lanier withdrawals should be on the same water restrictions as those at Lake Lanier even if they have sufficient water while we are in a draught!

Comment ID: 586
Author Name: Tim Duffey
Organization:

2. I fully understand that new and more serious needs have arisen over the years, such as Atlanta's water supply for drinking and sewage plus Florida's fish industry-all due to supply and demand as a result of growth. This plus the same needs for recreational purposes have been affected by growth and demands. We (local and state officials and the Corps. of Engineers) have discussed these and other matters over the course of several years. The resulting solutions were to take all these matters to a common table and all parties agree to a " Share the Pain" plan. I think it is great that the Corps is rethinking their plan and "asking" the actual daily "users" for input. I think it is high time that we all shed our past and concentrate on a brighter future for all concerned. Each and every entity's need is equally as important, but all should realize that we will have to share the pain to survive.

Comment ID: 681
Author Name: Earl Arrowood
Organization:

Other states are enjoying our water without water restrictions. Lake Lanier supplies water to the City of Atlanta and it is at new lows.
Fairness must be implemented as well as conservation for all involved.
--
Fairness must be implemented as well as conservation for all involved.

Down stream lakes and rivers are full. Other states are enjoying our water without water restrictions. Lake Lanier supplies water to the City of Atlanta and it is at new lows.

Manage Reservoirs to Preserve Water Supply (Water Supply)

Comment ID: 40
Author Name: Paul M. Flood
Organization:

3. Since Lake Lanier is the primary water storage reservoir for the ACF, a process must be developed that would enable Lake Lanier to refill to normal pool at the same time or before the

other lakes in the River Basin.

Comment ID: 212
Author Name: Andy Fritchley
Organization:

I am deeply concerned over the inflows and outflows of West Point Lake and the impact that has on water quality of area residents. West Point Lake is essential for drinking water and maintaining a consistent water level (633 - 635) is critical for residents.

Lake Lanier - Reduce Releases & Withdrawals (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 9
Author Name: Charles and Judy Salter
Organization: Chestatee Homeowners

It is a known fact that Lake Lanier is below appropriate level of water thereby limiting the lake's recreational use. Too much water has been allowed to flow downstream. Lake Lanier has been adversely affected by the drought and excessive outflow of lake water. Please help our water level not get any lower by whatever means available to you.

Comment ID: 83
Author Name: Steven Voige
Organization:

I feel water releases should be lowered until lake levels are at full pool. When less rain falls during a given time period the river levels below the lakes would have been naturally at lower levels also.

Comment ID: 292
Author Name:
Organization:

As a boater and a resident the water in Lake Lanier is VERY important for recreation and our supply of fresh drinking water.

Comment ID: 293
Author Name:
Organization:

As a boater (sailboat) and resident, the quantity of water in Lake Lanier is vital for recreation and our supply of drinking water. PLEASE reduce the volume of discharge.

Comment ID: 299
Author Name: Jeffery Daigrepont
Organization:

I would like to see the Corps consider releasing less water out of Lanier on days when there is significant rain south of Lanier. Even if the cut back in only for ONE day, this would help our lake recover. Right now most of the lakes south of Lanier are at full pool or better. Now would be our best shot at pulling Lanier out of this.

Last year it was mid-spring before the reductions were considered. If we can do something NOW, (while there is less demand) we will have more opportunity to get caught up. Lanier is at the very top of the basin and has the least amount of watershed and needs the most help right now. Like others, out economy depends on having water.

The current manual does not appear to consider rivers south of Lanier that add water into the ACF basin. This water should off-set what is required from Lanier.

Comment ID: 380
Author Name: Susie Gajewski

Organization: Sugar Hill City Councilwoman

Lake Lanier was originally created as a recreational reservoir. Since its creation more and more cities, counties and states have made claims to this water source. Please take a look at ways to reduce the release of water while informing some regions that they may need to look into their own reservoirs for the future.

Comment ID: 394
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

4. Store more water in Lanier -
a) minimize releases for downstream unless Lanier is full (once you let it go you have lost control).

Comment ID: 486
Author Name: Jim & Judy Foster
Organization:

After 50 years of growth, it is about time the Corp reviewed this plan. There must be restrictions on the amount of water withdrawn from Lake Lanier, other reservoirs built along the River Basin to meet the demands and more prudent use of the water that is released. With the great demands, Lake Lanier should be allowed to fill beyond full pool during the rainy season and withdrawal should be reduced during times of draught! All communities benefiting from the Lanier withdrawals should be on the same water restrictions as those at Lake Lanier even if they have sufficient water while we are in a draught!

Comment ID: 571
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

4). Store more water in Lanier. a). Minimize releases for downstream unless Lanier is full. (Once you let it go you have lost control.)

Comment ID: 698
Author Name: Ann Langley
Organization:

It needs to be readjusted based on true need. The leaders involved from that state need to understand that. The lost the Georgians are experiencing are massive. Both in property values, recreation and local economy.
--
We absolutely need to readjust the amount of water that we release to ALA and FL. They do not need this large amount of water. My understanding is that this amount was determined pretty much arbitrarily but when we had plenty of water. It needs to be readjusted based on true need. The leaders involved from that state need to understand that. The lost the Georgians are experiencing are massive. Both in property values, recreation and local economy.

Comment ID: 714
Author Name:
Organization: Gibbs Landscape Company

We need to study alternatives to the current operating plan. Existing operations seem to have unnecessarily drains lake Lanier. The corp should not be constrained by legal arguments about its authority to change existing operations. We need to study alternatives to determine the best use of the reservoir. Three million residents in north Georgia rely on lake Lanier and the Chattahoochee as their main drinking water source. Lake Lanier is also a resource that supplies water to business and industry including the landscape industry which results in 8 billion dollar economic impact to the state of Georgia. We need to study options and keep as much water in Lanier as possible.

Comment ID: 715
Author Name:
Organization:

I have lived all my life on Lake Lanier. The current condition of the Lake is indescribable!!!!! I know that only God has control over the drought, but it is a shame and a disgrace that the mistake of releasing too much water was made and that too much water is still being released for muscles in Florida. This is our drinking water source and a very huge recreation source to our area. Please, please, please stop the nonsense and use some common sense.

Comment ID: 764
Author Name: Fran Bonner Habeeb
Organization:

The Corps must change their controls to ensure the lake provides the necessary means to it's constituents. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1. Additionally, Lake Lanier should not be drawn down for mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River. Also,
management triggers must be in place for Lake Lanier withdrawals during times of drought.

Comment ID: 771
Author Name: bruce longshore
Organization: na

There have been numerous droughts before and the release from the lake during the past two years have been unprecedented during a drought.

The recovery of the water basin will face significant challenges with the current release practices.

Comment ID: 776
Author Name: Gene Obermeyer
Organization:

When the source of the water reduces you need to lessen the amount of water you send down the basin.

Comment ID: 779
Author Name: Brian Adams
Organization:

Please consider taking additional steps to ensure higher levels for Lake Lanier. I understand that we are in a drought, but common sense should apply by not releasing much more water downstream than flows in to the lake. Lake Lanier has a tremendous financial impact on north Georgia, not to mention precious life sustaining drinking water. As Lake Lanier continues to drop, it never ceases to amaze me that each time I drive over the Chattahoochee river- it appears to be nearly overflowing. This should make for an interesting investigative news report. Thanks for your consideration and please protect this valuable resource.

Comment ID: 814
Author Name: Tim Perkins
Organization: Forsyth County

Releases above natural river flows should not be made when the lakes are in action zones 2-4. for any of these needs: flood control actions, fish spawn operations, maintenance and repair of turbines, emergency situations such as drownings and chemical spills, drawdowns due to shoreline maintenance, releases made to free stuck barges, and other circumstances. The fish survived before the dams were built the natural flow should suffice.

DEMANDS/NEEDS

Downstream Needs (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 2
Author Name:
Organization:

I've heard my friends engage in hyperbole to the effect that the Corps values mussels over people. While I realize the Florida consumers have co-opted environmental concerns to serve their own economic self-interest

---

Comment ID: 47
Author Name: Mike Godfrey
Organization:

Dear Colonel Jorns: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") has solicited public comments regarding the scope of issues to consider as the Corps updates its water control manual for the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint ("ACF") River Basin. 73 Fed. Reg. 54,391 (Sept. 19, 2008). This letter provides the comments of the Southern Nuclear Operating Company ("Southern Nuclear"). Southern Nuclear operates the Farley Nuclear Plant ("Plant Farley"), located on the Chattahoochee River near Dothan, Alabama, which provides 19% of the total electricity generation for Alabama Power Company. Plant Farley relies on adequate elevations and flows in the Chattahoochee River for cooling water and discharge assimilation. From time to time, it is necessary to transport oversized equipment to and from Plant Farley by barge. Accordingly, Southern Nuclear has a significant interest in the Corps' management of its reservoirs in the ACF River Basin. As the Corps revises its ACF water control manual, it is the position of Southern Nuclear that the Corps must ensure: (1) minimum flows of 2,000 cubic feet per second ("cfs") in the Chattahoochee River at Columbia, Alabama; (2) support of navigation on the Apalachicola and Chattahoochee Rivers; and (3) operation of the Corps' ACF reservoirs for their Congressionally authorized purposes. Each of these issues is explained more fully below.

Comment ID: 90
Author Name:
Organization:

Comment:
Please maintain historical flow levels to Apalachicola Bay

Comment ID: 91
Author Name: alan pierce
Organization:

I very concerned that the Apalachicola Bay ecosystem is not being considered when it comes to developing the Water Control Manual. The Bay is the most pristine and productive body of water in the southeastern US. Everybody benefits from the shrimp, oysters, blue crabs, etc that come out of the Bay. Please include the Bay in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Comment ID: 93
Author Name: Marilyn Blackwell
Organization:

I have deep concerns on the following issue which is not being addressed or suggested in any of the options to comment on.
There exist a disconnect on the issue of "maintaining" a healthy eco system in the Apalachicola River System as to maintain suggest that this system exist in a healthy state.
--
I have deep concerns on the following issue which is not being addressed or suggested in any of the options to comment on.
There exist a disconnect on the issue of "maintaining" a healthy eco system in the Apalachicola River System as to maintain suggest that this system exist in a healthy state.
This system has been degraded severely for sixty plus years as a result of the COE maintenance practices. During this time, little care has been afforded to the health of this system. The river, creeks, sloughs, the off river mud flats, lakes and ponds have been impacted by dredged spoil.
Prior to the early 1970s, spoil was placed in the flood plain where erosion during flood season smothered plant life and elevated the ground level.
After the early 1970s, spoil was placed on the banks of the river, within banks and in open water. There now exist 135 within bank disposal sites, 26 dike fields and three open water sites.

These practices have resulted in major opposite bank erosion, eroding not only spoil from below the water line but also causing banks above the water line to fall in which added to the overload of sediment in the system.
The flood plain has undergone alarming changes as a result of these practices. Fish and other marine life no longer have access to the flood plain water bodies to spawn and forage. Native plants and wildlife has been adversely effected.
Within bank dredged spoil sites and dike fields produce the same effect in that both channel water to a desired section of the river bed. The size of the within bank disposal sites, visual at low water is only a small portion of the existing portion below the water level. These structures displace a large amount of water in the river, cause opposite bank erosion and help to blanket the flood plain, creeks and sloughs. Many of the within bank disposal sites have been located adjoining or just upstream from the mouths of sloughs and creeks.
The Apalachicola River System is very unhealthy. Past restoration projects have been failures. All were stated to need future maintenance in plans that were developed for them. A number of these restoration projects resulted in further degradation to the system. The Battle Bend project cost two million was a good example of this.
I would appreciate the consideration of water in the amount that would allow the Apalachicola River System to heal. There are clear signs that this process is beginning. Although healing would involve years, once healed there would be no need for maintenance.
To maintain a healthy system, there first must be a healthy system to maintain. This system needs only waterlife blood and time.

Comment ID: 95
Author Name: Alice Jean Gibbs
Organization:

Save our river!!

Comment ID: 96
Author Name: Lynn Wilson
Organization:

prevent Atlanta development from diverting our water system

Comment ID: 126
Author Name: Mark and Charlene Powell
Organization:

We are following the Corps of Engineers plan closely since we are located on the Walter F. George Reservoir. We are aware of the drought/water usage situation of the Atlanta area but also feel they have been negligent in continuing to build and increase their population without making any provisions for their future need for water. This is a responsibility of the community to plan for the future and not think it will just take care of itself. We appreciate the Corp taking in consideration the severe economic impact it will have on communities located below Lake Lanier that depend on the Chattahoochee River. This is not about mussels. This is about livelihoods and survival for communities hundreds of miles down river. We love the Chattahoochee and do everything we can to take care and protect it. I wish everyone had its best interest at heart. We have a resource that should not be taken for granted.

Comment ID: 127
Author Name: Ronald Ready
Organization:

Let enough water through to provide fresh water balance down river & in Apalachicola Bay

---

Comment ID: 146
Author Name: Bob Kustermann
Organization:

Will are Lake ever be let down again to the drastic level during the drought. Lake Harding remained at full pool the entire time. The Florida problems with their fish and mussels need to be addressed in other ways with all the water they have there.

Comment ID: 198

Author Name: Joel Upchurch
Organization:

West Point Lake was not put in place to support GA/Al power plants down stream it

should be a crime for the lakes that are managed by the corps to be drained each year when the ga power lakes down stream

have full beautiful lakes all the while

screaming for more water for their down stream plants

Comment ID: 210
Author Name: Rocky Millenbine
Organization:

This should be top priority. The amount that would be damaged in a flooding situation should outweigh the need for increased storage for recreation purposes.

Comment ID: 282
Author Name: Lesley Cox
Organization:

The upstream users are taking too much water from the system!!! Since 1983 you have been asked to include to the fresh water requirements of the Apalachicola River and Bay in your Water Control Manual. It still hasn’t been done!!! The ACF file comment file must be huge by now. How about sharing what you've been collecting all these years so everyone knows we've been making these demands all along.

Comment ID: 311
Author Name: Stephen Scanlan
Organization:

Please do not allow the destruction of this great eco system by reducing the water flow to Accommodate a city that does not adequately plan for its population growth and its land developers.

Comment ID: 319
Author Name: Doug Burnd
Organization:

We have been utilizing Lake Lanier since 1957 for recreation purposes. We are aware of all the needs that the Chattahoochee River provides for however we also know that the total demands listed are more than the river can provide even in times when we have sufficient rainfall. I feel that a more realistic look at the downstream demands needs to be made and that more water needs to be allocated for the Atlanta area as it grows.

Comment ID: 369
Author Name:
Organization:

I have a boat on Lanier, and look forward to the day when high water returns , but I do not believe that water levels should be kept high for the sake of esthetics and for the benefit of the lake property owners at the expense of endangered species down river. Water conserving measures are working in the Atlanta area and it is good for people to learn how to do so.

Comment ID: 376
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The North Georgia region should not be required to offset the salinity of the Bay water by releasing more fresh water out of Lake Lanier and down the ACF system.

Comment ID: 383

Author Name: Gordon Brand
Organization:

During this current drought, it appears The US Army Corps of Engineers Water Control Manual, places more importance on the water demands of users below the Buford Dam.

How else can you explain the low lake Levels of Lake Lanier compared to the other Lakes in the ACF Basin.

Its unfair that Lake Lanier, fish, mussels, wildlife, recreation, water safety, boating and marina industry, housing values, water quality, erosion are not recognized to have the same needs as the down stream users.

Comment ID: 392
Author Name: Cile Gierhahn
Organization: Lakefront Homeowner

There is no equity to GA residents in this plan. Perhaps come up with a per capita measure and release/retain water in Lake Lanier on that basis. GA should not be expected to provide other states water for THEIR industries while ours suffer.

Comment ID: 405
Author Name: L Levi
Organization:

How will a few hundred comments from residents of Apalachicola Bay area (approx 10,000 population in Franklin county) compare with thousands of comments from metro Atlanta area?? Many folks in Apalachicola Bay area already feel that there is a bias in favor of upper basin needs in this water allocation issue.

Comment ID: 424
Author Name: James Klass
Organization:

Manager water releases according to true need down stream.

Comment ID: 505
Author Name: John and Jodi Wacho
Organization:

1) First and foremost, logic has to govern the release of water from Lake Lanier. This is obviously not part of the present plan, due to the fact the lakes in the ACF Basin below Lake Lanier are full or minimally below full pool, while Lake Lanier is almost 20 feet below full pool. This is not due to the drought or over use of water by the public in Georgia. When recent rainfall calculations are totaled, compared to the amount of water released, the Lake should only be down some 3-5 feet. This is due to mismanagement of the releasing of water. Look at what is going on downstream, not what the Manual says. If the downstream areas are full, decrease the outflow.

Comment ID: 572
Author Name: Billy Turner
Organization: Columbus Water Works

We believe all of these concerns can be accommodated if the Corps understands the relationships among these discrete functions and operates the ACF system accordingly. It is of critical importance to CWW that the Corps pay greater attention to Chattahoochee River flows in the middle stretch of the river. Our FERC approved flows of 800cfs minimum, 1350cfs daily average and 1850cfs weekly average are critical and necessary to sustain the aforementioned projects and programs at Columbus and southward. These flows, for reasons unknown to us, are not being consistently met. Since June 24, 2008, our FERC flows have fallen short some 60% of the time for weekly averages and 10% for daily averages. These shortfalls came in spite of the Corps IOP modeling which states that the FERC flows will be met as long as West Point

reservoir exceeds an elevation of 621.6 feet. This elevation has been met and significantly exceeded all summer. These occurrences certainly raise questions for CWW. Are these lapses due to a lack of attention by the Corps to this stretch of the river? Is there some other overriding consideration of which we are not aware? The Corps' ambivalent attitude concerning the FERC flows at disconcerting, especially since Crops documents state that all FERC flows will be maintained. Yet Corps representatives continue to state in public that there is no obligation to meet FERC flows. The Corps cannot continue to take these incompatible positions. We need some assurance from the Corps that the FERC flows at the Columbus gage will be observed and protected as called for in the IOP. We appreciate the Corps attention to these issues.

Because of the above plans, CWW continues to be concerned that the Corps' focus seems to be isolated to only two points of flow in the ACF, at Peachtree Creek and the headwaters of the Apalachicola. We have repeatedly asked that the Corps broaden their focus and give significant attention to the flows in the middle Chattahoochee River, especially during periods of drought and flooding. We believe that the cloud on the future growth of the Columbus area can be laid at the feet of the Corps due to its failure to operate the system consistent with the authorized project purposes.

Comment ID: 664
Author Name: J. Gordon Shuler
Organization:

Please insure that the Apalachicola River and Apalachicola Bay are protected with adequate water flow.

Comment ID: 715
Author Name:
Organization:

I have lived all my life on Lake Lanier. The current condition of the Lake is indescribable!!!!! I know that only God has control over the drought, but it is a shame and a disgrace that the mistake of releasing too much water was made and that too much water is still being released for muscles in Florida. This is our drinking water source and a very huge recreation source to our area. Please, please, please stop the nonsense and use some common sense.

Comment ID: 717
Author Name: Mr. and Mrs. John McCarthy
Organization:

Just saying what everyone else is saying that is impacted by the lack of a current manual for Lake Lanier. Shoreline erosion, economic impact, water supply - the whole basin needs to be re-manualed. The manual should be a total plan, not just for the lake. Water usage all the way to Apalachicola needs to be included.

Comment ID: 719
Author Name:
Organization:

Imperative to protect and maintain water flow into Apalachicola Bay

---

Comment ID: 755
Author Name: Will Poston
Organization:

The original mandate of the 1950's should be amended to allow Lake Lanier to refill itself from the water flowing into the basin and when after reaching the full pool level again, then allow the water coming in to the lake to flow down stream as it would have normally without a water shed. The demand for water in this area is much greater than when the lake was built in the 1950's.

I believe that people are much more important than the mussels downstream. These mussels will survive just as they would have without letting all the water flow down stream. The mussels will adapt.

Our very survival is threatened without the necessary water that the Atlanta area needs. All the water sheds below us are full. Why isn't this water allocated to accommodate this crisis for the Atlanta area?

Comment ID: 757
Author Name:
Organization:

The Apalachicola estuary and bay need to be part of the ACF system. I recommend changing the word "basin" to "system." Maintaining both the estuary and bay is vital for environmental, recreational (just like Lake Lanier), commercial (oyster, shrimp, and seafood) in both Apalachicola and the Gulf Coast states.

Comment ID: 758
Author Name:
Organization:

Because of the information listed, maintaining the productivity of the estuary and bay is essential and should be part of the plan/manual.

Comment ID: 769
Author Name: Walter Anderson
Organization: City of Berkeley Lake

The facts would suggest that the impact of conserving water in Lake Lanier for consumption and recreation does not constitute a large percentage of the water flowing into Florida from this watershed. As a result, I think the Atlanta local use (both drinking water and recreation) should be emphasized more than the downstream issues in managing water flow through Buford Dam.

Future Water Needs (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 280
Author Name: Joshua Norred
Organization:

Florida is more concerned about Mussels than about the people who depend on this water for drinking (thats a sad thought). Wake up people.. no water means no drinking water also

---

Comment ID: 295
Author Name: Kathy Nguyen
Organization:

Three million residents in north Georgia rely on Lake Lanier and the Chattahoochee River as their sole source of drinking water. We have no alternative source of water supply, so careful management of this precious resource is critical.

Metro Atlantas use of water in the ACF Basin is reasonable by any measure. Currently metro Atlanta uses only 1 to 2% of the water in the ACF Basin as measured by the flow at the Florida line. The new Water Control Plan should be designed to accommodate withdrawals consistent with projections contained in the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning Districts Water Supply and Conservation Plan.

Comment ID: 307
Author Name: Bob Zumwalt
Organization:

I can't imagine why you waited this long to think about updating your manual. What have you been thinking about?
I've been attending meetings about this lake for years, and we all knew that we had a potential problem here. Seems like your agency has again put off doing anything about another conflicting situation (like Katrina).

The Atlanta metro area developed where it did, based on the availability of water from the Chattahoochee River. Can you imagine what's going to happen if this area is without water, even for a day?

Comment ID: 309
Author Name: Gary M Cash
Organization: Just a concerned American

I have read your article about the meeting planned to inform the public of the plans and changes being reviewed to better control the water level of the Lanier basin and
other areas. True the plans from the fifties needs to be updated and changes made to help prevent this drought ridden problem from happening again if possible. But, those reviews and plans you say wont be ready to implant until possibility 2011.
But what about now, can the basin keep sufficient water supply to all the people that use it now until then or until adequate amount of rainfall can slow its decline of water level. Somehow I don't think it can. I have sent suggestions to the governor and to the army corps of engineers and can not get a straight answer to my question of a quick fix solution till your reviews and implantation of your plans can be set in place.
Therefore I'll ask one more time to you and see if I can get an answer.

Comment ID: 377
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The State of Georgia owns the water in the system and should be allowed to dictate where it is utilized for human consumption. Human consumption should take predence over all other uses within the system. Water conservation methods should be analyzed for effectiveness and plans implemented across the entire system, not just in Atlanta and North Georgia.

Comment ID: 450
Author Name: Sidell Tilghman
Organization:

I realize that most of my suggestions require funding, but since this new Congress wants to go on a spending spree and the Southeast US is such a popular place to be for the citizens, then what's the problem throwing some of those billions that get tossed around down our way- you know, to plan for future growth. The longer the no solution situation goes on, the longer it will take Lake Lanier to fill up and what are Alabama and Florida going to do when Lanier is down to the dead pool. The lawsuits are going to look pretty ridiculous.

Comment ID: 451
Author Name: Jodi Wacho
Organization:

Also, please make sure the Congressional studies performed and released this summer re: the flow needs downstream for nuclear and power plants is looked at, so the flow can be decreased re: these issues. The minimal required was 4200psi. A minimum level needs to be set, so the lake is not lowered any further than 1061 if full pool is 1073. This will ensure water availability for the future.

Comment ID: 490
Author Name: Judson Davis
Organization:

Federal Inter-Basin Transfer of Water -Solves the Decades Old Water Wars Disputes. Georgia and Tennessee have had a lengthy property line dispute that has lasted for hundreds of years. Congress set the property line dividing the states at the 35th parallel. A survey back in the 1800s set the line in the wrong place, effectively locating a sliver of what would have been Georgia, into Tennessee. This sliver includes part of the Tennessee River. A simple pipeline from the massive Tennessee River, bringing water into Georgia's drought-stricken regions, would forever solve the water wars issues between Georgia, Florida and Alabama. Georgia should quit claim any disputed property to Tennessee in return for a tap into the Tenn. River. We could then use the Interstate -75 right of way for a pipeline down to a "T" with one leg going

east into the Lake Lanier watershed (and the ACF River system), and a second leg continuing down 1-75 into the Allatoona watershed. This plan effectively ends the decades old Water Wars dispute between the southern states. Here's how: Tennessee Wins: They have their disputed land free and clear. The tap is a few miles from the Alabama line. Tenn. has enjoyed full use of the Tenn. River resource by this point. They won't miss a drop. No more disputes with Georgia. Alabama Wins: They won't miss the miniscule withdrawal. The Tenn. River is huge. They will gain a forever full river system along the Chattahoochee River (ACF system) along the Alabama boarder with Georgia. Tons of water for their Dothan plant. No more disputes with Georgia. Florida Wins: Florida will forever have water flows keeping their sturgeon and mussels watered. Florida's oyster industry can now have the water with no more drought flow reductions. No more disputes with Georgia. This pipeline project is tiny compared to similar projects in Alaska (oil & gas pipelines) and Los Angeles (drinking water aquifers). This pipeline solves the problems amongst the states and provides several benefits for all of the states. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Corps of Engineers, both federal agencies, can work together and effectively solve the Water Wars issue, permanently. I appreciate you helping us during this drought. Many Thanks, Judson Davis, Gainesville, Ga

---

Comment ID: 532
Author Name: Jim Geist
Organization:

We need to spread the responsibility for meeting the needs of the mussel’s survival and the economic needs of the Apalachicola oysters to include these other areas. If the drought goes away tomorrow and demand continue to increase without the significant increase is storage we will contend with this condition over and over again and at some point, when another drought occurs even emptying Lake Lanier will not meet the increased needs.
--
We need to spread the responsibility for meeting the needs of the mussel’s survival and the economic needs of the Apalachicola oysters to include these other areas. If the drought goes away tomorrow and demand continue to increase without the significant increase is storage we will contend with this condition over and over again and at some point, when another drought occurs even emptying Lake Lanier will not meet the increased needs.

Comment ID: 567
Author Name: Charles Bannister
Organization: Gwinnett County

The COE EM 1110-2-3600 Section 3-3 b. (I) states "Furthermore, for many projects that have been operational for a number of years, the water control plans and water control manual are out-of-date, and there is a need for revising them to make them applicable to current conditions." We believe that everyone will concur that things are not the same in north Georgia as they were when Lake Lanier was built. The water control plans and the water control manual need to address the current conditions in which we find ourselves with some three million people in the Metropolitan Atlanta area relying on the ACF basin for drinking water for their health and safety.

Comment ID: 802
Author Name: Steve Burrell
Organization:

We have been severely affected by the consistent drop in water levels. With the growing population and demand for water, coupled with drought conditions, it doesn't make any sense to send enormous amounts of water downstream. Other lakes in our region, like lake Oconee, are near full pool even with the drought. We need change to occur quickly or Lake Lanier will be little more than a mud hole.

Comment ID: 809
Author Name: Tim Perkins
Organization: Forsyth County

Forsyth County has made multiple official request for a storage contract for water from the lake and that should be considered in this plan update.

You should not only be looking at the current demands on the river in this study. Consideration should be given looking at future population projections and water demands from the river.

Growth Management (Water Resources)

Comment ID: 404
Author Name: L Levi
Organization:

Require future growth and development in Atlanta to demonstrate where water supply will come from to support planned growth - accountability for sustaining continued growth is needed.

Comment ID: 415
Author Name: diane mcgrath
Organization:

Allowing Georgia to issue permits almost indiscriminately for water use and development is the equivalent of allowing them to use our sacrifice and moderation for their greed and gain. During this summer's drought I did not see ONE LAWN THAT WAS NOT BRIGHT GREEN IN THE ATLANTA AREA.
Let them live with dried up lawns and dirty cars so that the water is used for it's life giving qualities first and luxury last. If they have to restrict themselves to drinking and bathing what is the harm in that?

Comment ID: 654
Author Name: Linda Raffield
Organization: FCSWA Secretary

The problem as we see it from this end is that this problem did not happen over night, and it is not just because of the drought. If it were there would be less opposition to the recommended water levels and flow cutbacks. The man made problems of uncontrolled development which requires more water than is available without the least bit of concern for others in continuing development is more than we should or can be expected to swallow. We have been informed that while we are in a drought situation where there is limited water supply nothing has or will be done to detour further development to an already over burdened system.
Knowing this and the lack of consideration in industries which over the years would rather pay heavily in fines than adhere to environmental controls regardless of the consequence.
The added consideration of government who knowingly ignored the problem for almost thirty years is enough to anger the most humble.
All that aside where do we go from here?

OTHER

Other (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 6
Author Name: Heinz J. Mueller
Organization: EPA

It is our understanding that an ACF Water Control Manual Update and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are to be developed by the Mobile District. We further understand that some water management operations described in the current basin-wide ACF Water Control Manual may be modified. Any operational changes in the various federally managed reservoirs will reportedly be fully described in each updated reservoir-specific Water Control Manual, and then included within the overall ACF Master Water Control Manual.

EPA understands that the updated ACF Water Control Manual will outline the regulation schedules for each project, as well as specifications for storage and releases from each reservoir. The updated ACF Water Control Manual will also provide documentation including revised Water Control Plans for each of the specific projects and river basin systems within the ACF. The updated ACF Water Control Manual will further include guidelines for making water management decisions, and will "outline policies and data protocols for flood control operations

and drought contingency operations." Mobile District reports that the updated ACF Water Control Manual is needed "to enable managers to strike the best balance possible for the many multi purposes and demands...and a complex set of factors is needed to determine appropriate water management at each lake."

EPA understands that the updated ACF Water Control Manual will identify all constraints, including but not limited to: authorized project purposes, power contract commitments, hydrologic and climatologic factors, downstream lake and basin wide conditions, potential threats of flood and drought, and will include the resultant lake levels that are required to satisfy all of these various requirements. Because of the complexity of the updated ACF Water Control Manual, we understand that during the scoping process, Mobile District "will be collecting input from a broad range of stakeholders throughout the region."

Comment ID: 16
Author Name: William D. Rezak
Organization:

You accidentally released 26 billion gallons from the lake in April 2007 due to a faulty gage, when all of us who live on the lake knew the level was incorrect. You owe us special consideration, since the lake has never recovered from this error. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Comment ID: 27
Author Name: Patty Chastain
Organization:

I believe it's a natural resource that we are all entitled to have equal access and equal use of the river. One entity should not be more important than the other. So as the leaders make their decisions on how they are going to manage the river, I hope that they will remember that, that this river belongs to the people. That's all.

Comment ID: 28
Author Name: David McLain
Organization:

I have a recommendation to be made to the ongoing process that they are working with now. There should be a visible correspondence between what is taken as stakeholder comments during the EIS scoping process, and the resultant water control manual. There should be, in my judgment, a flow chart developed that says input goes in over here and it gets processed and then it results in changes in the Water Control Manual.

Based on what I was told this evening by those that were standing in the different stations, the Water Control Manual is constrained to deal with things not in litigation. Everything is in litigation, and I don't know how you can possibly write a Water Control Manual that avoids issues that are in litigation. The scope of the Environmental Impact Statement, the way it was presented was a broad scope. It included everything, which is great. The scope of the Water Control Manual was not really discussed, and there should be some correspondence or correlation between these meetings where public input is asked and the outcomes, which result in the Water Control Manual. We are not interested in just having an answer back to a question asked during the scoping process. We are interested in seeing a resultant action taken in a Water Control Manual, and there are issues that need to be addressed in this process, as, for example, the Corps asserts that it is a state responsibility to allocate water, that that's all, that they are not in that process. The Corps is not responsible for the allocation of water. The states are, however, the Corps enters into, has a responsibility for managing, the reservoirs in the system. And in doing so, they allocate by water contract portions of the reservoir for use by water users, such as Gwinnett County. To say that this allocation of water in this water contract is not an allocation of water is a distinction without a difference. They need to admit that, and that the Corps is in the process of allocating water. They have a responsibility for, at least, a portion of it. Finally, the ACF is an interstate water. It is not waters that rise and fall in Georgia. It is not as Governor Perdue asserts, that if a drop of rain falls in Georgia, it's Georgia water. That's simply not what the law says. There are downstream impacts of that, and that's what this impact, this Environmental Impact Statement should document, and I am in hopes that it does. I'm in hopes that all of the people that we're advocating come to this meeting can get a reasonable response and see that what they said, what they invested their time and effort in

shows up in the Water Control Manual that is going to govern the rivers of their community.

Based on what I was told this evening by those that were standing in the different stations, the Water Control Manual is constrained to deal with things not in litigation. Everything is in litigation, and I don't know how you can possibly write a Water Control Manual that avoids issues that are in litigation. The scope of the Environmental Impact Statement, the way it was presented was a broad scope. It included everything, which is great. The scope of the Water Control Manual was not really discussed, and there should be some correspondence or correlation between these meetings where public input is asked and the outcomes, which result in the Water Control Manual. We are not interested in just having an answer back to a question asked during the scoping process. We are interested in seeing a resultant action taken in a Water Control Manual, and there are issues that need to be addressed in this process, as, for example, the Corps asserts that it is a state responsibility to allocate water, that that's all, that they are not in that process. The Corps is not responsible for the allocation of water. The states are, however, the Corps enters into, has a responsibility for managing, the reservoirs in the system. And in doing so, they allocate by water contract portions of the reservoir for use by water users, such as Gwinnett County. To say that this allocation of water in this water contract is not an allocation of water is a distinction without a difference. They need to admit that, and that the Corps is in the process of allocating water. They have a responsibility for, at least, a portion of it. Finally, the ACF is an interstate water. It is not waters that rise and fall in Georgia. It is not as Governor Perdue asserts, that if a drop of rain falls in Georgia, it's Georgia water. That's simply not what the law says. There are downstream impacts of that, and that's what this impact, this Environmental Impact Statement should document, and I am in hopes that it does. I'm in hopes that all of the people that we're advocating come to this meeting can get a reasonable response and see that what they said, what they invested their time and effort in shows up in the Water Control Manual that is going to govern the rivers of their community.

Comment ID: 31
Author Name: Dennis Rosendahl
Organization:

Comment Area: ACF Basin, Water Control Manual Update: West Point Lake and Dam, Water Management for Federal Purposes: Recreation, Flood Damage Reduction, Water Quality, Water Supply

---

Comment ID: 32
Author Name: Phil Pendue
Organization:

Comment Area: Flint River Dam and Lake, Water Control Manual Update: West Point Lake and Dam, Water Management for Federal Purposes: Drought Operations, Recreation, Water Quality

---

Comment ID: 33
Author Name: Donna Garrett
Organization:

Water Control Manual Update: West Point Lake and Dam, Water Management for Multiple Federal Project Purposes: Drought Operations, Hydropower, Recreation, Flood Damage Reduction, Water Quality, Water Supply

---

Comment ID: 37
Author Name: Carol A. Couch
Organization: GA EPD

I. Introduction A. Chattahoochee River The Chattahoochee River is one of the State of Georgia's most precious natural resources. The citizens of the State of Georgia rely upon the Chattahoochee River and the federal reservoirs constructed on it to meet vital needs of the citizens of the State of Georgia, including water supply, waste assimilation, recreation, and navigation, and to support the biological needs of a wide variety of species.

Comment ID: 39
Author Name: Unknown
Organization:

Water Control Manual Update for Lake Sidney Lanier/Buford Dam; Water Management for Multiple Federal Project Purposes: Drought Operations, Navigation, Water Quality, Water Supply

---

Comment ID: 43
Author Name: Students of River Basin Management
Organization:

US Army Corps of Engineers: Respectfully submitted are suggestions contributed by Florida State University's River Basin Management class to the updated Water Management Plan Manual. The intent of this letter is to constructively contribute to the process. Our effort is aggregate and represents the interests of all the students. The River Basin Management course provides extensive training in river basin management and planning through providing a foundation of understanding of river basins as a system from a biological, hydrological and geopolitical basis. A special emphasis of this course is focused on the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint basin. We are knowledgeable of the technical tools and concepts used to understand and manage river basins from a system wide context including negotiation and math simulation tools. It is our understanding that the balance between human use and ecosystem protection is
difficult to achieve, but this must be of primary consideration.

Comment ID: 58
Author Name: Caroline Weiler
Organization:

Secondly, I am hoping that the Corp will make new rules that will keep the water flowing downstream so that this magnificent spot on the planet will survive and thrive for the world to experience for future generations. This kind of living museum is disappearing.

Comment ID: 60
Author Name: Denesia Cheek
Organization: National Park Service

In response to the September 11, 2008, Water Control Manual Update Process and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Interagency Scoping Meeting, the National Park Service (NPS) has reviewed the Corps of Engineers ACF Water Control Manual Update. The Master Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin was last completed in 1958 and it did not include Water Control
Manuals for the West Point, Walter F. George, and George W. Andrews projects. In addition, NPS understands that the updates to the Water Control Manuals are typically integrated with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) public involvement process. The current request expands on previous request to manage water and balance the lakes in the ACF system during times of drought, navigation, hydropower, recreation, water supply, water quality and other project purposes.

Comment ID: 64
Author Name: Sunny Park
Organization:

WE ARE DESPERATELY NEED YOUR HELP WITH PERMANENT SOLUTION. PLEASE HELP!

Comment ID: 67
Author Name: Jeff Lukken
Organization: Mayor of LaGrange

A "quick and dirty" EIS and shot at
a new water control manual that skims through the massive issues facing West Point Lake and the ACF basin can not be an option for consideration by the Army. Only the most thorough study and vetting resulting in a cultural change in the Corps understanding and management of the system will assure a basin that meets the needs for future generations.

Comment ID: 69

Author Name: Jeff Brown
Organization: Troup County Chamber of Commerce

A "quick and dirty" EIS and shot at
a new water control manual that skims through the massive issues facing West Point Lake and the ACF basin cannot be an option for consideration by the Army. Only the most thorough study and vetting resulting in a cultural change in the Corps' understanding and management of the system will assure a basin that meets the needs for future generations.

Comment ID: 73
Author Name: Matt Frend
Organization:

West Point Lake and Dam

Comment ID: 74
Author Name: Charles McLeod
Organization:

ACF Basin, West Point Lake and Dam, Water Management - Hydropower, Navigation, Recreation, Flood Damage Reduction, Water Quality, Water Supply; Shoreline Management

---

Comment ID: 75
Author Name: Sally Bethea
Organization: Upper Chattahoochee Riverkeeper

Dear Colonel Jorns: Thank you for the opportunity to comment as part of the Corps' revision of the Water Control Plan ("WCP") for the ACF system. Please consider the contents of this letter as comments from the approximately 4,000 individuals and businesses represented by the Lake Lanier Association. The Lanier Regional Economy Must Be Preserved A regional economy of more than $5.5 billion has grown up since the 1950's around Lake Lanier. The lives and livelihoods of thousands of people are tied to maintaining Lake Lanier at a water level that supports the lake-based economy that has become the lifeblood of the region surrounding Lanier. The operations that the Corps defines in its new WCP must be designed to preserve and protect that economy and the people whose lives depend on it by maintaining the highest possible water level in the Lake. The comments in this letter address ways in which we believe the Corps should design its WCP to safeguard and maximize the benefits Congress intended through the construction of Buford Dam and the resulting creation of Lake Lanier.

Comment ID: 78
Author Name: Ann Gage
Organization:

LAKE LANIER DILEMMA Do we have 2 years to wait for the "WATER CONTROL MANUAL" to be completed? Or is this just another procrastination ploy? For 40+ years there have been many studies, surveys, tests, forums, public hearings, research, media news stories and then, more studies. Now, we are told that the lake is impaired. Perhaps, soon, it will be extinct, if we do nothing. We do not need more studies to inform us that the lake is in trouble. One needs only to look at the lake and observe the shrinking level. This observation needs to be translated into a VISION for the future. In this age of technology and engineering marvels one would think that something could physically be done to fix the dilemma of 'lack of water in Lake Lanier.'
I am aware of the fact that the residents of Hall County have been conserving water, Mother Nature has not cooperated with our need for more rain, Atlanta needs water, plus all the other uses that have put a strain on the supply and integrity of the quality of the water. However, all of the excuses, and more regulations and studies have not solved the problem. Also, the passing the buck from the one of the 10 regulatory agencies to another has not solved the problem. In the first century, the Romans built aqueducts to get water from the mountains to the cities. I am not expecting us to do the same.....but, can't someone DO SOMETHING, NOW, instead of waiting for the "WATER CONTROL MANUAL" to be completed?

Comment ID: 89
Author Name: Charles Chapman
Organization:

Georgia should not be bailed out of their lack in effectively planning water management.

Comment ID: 111
Author Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Troup County has needs and legitimate purposes for the West Point Lake. Please enforce these original purposes for building this lake in Troup County.

Comment ID: 113
Author Name: West Point Lake Advisory Council
Organization: West Point Lake Advisory Council

3. Return to managing the lake consistent with congressionally authorized purposes

---

Comment ID: 133
Author Name: Randy Nix
Organization:

I feel that we will fare well if an unbiased study is done of the basin and a common sense management plan is put in place.

Comment ID: 143
Author Name: Kent Bennett
Organization:

I enjoy the lake.
--
I enjoy the lake. I like the water levels to decline in the winter to 630 levels for fishing. I used the low levels this past year to add a boat slip onto my dock.

Comment ID: 193
Author Name: Maureen Struble
Organization:

I support the comments on the blue sheet of paper.

Comment ID: 208
Author Name: RON GARRETT
Organization:

OUR BIGGEST CONCERN IS THE WATER LEVEL BECAUSE THE LAKE THERE WAS ONLY A SMALL CREEK ON BEECH CREEK.

Comment ID: 234
Author Name: roy spinks
Organization:

The Corp is encouraged to maintain the lake consistent with the original congressionally authorized uses.

Comment ID: 315
Author Name: Harold Trip
Organization:

My opinion of this gathering is it's total and complete hypocrisy, a waste the taxpayers' money. This lake is totally being mismanaged for whatever alternative reason. This gathering and bringing us out to look at what you're showing us means absolutely nothing. The lake is fifty years old, and through several severe other droughts we have been able to maintain the water level at a point that is nothing like what we're currently going through. We had fourteen inches of rain with the storm out of Florida. As soon as we picked up two and a half, three foot of water

you inadvertently doubled or quadrupled the amount of discharge out of the lake and drug it right back down. This community is highly upset with regard to the management of this lake, and you have a pop that's right about at the boiling point.

Comment ID: 318
Author Name: Kim Sak
Organization:

does the Corps and state work together to evaluate future movement of water between drainage basins throughout the state of Georgia and then beyond our waters?

Comment ID: 326
Author Name: Thomas Clark
Organization:

It seems out of touch to expect Lake Lanier to provide water to the rest of the drainage basin during drought when its basin only constitutes 9% of the total.

Comment ID: 341
Author Name: Rick Mallory
Organization:

4. Keep the lake usage consistent with the original congressional authorized purposes.

Comment ID: 343
Author Name: *Helen F. Henry
Organization:

I am interested in maintaining a consistent water level

Comment ID: 345
Author Name: *Charis Acree
Organization:

Please return to managing the lake consistent with Congressionally authorized purposes.

Comment ID: 353
Author Name: *Beverley Johnson
Organization:

but amount of water is #1.

Comment ID: 354
Author Name: *Barbara Keller
Organization:

It is also a fact that costs to manage the Lake are extraordinary and I do think we have a community interested in partnering with the Corps to achieve all of the Congressionally authorized purposes.

Comment ID: 355
Author Name: *Daniel Houghton
Organization:

2. Maximize positive impact

3. Return to manage the lake

Comment ID: 360
Author Name: *Mickey McCoy
Organization:

Return to managing the lake consistent with Congressional Authorized purposes;

Comment ID: 363
Author Name: *Otis F. Woodward
Organization:

Want to keep w/p lake at good water level.

Comment ID: 372
Author Name: Nancy Niekro
Organization:

You probably could give this project to Georgia Tech, or for that matter any high school, and they would come up with some logical answers.

Please, lets not let this go the way of the second perimeter we were supposed to have to alleviate the traffic problem that exists in Atlanta.

Attending a meeting last night we discovered that at current time there is a 3 year project to determine where water will be needed in the future. Time is of the essence, we have a problem now.

Comment ID: 378
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

When the new operating plan is derived, careful consideration should be given to the plan's impact on human life.

Comment ID: 379
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The State of Georgia should be allowed to dictate the instream cfs flow requirements in this section

---

Comment ID: 382
Author Name: Valerie Hall
Organization:

I would like to comment on the level of water in Lake Lanier. As a taxpayer and Lake Lanier homeowner, we need your support in getting the level of the lake back to full pool. It is ridiculous that this lake has been drained to the point it is at. I have lived on this lake for over 30 years and never seen such a long running problem. I understand that it was not meant for recreation, but since it was meant to provide water for the residents of this area, we should absolutely not be forced to drain this lake to keep sturgeons and mussels alive in Florida. HUMAN LIFE COMES FIRST!!! Also, the excuse of providing power to those in Florida is lame too. They have enough lakes full of water to support their power needs. We need to take a stand as a state and defend our needs. Please revisit your policies and procedures regarding Lake Lanier and bring water back to OUR natural resource.

Comment ID: 393
Author Name: Cile Gierhahn
Organization: Lakefront Homeowner

So what's to comment on here??

Comment ID: 394
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

1. Build FLEXIBILITY into the manual so that the COE can be more PRO-ACTIVE and less REACTIVE. (Quit going by an old manual - change it!)
2. Have pre-set intervals for manual review and updates. (Don't let the manual get so outdated that chaos occurs forcing change).

O/A Comment: Management of the ACF by the COE has played directly into the hands of Alabama and Florida in recent years. They have gotten adequate/more than adequate water so why agree to a change? They have and will drag out the water wars as long as possible.

Comment ID: 399
Author Name: Jane Browder
Organization: lake property owner

The economic destruction this mismanagement and drought has caused the Lanier area is more dramatic than what it is causing Florida or Alabama. We have not denied those states water and the flows are consistent to past years.

The new manual hopefully will make management of Lanier's water level a top priority and adjust accordingly to weather conditions.

Comment ID: 400
Author Name: Chuck Hall
Organization: Lake Lanier Homeowners Assoc.

I think the citizens and the Corp should work hard together to preserve this resource and keep it full or over full!

Comment ID: 401
Author Name: Chuck Hall
Organization: Lake Lanier Homeowners Assoc.

I think while the habitat on the Apalachicola River is important the lives and quality of the water in the Atlanta area takes precedence over it!
Also the habitat on Lake Lanier should carry as much weight in this matter! Keeping Lake Lanier full or over full is important for all of us in the basin! When the lake is gone you only get the natural flow and then you will have to take it to God!

Comment ID: 409
Author Name: Frank Russo
Organization:

return to managing the lake consistent with congressionally authorized purposes

---

Comment ID: 412
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association County Commissioners of Georgia

In summary, ACCG urges that any new Water Control Plan not simply tweak or replicate the Corps existing operations. Instead, alternative operating plans must be developed using modern inflow forecasting and modeling to meet the agreed upon performance measures that will manage our shared water resources much more effectively both now and into the future.

We believe that such an update is within the discretion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and that the Corps has the responsibility to more adequately determine the highest and best use of this reservoirs storage given the current conditions within the basin.

Comment ID: 425
Author Name: HUGH R. MCQUEEN
Organization:

My comment is this - according to your pamphlet that you put out, West point Lake was designed for recreational purposes...not for a source of drinking water for the city of Atlanta!! So, with all due respect, do your jobs in respect for which the lake was intended. Not for a political tool for those who would use it as a political issue.

Comment ID: 434
Author Name: Pam
Organization:

Please save Lake Lanier!! The Apalachicola area doesn't need our lake's water, they are doing fine on their own. At the end of May 2008 our family vacationed in the Apalachicola/St. George Island area and they had more water in the area than I've seen in the Lanier area for several years.
How can a tiny lake like Lanier be expected to provide water to the entire Alabama/Florida area?

Comment ID: 435
Author Name: Nolton Johnson
Organization:

The EIS and Revised WCP are long over due for the ACF in my opinion.

Comment ID: 438
Author Name: Steven Voige
Organization:

Lanier's "Fall Pool" should be a higher priority. Obvious levels can not be explained to my understanding. Lakes below Lanier have their own tributaries why is Lanier with its 1000 sq. mile basin being drawn down when lakes downstream have basins equaling 2-5 times the catch basin area?

Fix it!

Comment ID: 441
Author Name: Miller Stevens
Organization:

I happen to know they have plenty of water downstream we are in a Draught - we need the lake to be managed correctly for the first time in History our water entertainment drinking water home values etc

---

Comment ID: 445
Author Name: David Sargent
Organization:

* Have corp manager’s report to someone?? My own Congressman does not know who they report to.

Comment ID: 447
Author Name:
Organization:

What a bunch of B.S.

Comment ID: 453
Author Name: Patsy M Street
Organization:

I have heard that an earthen Dam will have a certain lifetime. What is the lifetime of Lanier and is there a way we can extend the life of the lake. Seems to me a drought would be a great time to do some work and it may be timely & cheaper.

Comment ID: 456
Author Name: Ben Hampton
Organization:

Corps position - said everything they tried to do something - they were stopped by the courts. Get legislators to help draft legislation to help solve the problem.

Comment ID: 461
Author Name: RPM
Organization: Boat Dealer

To long for lake recovery after lake levels are dropped

Comment ID: 468
Author Name: Ethyl L. Ault
Organization:

We need to protect West Point Lake and Dam.

* Return to managing the lake consistent with Congressionally authorized purposes

---

Comment ID: 469
Author Name: Robbie Nichols
Organization:

3. Manage lake as congress authorized

Comment ID: 480
Author Name: Nicholas Grillo
Organization:

Having attended USACOE meetings I understand the demands being placed on the Corps throughout-out the ACF system by state and federal requirements. We have been told the governing manual used by the Corps to manage the ACF system was written in 1958. Obviously the demands on the system have drastically changed in the past 50 years, and a new operating manual is needed.

Comment ID: 481
Author Name:
Organization:

WE have lived on Lake Lanier for 16 years and our perception of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Core) has not changed;

Turns their backs on adequate water levels:

a typical government agency that wastes money and accomplishes nothing!
NOW, this Water Control Manual Update has far too many inputs (as experienced at your community meeting)!! This should be a simple task. You will never complete it in a timely manner with all the inputs you are looking at.

Comment ID: 482
Author Name: City of Oscarville
Organization: City of Oscarville

Lake management. The Corp of Engineers has managed the lake for over 50 years. If after this time you still need an additional ten years to write a water management plan then something is drastically wrong. What can you possible learn from these scoping meetings that you do not already know and why would it take ten years to implement it? Who is actually in charge of lake management the Corp, DNR or EPA? Closing comments. While the Corp is well schooled in military matters who among you is schooled in management of a major resource as Lake Lanier?

Is it time to turn the management of Lake Lanier over to the State of Georgia?

Comments for the Corp of Engineers Scoping meeting Submitted by the concerned citizens of Oscarville Stated purpose of the scoping meeting held October 29,2008 in Gainesville, Georgia is to balance needs including: Navigation, hydropower, flood damage reduction, recreation, fish and wildlife, water quality and water supply. Scoping meeting continued.

Comment ID: 485
Author Name: George Ehrhardt
Organization:

Dear Corps of Engineers, I am writing to give you my views of what needs to be accomplished

by your update of the Water Control Manual for Lake Lanier. First, and most importantly, is the time frame for your new manual. A new manual for 2010 will be of little use to the citizenry of North Georgia.

The current problem caused by the old manual is that it did not take into account the huge growth in population of the greater Atlanta area. The large in-migration of people into North Georgia is said to cause at least a doubling of that population by the year 2060. That is the year the new manual should be positioned to take care o

---

Comment ID: 487
Author Name: Melvyn & Gail Smith
Organization:

We appreciate the opportunity to have input into the process and hope that changes to "The Water Control Manual" will be completed/implemented in a timely manner.

Comment ID: 494
Author Name: Tom Oliver
Organization: Hall County Government Board of Commissioners

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Hall County Board of Commissioners is pleased to have this opportunity to comment on the proposed plan update referenced above.

As you are aware, the current plan hasn't been updated in over fifty years. Since the last update, conditions in the river basin have dramatically changed. In the 1950's, the river system easily provided for the small human populations living within the basin. At the same time, the Buford Dam enabled water flows to be controlled to ensure consistency in flow throughout, including hydropower, water management, and water quality. No longer was the Chattahoochee "wadeable" or "bursting at the banks" at the mercy of Mother Nature. Today, with the addition of the West Point Dam, the river system provides water to some five million Georgians, supplies critical peak electrical power to the southeast, and provides fresh water to fuel a significant seafood industry in Apalachicola Bay. Georgia contains over 74% of this river system basin within our state boundaries, and our system has suffered the most in recent years. Especially, here in Hall County at Lake Sidney Lanier. Recent reports state it will be at an all time record low in the coming months.

Comment ID: 503
Author Name: Kit Dunlap
Organization: Hall Chamber of Commerce

We certainly understand that we must share Lake Lanier's waters. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must update the water control manuals for the ACF Basin .....including studies of science, technology and economic impacts.... with the most up-to-date factual information examining new and different ways of operating Lake Lanier and the other Corps projects in the ACF Basin. We must bring the operations of our water resources to the twenty-first century.

Comment ID: 505
Author Name: John and Jodi Wacho
Organization:

In response to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, public scoping meetings, we respectfully submit the following points to consider in rewriting the Operation Manual for the ACF Basin:

3) A contingency plan should be in place for any oversight by the Corps, i.e. when 3 feet of water was let out this past year, how does that get replaced?

Make certain when these other states are claiming there is no water, that this is factual. We physically visited each Corps owned reservoir, power plant owned reservoir, and the rivers and streams in the ACF Basin during these past 2 years. Most are overflowing and only a few are slightly below full pool. With this being the case, why is water and why was water continually

being released from Lake Lanier?

Comment ID: 506
Author Name: Marilyn Haight
Organization:

Please take my concerns into consideration & do whatever you can to insure that someday we will have the lake back to a full pool level, a lake to be enjoyed by all.

Comment ID: 519
Author Name: Brad Jordan
Organization:

Why not during the rainy season, the Corps not allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool? The corp should allow this to happen no later than June or July of 2009.

Comment ID: 529
Author Name: Tim Altman
Organization: Timberidge on Lanier Condominium Association

We must maintain this water source for consumption, wild life and recreation. What is the impact of millions of gallons of waste added to a smaller water base? Would the waste permits be approved based on a water level below 1530, 1520?
The bottom line is that a better job must be done in protecting this resource

---

Comment ID: 530
Author Name: Lisa H. Howell
Organization:

-Consider dredging the cove at the GA 400 bridge and addressing the siltation issues that have arisen from the construction and water treatment plants. Their unexcused neglect to the lake and it's value has created an eye sore. The City of Cumming and the County of Forsyth should want to make this location on the lake look better due to the fact that is the only true major Hwy./Interstate that shows Lake Lanier.

Comment ID: 532
Author Name: Jim Geist
Organization:

I was out of town on business on October 29th and was unable to attend the public meeting that was held in Gainesville. At the last public meeting, which was a couple of years ago I tried to make the point that the water shed that flows into Lake Lanier was simply geographically too small to meet any reasonable projected water needs for the relatively huge geographical area that Lake Lanier is asked to support.

Based on this fact alone, disregarding the current draught, the water shortage that we are currently experiencing that is attributed to the draught, was an inevitable occurrence that I suggested and continue to suggest can only be alleviated with a significant increase in the water reservoir capacity within the system which would allow for a significantly more sensitive release of water from Lanier based on a minimal lake level and lake inflow.

Comment ID: 543
Author Name: Lee Bitzer
Organization:

I understand that you are trying to share this water with all, how ever the rules that you are and have been using make no sense today. True we have been in a drought for the last several years, but you have done nothing!!!!
What has to be done to wake this government agency up ????? Having to take years to rewrite a manual to change the way you operate after looking the other way for years is poor.
You had to see what was happening to this area over the years buy you chose to NOT ADDRESS it.
Lets cut through the RED TAPE and do the right thing NOW before its to late.

Thanks for letting me vent and hope you will take action.

Comment ID: 546
Author Name: John E. Webb
Organization:

Full benefit by all parties must start at the beginning of the basin, if the Lake Lanier project is allowed to remain at the bottom of the pool the people who use the lake for business and pleasure suffer from undue hardship.

Comment ID: 550
Author Name: Todd Bitzer
Organization:

Please be advised that it is my opinion that the Corp needs to revised it's plans and operations for Lake Sidney Lanier.

Comment ID: 554
Author Name: John Gundlach
Organization:

I don't understand how Alabama and Florida can honestly place a claim on Lake Lanier and the watershed above it. In the whole ACF basin, Lake Lanier represents about 5% of the entire watershed area. Why are they so greedy that they feel like they should have a stake in the very small basin that supports the largest city in the southeast?

Comment ID: 557
Author Name: Terry Donnenwirth
Organization:

We were in Alabama and Florida this summer and observed that they were not low on water as we were. The Chattahoochee River seems to be always almost to the overflow mark now. It used to go up and down with the seasons. When it rains, the dam should be closed to allow the natural rain to flow and not be wasted.

Comment ID: 558
Author Name: mike
Organization:

manual not updated since 1958? since then, how many lake have been created down stream??

Comment ID: 570
Author Name: Bradley Curry, Jr.
Organization:

My particular concern is that the reservoir operations plan be updated as promptly as possible. For reasons that we all understand, this process has been delayed far too long.

Comment ID: 571
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

Q/A Comment: Management of the ACF by the COE has played directly into hands of Alabama & Florida in recent years. They have gotten adequate/more than adequate water so why agree to a change? They have & will drag out the water wars as long as possible!

Comment ID: 597
Author Name: Kent Caldwell
Organization:

3 years ago I purchased my retirement home on Lake Sidney Lanier because I felt it was the best water controlled lake in the state, was I wrong. I'm a full time Florida resident so I have interests in both Florida and Georgia but for the life of me I can not figure the Corps thought process in the continued release of water from lake Lanier even in severe drought conditions. 2

summers ago the corp made a mistake and release approx. 2 ft of water to much and blamed it on a faulty valve, then why not shut off any future releases until you have recovered from that accidental release.

When it was raining in southern GA and not in northern GA did they replace any water back into the Lake? Of course not. If you don't get a grip on the lake releases NOW you will continue to have a MAJOR problem.

Comment ID: 598
Author Name: Brian Otte
Organization:

I don't see a higher lake level of 1073 as being a good alternative. The challenge to keeping Lanier full is its small basin - trying to make the lake bigger (or higher) could only make maintaining a steady lake level even more difficult.

Comment ID: 616
Author Name: Craig Grier
Organization:

Please stop draining all water except that what is needed for life support.

Comment ID: 619
Author Name:
Organization:

Please find someone who can manage this area effectively.

Comment ID: 635
Author Name: O.W. McGowan
Organization:

In other words follow the original congressional purpose for the lake

---

Comment ID: 639
Author Name: Patrick Brock
Organization:

Manage lake according to Congressional intent & purposes

Comment ID: 646
Author Name:
Organization:

I would like to know that all the issues concerning the regulating/controlling the flow of water out of Lake Lanier has been rectified.

Comment ID: 647
Author Name:
Organization:

I would like to know that all the issues concerning the regulating/controlling the flow of water out of Lake Lanier has been rectified.

Comment ID: 651
Author Name: Bert Sykes
Organization:

I cross the Chattahoochee on a daily basis and am amazed at the level the river maintains when we are in drought conditions. Recently, the river levels appear to be higher than just a month ago.

Comment ID: 654

Author Name: Linda Raffield
Organization: FCSWA Secretary

Last but not least to see that there are no winners in this war, all are suffering the numbers, data and statistics are not worth a hill of beans if you don't' put the human equation to it as well. Most importantly that we all work at it together, this should not be the responsibility of any one person or one agency to make the decisions for all the people this concerns and most assuredly everyone should have the willingness and thoughtfulness to work together.

Comment ID: 657
Author Name: Joe Shields
Organization:

MR. SHIELDS: My name is Joe Shields. I work at 260 Dr. Frederick S. Humphrey Street, Apalachicola, Florida 32320. My email address is shieldj@doacs.state.fl.us. I'm going to leave my written comments with the court reporter.

Comment ID: 660
Author Name:
Organization:

The trend for reservoir levels in the Chattahoochee basin for 2008 should be explained by the Corps.

While Lake Lanier set a new record low level on every day of 2008, the remaining reservoirs in the Chattahoochee basin have remained at levels at or *above* their historical averages and/or their normal operating levels. Clearly there must be an explanation for this.

There are several potential explanations. Rainfall in the Lanier portion of the basin could have been lower than in other portions of the basin. The net outtake (municipal water system feeds minus wastewater returned) from Lanier for human use could be a factor. Seepage and evaporation loss could be worse on Lanier than on downstream reservoirs. And, other factors may come into play.

2)Why were some of the daily releases from Buford Dam during October and November of 2007 so large (e.g. between 3500 and 4000 CFS for 24hrs)?

3)While in a different (but adjacent) basin, the relatively good performance of the levels of Allatoona and Carters lakes should also be explained.

4)If net outtake for human consumption from Lanier is a statistically significant part of the problem with the record low lake levels on Lanier, will you provide information that illustrates this?

Comment ID: 661
Author Name: Glenn
Organization:

Please Fill the lake to a respectable level.

Comment ID: 666
Author Name: Jan Hageman
Organization: Resident

Low lake levels endangers human life. If it was all a result of a drought would be one thing, but we endanger human life in order to save 3 endangers species that can not survive on their own. Mother nature considers them the weak and only lets the strong survive. Fighting mother nature is always a losing battle. Please bring the lake levels up so that the aquatic life in Lake Lanier can get back to a life of normalcy.

Comment ID: 671
Author Name: Laurie Hageman
Organization:

Atlanta needs this water yet the Feds say Atlanta doesn't have rights to this water. If all this water originates from a water basin that lies completely in Georgia then why does Atlanta not have total rights over where this water goes?

Comment ID: 689
Author Name: arnold hall
Organization: none

GOVERNOR CHARLIE CRISP, YOU AND THE WORTHLESS GOVERNOR CAN TAKE YOUR MUSSELLS AND SHOVE THEM .....I THINK YOU BOTH AND HATE FILLED HALF MEN THAT ARE TOTALLY WORTHLESS. AND LETS NOT FORGET THE SPINELESS WIMP SONNY PERDUE WHO DESPERATLY NEED A BACKBONE. THE WORTHLESS GOVERNOR I MENTIONED AT THE TOP IS THE ALABAMA GOVERNOR, I HOPE YOUR WORTHLESS GRUDGE FIGHT WILL BRING YOU TONS OF SORROW IN THE FUTURE.

Other (Water Resources)

Comment ID: 29
Author Name: Van Lewis
Organization:

Another thing that I want to complain about in particular is the United States subsidy, the federal government subsidy for and the state government's persistence in creating more and more larger and larger what are called sanitary sewer systems, flush toilets. A flush toilet might have been a good invention when it was invented hundreds of years ago, but there are too many people in the world now for us to continue to abuse our freshwater resources and our human urinary and fecal resources, which are fertilizers by mixing them together. We, the taxpayers, pay enormous amounts of money creating these dinosaurs that mix these two valuable resources and by mixing them, destroying them and make enormous problems, physical problems and financial problems. We are wasting money. We are wasting water. We are wasting fertilizer, all three, just massive amounts. If you live in the city, the city charges you to give you freshwater. You fertilize it in your toilet. You send it back to them, and they charge you again when you send them that fertilizer. They got you coming and going. It's all a mistake. We need to be doing what Mother Nature does with these resources, which is compost them. Mother Nature has been taken animal fecal, and urinary resources for hundreds and millions of years and doing the right thing with them, feeding the plants with them, feeding bacteria, feeding fungi, feeding plants. That's what we need to be doing, and there is a system for it. The State of Florida owns quite a few of them in state parks around here. It's a composting toilet. You get rid of your water bill, half of it; get rid of your sewer bill, half of it, and you come out with a valuable final product. You don't waste the water. You get fertilizer out of the system, and it's what we need, not in a few state parks around. We need millions and millions of these systems, and we need to make flush toilets illegal. They are destroying us.

we need to make flush toilets illegal. They are destroying us. It used to be part of what made it possible for us to live without disease, but now they are destroying our resources, and they are our enemy. They used to be our friend. They are no longer our friend. They are our enemy now, and we have to stop making these systems. We have to use rational systems. We have to use biological systems. We have too many people now to be using these old antiquated systems. We continue to spend billions and billions and billions every year making bigger and bigger and bigger dinosaurs. It's all a mistake. We have to stop it. We have to do a better system. Atlanta wants our water so they can flush toilets. That's the main thing they need it for is flushing toilets and washing cars and wasting water in other ways, and the governor of Georgia says that all we need it for is a few muscles in the river. He's an idiot or he's a liar. I don't know which it is, but he's an idiot or he's a liar, and I hope the Corps of Engineers will take seriously their responsibility to help the United States of America instead of to destroy it like it's doing now. One of the biggest ways that they could help is to end, to teach the country to end the production of these massive, massively mistaken, massively expensive and destructive sewer systems. We don't need them. We need to use the water on site that we use, and not create anymore black water. That's what toilet water is called, black water. We need to use our gray water and quit making black water so that's what I have to say about it. We can save the Apalachicola River by stopping up all of those and making everybody use compost toilets.

Mother Nature is a guide to us, and we need to be paying attention. Thank you.

Comment ID: 35
Author Name: Keith Shannon
Organization:

Corps of Engineers needs to realize that all water that falls within the state of Georgia belongs to the state of Georgia, not to Alabama and not to Florida.

Comment ID: 37
Author Name: Carol A. Couch
Organization: GA EPD

The Chattahoochee River rises in the Blue Ridge Mountains in northeastern Georgia and flows through Atlanta to the southwest until it turns south and forms, at its western bank, the border between the States of Georgia and Alabama. Along the way, the Chattahoochee River runs through the Georgia towns and cities of
West Point, Columbus, and Fort Gaines. The Chattahoochee River joins the Flint River at Lake Seminole at the Florida border. Upon crossing into Florida, the Chattahoochee River becomes the Apalachicola River and empties into the Apalachicola Bay in the Gulf of Mexico. The Chattahoochee River is part of what is known as the ACF River Basin. The ACF Basin covers parts of the Blue Ridge, Piedmont, and Coastal Plain with 74 percent of the basin lying within Georgia, 15 percent in Alabama, and 11 percent in Florida.

B. Lake Lanier Lake Lanier is located near the headwaters of the Chattahoochee River, and the flow in the Chattahoochee River into and below Lake Lanier in the upper portion of the ACF Basin is small, particularly in comparison with the much higher flows downstream in Middle and Southern Georgia and in Florida. Only 6% of the drainage area of the ACF Basin flows into Lake Lanier. Yet, Lake Lanier provides the majority of storage capacity (64%) among the federal reservoirs within the ACF Basin. As the Corps has repeatedly acknowledged, since Lake Lanier, when drawn down, can take a long time, even several years, to refill, particular care must be given to conserve and protect the water stored in it.

C. The Vital Role of Lake Lanier and the Upper Chattahoochee
River in Meeting Georgia's Water Supply Needs It is the policy of the State of Georgia that its waters are to be managed prudently to meet the needs of its citizens, and to protect and preserve Georgia's environment and natural resources. O.C.G.A. § 12-5-21(a). Georgia regulates municipal and industrial water withdrawals pursuant to a statutory framework that requires persons seeking to withdraw more than 100,000 gallons of water per day to obtain a permit from the State. O.C.G.A. §§ 12-5-21(b), 12-5-31. An applicant for a water withdrawal permit must submit detailed information to allow the State to determine, among other things, that the applicant's need for the withdrawal is reasonable, that the applicant will take appropriate measures to conserve water, and that the applicant's use of water will not have unreasonably adverse effects on other water users. O.C.G.A. § 12-5-31; DNR Rule 391-3-6-.07. In the Metropolitan Atlanta area, the State will not issue a permit for any new or expanded water withdrawal unless such withdrawal is consistent with the Water Supply and Water Conservation Plan of the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District. O.C.G.A. § 12-5-584(d)(3). The State of Georgia has enacted a comprehensive statewide water plan that will guide regional water plans to be developed throughout the State. The Chattahoochee River is the primary source of water supply to the majority of Metropolitan North Georgia's more than 4 million people. Roughly 75% of the municipal and industrial water supply for the ten county region served by the Atlanta Regional Commission, for example, comes from the Chattahoochee River/Lake Lanier system. Current needs for water from the Chattahoochee River could not be met without withdrawals directly from Lake Lanier and coordinated releases from Lake Lanier that augment flows in the Chattahoochee River. In 2007, approximately 440 million gallons per day of water were withdrawn from the Chattahoochee River north of Whitesburg, Georgia, including Lake Lanier. In addition, approximately 257 million gallons per day of water were returned to the river and lake in that same area. Situated as the Atlanta area is toward the uppermost geographical confines of a relatively narrow upper Chattahoochee River drainage system, the options for solutions to regional water needs are very few in number.

Comment ID: 504
Author Name: Katheryn Dunlap
Organization: Metropolitan North GA Water Planning District

Water use in the metropolitan area is reasonable by any measure. The net amount of water withdrawn for water supply from Lake Lanier and the river downstream of the dam accounts for 1% of the flows at the Florida line in normal years, 2% in drought years.

Comment ID: 545
Author Name: John E. Webb
Organization:

There is more water in Florida then there is in Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina and Tennessee combined.

Comment ID: 604
Author Name: FRED ROBBE
Organization:

As both a resident of Sandy Springs, GA and owner of lake property on Lake Lanier I am doubly impacted by the management of Lake Lanier, both for recreation and also drinking and watering lawns, shrubbery, car washing, etc.

Comment ID: 618
Author Name: Barry Smith
Organization:

As a tax paying citizen the negative economic impact combined with the drinking water needs to the Atlanta Metro Area need to be protected.

Comment ID: 647
Author Name:
Organization:

Since this lake provides so much water to Atlanta and the surrounding areas, I would like to know that we will have water to live by and water to sustain the various industries whose livelihood depends on it.

Comment ID: 660
Author Name:
Organization:

The trend for reservoir levels in the Chattahoochee basin for 2008 should be explained by the Corps.

While Lake Lanier set a new record low level on every day of 2008, the remaining reservoirs in the Chattahoochee basin have remained at levels at or *above* their historical averages and/or their normal operating levels. Clearly there must be an explanation for this.

There are several potential explanations. Rainfall in the Lanier portion of the basin could have been lower than in other portions of the basin. The net outtake (municipal water system feeds minus wastewater returned) from Lanier for human use could be a factor. Seepage and evaporation loss could be worse on Lanier than on downstream reservoirs. And, other factors may come into play.

1)What is the lingering effect on the Lake Lanier pool level from the 2 foot gauge error that occurred in 2006?

Comment ID: 663
Author Name: J. Gordon Shuler
Organization:

Our river and our bay deserve to be protected with adequate water flow.

Other (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 2
Author Name:
Organization:

My family and I enjoy outdoor and recreational activities on many parts of the Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, not just near our home. Our chief concern at present is maintaining and preserving the Flint in its present
natural"" state to the greatest extent possible. I don't favor further damming of the Flint if it can be avoided.

Comment ID: 29
Author Name: Van Lewis
Organization:

Another thing that I want to complain about in particular is the United States subsidy, the federal government subsidy for and the state government's persistence in creating more and more larger and larger what are called sanitary sewer systems, flush toilets. A flush toilet might have been a good invention when it was invented hundreds of years ago, but there are too many people in the world now for us to continue to abuse our freshwater resources and our human urinary and fecal resources, which are fertilizers by mixing them together. We, the taxpayers, pay enormous amounts of money creating these dinosaurs that mix these two valuable resources and by mixing them, destroying them and make enormous problems, physical problems and financial problems. We are wasting money. We are wasting water. We are wasting fertilizer, all three, just massive amounts. If you live in the city, the city charges you to give you freshwater. You fertilize it in your toilet. You send it back to them, and they charge you again when you send them that fertilizer. They got you coming and going. It's all a mistake. We need to be doing what Mother Nature does with these resources, which is compost them. Mother Nature has been taken animal fecal, and urinary resources for hundreds and millions of years and doing the right thing with them, feeding the plants with them, feeding bacteria, feeding fungi, feeding plants. That's what we need to be doing, and there is a system for it. The State of Florida owns quite a few of them in state parks around here. It's a composting toilet. You get rid of your water bill, half of it; get rid of your sewer bill, half of it, and you come out with a valuable final product. You don't waste the water. You get fertilizer out of the system, and it's what we need, not in a few state parks around. We need millions and millions of these systems, and we need to make flush toilets illegal. They are destroying us.

we need to make flush toilets illegal. They are destroying us. It used to be part of what made it possible for us to live without disease, but now they are destroying our resources, and they are our enemy. They used to be our friend. They are no longer our friend. They are our enemy now, and we have to stop making these systems. We have to use rational systems. We have to use biological systems. We have too many people now to be using these old antiquated systems. We continue to spend billions and billions and billions every year making bigger and bigger and bigger dinosaurs. It's all a mistake. We have to stop it. We have to do a better system. Atlanta wants our water so they can flush toilets. That's the main thing they need it for is flushing toilets and washing cars and wasting water in other ways, and the governor of Georgia says that all we need it for is a few muscles in the river. He's an idiot or he's a liar. I don't know which it is, but he's an idiot or he's a liar, and I hope the Corps of Engineers will take seriously their responsibility to help the United States of America instead of to destroy it like it's doing now. One of the biggest ways that they could help is to end, to teach the country to end the production of these massive, massively mistaken, massively expensive and destructive sewer systems. We don't need them. We need to use the water on site that we use, and not create anymore black water. That's what toilet water is called, black water. We need to use our gray water and quit making black water so that's what I have to say about it. We can save the Apalachicola River by stopping up all of those and making everybody use compost toilets. Mother Nature is a guide to us, and we need to be paying attention. Thank you.

Comment ID: 35
Author Name: Keith Shannon
Organization:

But it seems the problem, to me, that that further south lake, I believe it was Lake Woodruff, is the smallest lake with the biggest drainage area, and all the water flowing to it. And from there it

just gets dumped into the ocean. It seems the logical thing to me would to be pick that water up at the outfall of that lake and send it back up to the north part of Lake Lanier and dump it out there to let it run the cycle again. And you can do that with a pipeline or you can do that with a fleet of trucks. And we could charge the state of Alabama and the state of Florida. Let them pay for it since they think that they're on Georgia's water.

It seems the logical thing to me would to be pick that water up at the outfall of that lake and send it back up to the north part of Lake Lanier and dump it out there to let it run the cycle again. And you can do that with a pipeline or you can do that with a fleet of trucks. And we could charge the state of Alabama and the state of Florida. Let them pay for it since they think that they're on Georgia's water. That's my solution.
--
It seems the logical thing to me would to be pick that water up at the outfall of that lake and send it back up to the north part of Lake Lanier and dump it out there to let it run the cycle again. And you can do that with a pipeline or you can do that with a fleet of trucks. And we could charge the state of Alabama and the state of Florida. Let them pay for it since they think that they're on Georgia's water. That's my solution.

Comment ID: 123
Author Name: Berny D. Ilgner
Organization:

One of the primary demands on the water resources in the ACF system is water supply to the Atlanta metro area. Will the study examine water supply options for Atlanta other than drawing water from the ACF system?

Comment ID: 309
Author Name: Gary M Cash
Organization: Just a concerned American

Is it not possible to arrange a convoy of tanker trucks to travel to one of our areas of this country and fill those trucks with some of the flood waters which is overly excess amount and truck it back to the Lanier basin? Thirty or forty trunks carrying 15000-18000 gals of water depending how much they hold would give us close to a million gallons of water that might help us make it through this god awful drought
until your plans get applicable. Cost you say...well how about everyone that uses our basin contribute about 5 dollars to help. Surely everyone who likes to water their lawns, wash their cars, and take a bath wouldn't mind contributing five little dollars to this plan. I should think they would. Lets see...5$ x at least 2,000,000
people =$10,000,000 to pay for this operation. So what do ya say? Can I get a good straight answer to my question? I would really like to know if this quick fix plan is workable. Will be waiting to hear from you as I am unable to attend your Wednesday
meeting due to disabilities. Respectively, Gary M. Cash...Flowery Branch

---

Comment ID: 310
Author Name:
Organization:

How well does the Savannah river district coordinate with the Mobile district regarding water sources and interbasin transfers? The State is divide in half by these offices.

Comment ID: 398
Author Name: Cile Gierhahn
Organization: Lakefront Homeowner

GA should charge AL and FL for our water. There is no motivation for them to conserve or find alternatives as long as we give it to them and we sacrifice. I understand there were no water restrictions in these states while our lawns suffered. Something's not right here!!!!

Comment ID: 548
Author Name: John E. Webb
Organization:

If you compare the average annual rainfall received by Mobile and Mobile Bay to the rainfall received by Gainesville, GA you would want to start pumping water North instead of demanding that more water be allow to flow south.

Comment ID: 654
Author Name: Linda Raffield
Organization: FCSWA Secretary

First there should be a limit put on what is already there, not allowing further development until the situation has been either controlled by Mother Nature or an alternative water supply plan.

Other (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 6
Author Name: Heinz J. Mueller
Organization: EPA

EPA recommends that the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to control sediment runoff and manage stormwater around the ACF system lakes should also be made part of the ACF Water Control Manual.

Comment ID: 36
Author Name: Tony Owens
Organization: MeadWestvaco

Federal law allows local communities to contribute to the construction of Corps reservoirs and essentially reserve a portion of the project's storage for local consumption. At the time of construction of Buford Dam, the Corps was authorized to accept funds from states and their political subdivisions toward the construction of authorized flood control projects in order to "provide additional storage capacity for domestic water supply or other conservation storage," as long as "local agencies" incurred the increase in cost and agreed to "utilize such additional storage capacity in a manner consistent with Federal uses and purposes." Pub. L. No. 75-208, 50 Stat. 515, 518 (1937), codified as amended at 33 U.S.C. § 70lh. State and local interests might have taken steps then which would have eased the current difficulties to some extent. However, local authorities in Atlanta did not avail themselves of that opportunity. The sprawling development that has emerged in North Georgia since that time has done nothing to change the longstanding legal principles governing Lake Lanier and the other ACF reservoirs. Only Congress can do that.

CONSERVATION

Conservation (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 8
Author Name: Tiffany Stone
Organization: Lake Lanier Resident

This Lake is precious to the state of GA for many reasons. Preservation of this lake is imperative and ways to conserve water in Lake Lanier must be updated in this new manual.

Comment ID: 369
Author Name:
Organization:

I have a boat on Lanier, and look forward to the day when high water returns , but I do not believe that water levels should be kept high for the sake of esthetics and for the benefit of the lake property owners at the expense of endangered species down river. Water conserving measures are working in the Atlanta area and it is good for people to learn how to do so.

Comment ID: 377
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The State of Georgia owns the water in the system and should be allowed to dictate where it is utilized for human consumption. Human consumption should take predence over all other uses within the system. Water conservation methods should be analyzed for effectiveness and plans implemented across the entire system, not just in Atlanta and North Georgia.

Comment ID: 387
Author Name: F T Davis Jr
Organization: Atlanta Regional Commission

The first responsibility of government at all levels with respect to any inland river is to make water available to support human life in the rivers' basin.

It is entirely reasonable to require proper conservation of the resources for other uses also, including health of other species, farming, hydro generation, navigation, and other purposes. But it is not reasonable for the first priority not to be water for use by humans along the waterways, especially in drought conditions.

I would personally support a prompt, independent study to take off the political heat and homecooking, so that the Corps could adopt a plan which would be in the nation's interest.

All options should be on the table, from mandatory conservation to new reservoirs along all three of the rivers.

This is a personal comment by a life-long Georgia resident concerned with the quality of life of all citizens, our environment, and the excess of heat over light being generated, and does not represent the position of ARC or of any other organization.

Comment ID: 402
Author Name: L Levi
Organization:

Incorporate use of water conservation measures in WCM update

Comment ID: 769
Author Name: Walter Anderson
Organization: City of Berkeley Lake

The facts would suggest that the impact of conserving water in Lake Lanier for consumption and recreation does not constitute a large percentage of the water flowing into Florida from this watershed. As a result, I think the Atlanta local use (both drinking water and recreation) should be emphasized more than the downstream issues in managing water flow through Buford Dam.

Comment ID: 802
Author Name: Steve Burrell
Organization:

We have been severely affected by the consistent drop in water levels. With the growing population and demand for water, coupled with drought conditions, it doesn't make any sense to send enormous amounts of water downstream. Other lakes in our region, like lake Oconee, are near full pool even with the drought. We need change to occur quickly or Lake Lanier will be little more than a mud hole.

Conservation (Water Resources)

Comment ID: 37
Author Name: Carol A. Couch
Organization: GA EPD

C. The Vital Role of Lake Lanier and the Upper Chattahoochee
River in Meeting Georgia's Water Supply Needs It is the policy of the State of Georgia that its waters are to be managed prudently to meet the needs of its citizens, and to protect and

preserve Georgia's environment and natural resources. O.C.G.A. § 12-5-21(a). Georgia regulates municipal and industrial water withdrawals pursuant to a statutory framework that requires persons seeking to withdraw more than 100,000 gallons of water per day to obtain a permit from the State. O.C.G.A. §§ 12-5-21(b), 12-5-31. An applicant for a water withdrawal permit must submit detailed information to allow the State to determine, among other things, that the applicant's need for the withdrawal is reasonable, that the applicant will take appropriate measures to conserve water, and that the applicant's use of water will not have unreasonably adverse effects on other water users. O.C.G.A. § 12-5-31; DNR Rule 391-3-6-.07. In the Metropolitan Atlanta area, the State will not issue a permit for any new or expanded water withdrawal unless such withdrawal is consistent with the Water Supply and Water Conservation Plan of the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District. O.C.G.A. § 12-5-584(d)(3). The State of Georgia has enacted a comprehensive statewide water plan that will guide regional water plans to be developed throughout the State. The Chattahoochee River is the primary source of water supply to the majority of Metropolitan North Georgia's more than 4 million people. Roughly 75% of the municipal and industrial water supply for the ten county region served by the Atlanta Regional Commission, for example, comes from the Chattahoochee River/Lake Lanier system. Current needs for water from the Chattahoochee River could not be met without withdrawals directly from Lake Lanier and coordinated releases from Lake Lanier that augment flows in the Chattahoochee River. In 2007, approximately 440 million gallons per day of water were withdrawn from the Chattahoochee River north of Whitesburg, Georgia, including Lake Lanier. In addition, approximately 257 million gallons per day of water were returned to the river and lake in that same area. Situated as the Atlanta area is toward the uppermost geographical confines of a relatively narrow upper Chattahoochee River drainage system, the options for solutions to regional water needs are very few in number.

Comment ID: 66
Author Name: Wilton Rooks
Organization:

5. Require all water users on all three rivers to document their water consumptive uses and to establish plans to reduce their consumption. This goes beyond conservation. It includes fixing leaks and making investments in better industrial uses of water including power plant cooling technologies. I realize this might be outside the purview of the water control plan, but the Corps can use its influence to get the states to require this documentation and plan. This would include returning all water taken out of the rivers back to the same river rather than exporting water needed in the ACF to the Atlantic Ocean as is done now.

Comment ID: 295
Author Name: Kathy Nguyen
Organization:

Metro Atlanta is committed to aggressive water conservation. The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is already far ahead of the rest of the basin in this effort.

--
Metro Atlanta is committed to aggressive water conservation. The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is already far ahead of the rest of the basin in this effort.

Comment ID: 369
Author Name:
Organization:

I have a boat on Lanier, and look forward to the day when high water returns , but I do not believe that water levels should be kept high for the sake of esthetics and for the benefit of the lake property owners at the expense of endangered species down river. Water conserving measures are working in the Atlanta area and it is good for people to learn how to do so.

Comment ID: 371
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

* Metro Atlantas use of water in the ACF Basin is reasonable by any measure. Currently metro

Atlanta uses only 1 to 2% of the water in the ACF Basin as measured by the flow at the Florida line. The new Water Control Plan should be designed to accommodate withdrawals consistent with projections contained in the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning Districts Water Supply and Conservation Plan.

* Metro Atlanta is committed to aggressive water conservation. The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is already far ahead of the rest of the basin in this effort.

Comment ID: 377
Author Name: Jonathon Heard
Organization: City of Cumming

The State of Georgia owns the water in the system and should be allowed to dictate where it is utilized for human consumption. Human consumption should take predence over all other uses within the system. Water conservation methods should be analyzed for effectiveness and plans implemented across the entire system, not just in Atlanta and North Georgia.

Comment ID: 402
Author Name: L Levi
Organization:

require upgrading and repair of those municipal water distribution systems that obtain water from ACF basin surface waters.

Comment ID: 423
Author Name:
Organization:

It seems to me that we need to limit the use of water consistently across the states. I am an Alpharetta Resident for 14 years and recently I moved part time to Jacksonville FL. I see so much water wasted watering lawns, etc. I also have a place in Panama City Beach FL and see the same level of waste in play. If FL doesn't have any watering restrictions or other controls in place, why are we sending GA water to FL. This has puzzled me for several years. Just thinking they might need to provide for themselves. Thank you.

Comment ID: 440
Author Name: Kevin Herbert
Organization:

A combination of improved water treatment facilities in Atlanta and higher "full pool" levels are needed. Water conservation in the city of Atlanta is not on the local government agenda like it should be. There should be something enacted to force better water treatment and conservation that would limit the amount of water release downstream. We need swift action.

Comment ID: 450
Author Name: Sidell Tilghman
Organization:

1. If Georgia has water restrictions, why not Alabama and Florida? You know, just to be fair.

Comment ID: 485
Author Name: George Ehrhardt
Organization:

At the meeting of the governors of Georgia, Florida and Alabama in the Spring of 2008, the governor of Alabama stated that his demands for water from Lake Lanier would be abated when the residents of that city were running out of water.....and that is fuzzy rhetoric. When the citizenry runs that low on water, there will be no other source of water available for them! You had best plan now for water availability for Georgians well into the 21st century.

Comment ID: 523
Author Name: Jack Griffeth
Organization:

A recent study released by the Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority called for increased water conservation and expansion of existing reservoirs. While Georgia citizens are conserving and should continue to conserve water more than ever, Lake Lanier's capacity continues to shrink with every rainfall which erodes the exposed banks.

Comment ID: 565
Author Name: Haywood Smith
Organization:

I have long been "green" when it comes to water conservation. I use rain barrels and cisterns to irrigate my vegetables and plantings. I haven't watered my lawn in two years. I use low-flow fixtures and appliances. I'm all for good conservation of our resources, and I hope the Corps will consider basic human needs above commercial ones.

Comment ID: 570
Author Name: Bradley Curry, Jr.
Organization:

Conservation and waste water treatment in the Atlanta region are the best in the state and substantially better than anything going on in Alabama or Florida.

Comment ID: 609
Author Name: Paul Kelman
Organization: Central Atlanta Progress/Atlanta Downtown Improvement District

1] Water use in metropolitan Atlanta is reasonable by any objective measure. The net amount of water withdrawn for water supply from Lake Lanier or the Chattahoochee River downstream of Buford Dam accounts for only one percent of the flows at the Florida-Georgia line in normal years, and two percent in drought years. Metro Atlanta is committed to aggressive water conservation. The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is already far ahead of the rest of the basin in this effort. The District is currently revising its Water Supply and Conservation Plan to be even more aggressive.

Comment ID: 735
Author Name: Carol Schwarz
Organization:

Conspicuously lacking in the dialogue between the 3 States is the "C" word -CONSERVATION! It only seems to be invoked in the Atlanta area during droughts, then dies off. A strong public relations campaign encouraging CONSERVATION in all localities proximate to and effected by the ACF, in addition to adding conservation criteria as a prerequisite to increase flow to an area. For example, if the good people in Atlanta Metro or Apalachicola are crying for more flow, consideration for increasing flow would not be considered until CONSERVATION standards are met. This provides for public by-in and certainly education towards an evaporating limited supply of water.

Comment ID: 807
Author Name:
Organization:

Georgia has been on water restrictions for several years. We decreased the amount of water being used. We certainly can do better and this is an area we all need to work on to improve. However I feel Florida and Alabama also need to be on water restrictions. We do not hear that they have been restricted in any way. They need to conserve the water as well as the Georgians.
The water demands of this area is great and if everyone doesn't work at conserving water we all are in trouble.

Conservation (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 284
Author Name: James Bishop

Organization:

conservation is important in a time like this for sure; however, there is only so much we can conserve.

Comment ID: 380
Author Name: Susie Gajewski
Organization: Sugar Hill City Councilwoman

Lake Lanier was originally created as a recreational reservoir. Since its creation more and more cities, counties and states have made claims to this water source. Please take a look at ways to reduce the release of water while informing some regions that they may need to look into their own reservoirs for the future.

Comment ID: 606
Author Name: William A. Cooper
Organization: Cobb Chamber of Commerce

Metro Atlanta is committed to aggressive water conservation. The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District is far ahead of the rest of the basin in these efforts and is currently revising its Water Supply and Conservation Plan to be even more aggressive. Thank you for your consideration of this request, the Cobb Chamber stands ready to assist you in this effort in any way we can. Sincerely, William A. Cooper President and CEO

ALTERNATIVES

West Point - Raise Winter Pool (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 3
Author Name: Gayle O\\\'Neal
Organization:

As far as the lake level in West Point Lake being dropped to such a low winter level in order to be prepared for the next flood"" this is absolutely ridiculous. When the first flood condition since the lake was impounded in 1973 the lake was at full pool and we handled it. Now I understand that measures have to be taken to protect the integrity of the Dam but our area has tried to be good stewards of the area by controlling development around the lake area to prevent erosion and to control the draw from the lake for drinking water.

Comment ID: 23
Author Name: Mr. Tom and Chris Hunkele
Organization: Lakeside Fitness & Therapy LLC

By copy of this letter - both of us designate the West Point Lake Advisory Council to represent our views on the serious issues facing West Point lake. We are requesting that changes to the Corps control and operation of West Point Lake include:• Maintaining a minimum lake level of between 633 and 635 MSL • Maximize positive economic impact • Manage the Lake consistent with Congressionally authorized purposes • Restoring and maintaining recreational facilities • Ensure recreational access fore low-income and minority families.

Comment ID: 77
Author Name: Richard C. Wolfe
Organization: Troup County Board of Commissioners

We implore you to consider six critical issues that we have identified though study groups which are vital to West Point Lake and they are as follows: • Maintain minimum lake level of633-635 msl
• Maximize positive economic impact • Return to managing the Lake consistent with Congressionally authorized purposes • Restore and maintain recreational facilities • Ensure recreational access for low income and minority families •

Comment ID: 82
Author Name: Vince Foody

Organization:

The Lake must be managed for consistent full pool (633 to 635) and the cleanliness and quality of the water must be maintained.

Comment ID: 116
Author Name: Tommy Mike
Organization:

With the new regulations coming on board, I would hope to see regulations that would set forth higher lake levels in the spring much sooner than May 15th, mainly because the lake was built with flood control as a primary objective, but, also, it was one of the first lakes ever built with recreation as a primary objective. And from a fisheries perspective, West Point Lake has been one of the best bass fishing and sport fishing lakes in general throughout the United States. And one of the things that we can do to insure that continues is to maintain a higher lake level much earlier than May 15th. May 15th is when West Point was supposed to be full, and I think it needs to be backed up to, say, March. And I know that that will not endanger us having a flood, because we've already had a 100-year flood, and the lake only came up three or four or five feet. So the lake can take care of a 100-year flood type situation. So by keeping the lake level higher earlier in the spring, late winter, early, early spring, you will ensure a much higher survival rate of the sport fish in the lake which will increase the fish population, and the people who come and fish the lake will have a much greater benefit. We've already seen that happen in 2008 with the higher lake level. The survival rate of the spawned sport fish will be much greater, probably 50 or 100 times greater than it normally is when the lake is down in the spring and early summer. So if we could encourage the lake level to be up in the spring for a longer period of time that would benefit the health in the fishery. As far as the lake being down in the wintertime, in the dead of winter, it is not detrimental from a fisheries perspective. It won't hurt the fishery if the lake does have to go down the month of January or February or December -- December, January, or February. It would not be the end of the world if the lake did have to go down at that time. But what I'm encouraging is higher lake levels earlier than May 15th, which is what the older regs call for.

Comment ID: 132
Author Name: DANIEL PRICE
Organization:

SINCE I LIVE ON THE UPPER END OF A COVE ON THE LAKE I SEE FIRST HAND THE DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF ERROSION AND UNINTENED SOIL DEPOSITION INTO THE LAKE WHEN LEVELS ARE ALLOWED TO FALL BELOW 633 MSL. PLEASE CONSIDER MINIMIZING THIS THROUGH A MORE CONSISTENT MINIMAL LEVEL ACTION LEVEL.

Comment ID: 167
Author Name:
Organization:

West Point Lake should be maintained at FULL POOL! To see the lake as it stood last summer with drought conditions was horrific. The area crossed by 219 and Mooty Bridge Roads looked like it did BEFORE the dam was completed. Granted, this was an extreme and hopefully unusual set of conditions; but low lake levels have been a continuous source of trouble and this needs to be addressed in my opinion.

Comment ID: 170
Author Name: Sammy Bailey Jr.
Organization:

Please maintain the lake level to the minimum.

Comment ID: 186
Author Name: Wayne Anderson
Organization:

thank you for your concerted effort to keep a full pool at West Point.

Comment ID: 191

Author Name: Kyle W Crawford
Organization:

Why is the rule curve for West Point Lake so dramatically different than the rule curve for any other lake in our basin? Why does winter pool have to be 628 if the corp was able to avoid flooding of West Point, Georgia during May of 2003, when the flood of the century occurred while the lake was at 635. The highest the lake got during that flood was 641 or thereabout, some 6 feet above full pull. Surely there is some common ground that can be agreed upon where winter pool can be raised so that our lake is safely navigable during the off season months.

Comment ID: 207
Author Name: Lillian Ford
Organization:

It is very important to this area to allow water levels to remain such that the lake use can continue year round. We must maintain water storage in the lake.

Comment ID: 219
Author Name: Todd Vinson
Organization:

The plan needs to be updated so the lake can be maintained at a full pool level for more months during the year.

Comment ID: 226
Author Name: Coleman Vice
Organization:

we need the water level at 635 for the growth of the lake and area plus the access for citizens all around the lake is very important - water flow for clean water is very important please listen to the citizens of Troup County for that we can work together in having a wonderful lake for everyone

---

Comment ID: 227
Author Name:
Organization:

Keeping West Point lake at full pool throughout the recreation seasons (March through November) is very important. Keeping winter(off-season) elevation at 632 would allow much better utilization of the lake and would increase the value of the resource compared to lower elevations, but would still provide large amounts of storage for flood control.

With today's technology, weather forecasting and flow control modeling, the entire basin should be managed to maximize lake elevations throughout the basin.

Comment ID: 229
Author Name: marjorie knipp
Organization:

We need your consideration in keeping the water supply in Lake West Point at a full or near full pool.
--
We need your consideration in keeping the water supply in Lake West Point at a full or near full pool.

Comment ID: 234
Author Name: roy spinks
Organization:

A minimal operating level of 633' msl will have a great economic impact on the W Ga area as experienced in 2008 as a result of the stable pool.

This will improve water quality and reduce shoreline erosion as well by stabilizing the water level.

Comment ID: 246
Author Name: Rich Gibson
Organization:

This will ensure improved water quality and reserve so that during drought conditions in the summer, the lake will not be drained. Additionally, this will allow recreational use year round and will greatly increase economic conditions for LaGrange and Troup County.

Comment ID: 249
Author Name: Alan E Trainer
Organization:

Please continue your efforts in maintaining a full pool in West Point Lake.

Comment ID: 261
Author Name: Randy Norred
Organization:

Dropping West Point below 633 has hurt the water quality, caused erosion, effected economics, and many other negative effects.

Comment ID: 314
Author Name: Charles S. Neely
Organization:

I believe winter pool level should exceed 628 MSL and history over the last 30 years would indicate that lower winter pool level could span a shorter period of time than has been the case. The 2008 level this fall seems far more realistic in terms of meeting all of the purposes for which the lake was impounded.

Comment ID: 330
Author Name:
Organization:

Comment:
Always Keep the Lake Level full.

Comment ID: 331
Author Name: Ron Garrett
Organization:

Keep Water level up consistently

Comment ID: 332
Author Name: Nancy H. Green
Organization:

Very concerned about keeping the water level as close to 635 as possible, also concerned about the quality of water with unrestricted growth in Atlanta.

Comment ID: 334
Author Name: Sarah Beth Mallory
Organization:

This lake is important to our area as a source of drinking water, recreation site, and economic opportunity. For West Point Lake to be sustainable body of water and offer opportunities for our citizens and visitors, an adequate level (635msl) of water must be maintained.

Comment ID: 337
Author Name: Terri Brooke
Organization:

Manage the lake to maintain a level of 633.

Comment ID: 356
Author Name: *Robert Parker
Organization:

Keep lake levels @ 630 in winter and full in summer.

Comment ID: 364
Author Name: *Marsha Woodward
Organization:

Keep lake levels at 630-635

Comment ID: 406
Author Name: Robert Johnson
Organization:

It is extremely important that you make every effort to maintain West Point Lake at full pool on a year round basis.

Comment ID: 574
Author Name: G. Eucle Vickery
Organization:

Historically, the lake has been maintained at very low levels between late summer and late spring of the following year to provide for flood storage. The reserved volume for storage has rarely, if ever, been needed during the life of the lake. As a matter of fact, during the 1993 spring flood event, the lake was already at full pool when we received a record 11 inches of rain in less than 12 hours. The rain fell below the Whitesburg flow gauge and even without proper data, the Corps managed to keep the dam and the lake safe as well as areas downstream. Reducing the volume of storage reserved for flood control and using other methods to mitigate flooding, while maintaining a minimum lake elevation of 633 msl, would allow for flood control while ensuring West Point Lake is managed in a manner consistent with Congressional authorized purposes.

Comment ID: 581
Author Name: Molly Link
Organization:

There has been excessive finger pointing among the Corps of Engineers leadership with the lack of reasonable justification for the extreme drop in lake levels and the inconsistencies in the management of the lake levels. My request is that the lake be managed as a recreation lake as authorized by Congress, which would include maintaining a stable lake level through out the year at 633 to 635 feet. This would also include maintaining the lake recreational facilities and launches.

Comment ID: 582
Author Name: Danny Rock
Organization:

]maintain the lake level as close to the full pool as possible

---

Comment ID: 585
Author Name: Calvin Willis
Organization:

Last year I would not have been able to see this glorious sight because there was not enough water at the Marina to allow safe navigation. I pay for my slip assuming that there will be enough

water maintained in the Lake to permit safe operation. The previous plan allowed too much water to be passed south without regard to the impact. As I understand it, the Lake was authorized by Congress in part to be a recreational facility. Failing to maintain the Lake with the minimum pool level of 635 to 633 feet above MSL does not abide by the Congressional intent and therefore should not be accepted in the new plan. Thanks for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

Comment ID: 636
Author Name: Meg McLeod
Organization:

Please keep the lake that was forced on us full! The land was taken with many promises that were not and have not been kept and the citizens of Troup would like for the corp to keep its word!

Comment ID: 817
Author Name: GENE JONES
Organization:

The lake needs to be better managed for the Congressionally authorized purposes. General recreation was one of the purposes. While I understand that flood control was also one of the purposes, dropping the lake as low as it has been, seems really wasteful. 628 is really too low!!!!!

Maintain Full Pool at Lake Lanier (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 42
Author Name: Tom Oliver
Organization: Hall County Government Board of Commissioners

4. We recommend that the Corp of Engineers seriously study and consider the effects of raising Lake Lanier's full pool level from 1,071 feet above sea level to 1,073 feet above sea level thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to Lake Lanier.

Comment ID: 56
Author Name: Buddy Manning
Organization:

I believe that the minimum lake level should be full pool. Never should it go below that if we actually can control it. It makes no sense to me that we would ever let out more water than is coming in

---

Comment ID: 486
Author Name: Jim & Judy Foster
Organization:

After 50 years of growth, it is about time the Corp reviewed this plan. There must be restrictions on the amount of water withdrawn from Lake Lanier, other reservoirs built along the River Basin to meet the demands and more prudent use of the water that is released. With the great demands, Lake Lanier should be allowed to fill beyond full pool during the rainy season and withdrawal should be reduced during times of draught! All communities benefiting from the Lanier withdrawals should be on the same water restrictions as those at Lake Lanier even if they have sufficient water while we are in a draught!

Comment ID: 533
Author Name: Jeanne Beachler
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 567
Author Name: Charles Bannister

Organization: Gwinnett County

The EM I 10-2-3600 3-6 c. (I) states "In addition to the basic economic functions for which the projects were originally authorized and constructed, water management goals now include environmental and social aspects of project regulation. This conforms to public laws dealing with water related activities that were enacted after the authorization of most water control projects. These laws require inclusion of certain aspects of environmental, fish and wildlife, and recreational uses in the management of the projects, or improvement of the environment of the rivers downstream through project regulation." We suggest that keeping Lake Lanier as full as possible meets these goals and helps protect the environment and the economy of north Georgia. We do not believe that the Mobile District's Interim Operations Plan and its modifications meet these goals as required by the COE rules.

Comment ID: 604
Author Name: FRED ROBBE
Organization:

My desire is that the Lake have a consistently high water level, but I know that is impossible. However, it only makes sense to me to be at full level in the summer when it gets the most use.

Comment ID: 606
Author Name: William A. Cooper
Organization: Cobb Chamber of Commerce

5] The water control plan should focus on retaining storage at the top of each basin in order to augment flows at critical times.

Comment ID: 614
Author Name:
Organization:

The Corps should do everything in its power to get Lake Lanier back to full pool! It should not allow any further releases until that is accomplished!

Comment ID: 615
Author Name: Judy Humphreys
Organization:

I cannot believe you believe they are more important than people! After all this time you are taking to redo the manuals our Lake is practically non-existent to owners. Please consider the citizens who live and own here and do something to improve the Lake level to full pool or above.

Comment ID: 625
Author Name: Mike Cooper
Organization:

I would like to see Lanier at 1070 or 1071 as often as possible.

Comment ID: 648
Author Name: Trey
Organization: Wakeboarder

Please let Lanier reach full pool again! When it rains, stop letting the water out!

Comment ID: 662
Author Name:
Organization:

WE NEED TO SAVE THE WATER ON LAKE LANIER AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE!
THE CORP. SHOULD SLOW THE AMOUNT OF WATER BEING SENT DOWN STREAM UNTIL THE LAKE GET'S BACK TO FULL POOL.
WE UNDERSTAND THAT NO ONE CONTROLS THE AMOUNT OF RAIN WE RECEIVE BUT WE CAN LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF WATER RELEASED.

Comment ID: 707
Author Name: Vicki Bentley
Organization:

I support updating the manual to increase water holding in Lake Lanier in order to increase water supply. Water supply, water quantity, and water quality are important concerns to me and my family.

Lake Lanier - Revise Rule Curve (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 8
Author Name: Tiffany Stone
Organization: Lake Lanier Resident

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 14
Author Name: Al Pope
Organization:

Full pool by June 1st • Standards of trigger points for draught conditions

---

Comment ID: 16
Author Name: William D. Rezak
Organization:

I request that you include the following in the new operating guidelines you are now preparing. First, please allow the lake to reach full pool during the rainy season and no later than June 1 each year.

Comment ID: 17
Author Name: Marguerite Daniel
Organization: Athens Boat Club, Inc.

1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 42
Author Name: Tom Oliver
Organization: Hall County Government Board of Commissioners

To Whom it May Concern: The Hall County, Georgia Board of Commissioners is keenly interested in the outcome of the Anny Corp of Engineers work to revise their ACF Water Control Manual. We understand that this manual will have a significant effect on the Chattahoochee River Basin and Lake Lanier in Georgia. Listed below are a few points that the Hall County Commission would like for the Corp of Engineers to consider as they revise the Water Control Manual: 1. During the rainy season we would recommend the Corps of Engineers allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1st of each year;

Comment ID: 79
Author Name: James Griffin
Organization:

We are Lake Lanier residents and have great concerns regarding the Corps' oversight of Lake Lanier during the last 5 years. Regarding the water level of the lake the following comments need to be made: - During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 80
Author Name: Greg and Mary Drummer
Organization:

We are and have been very concerned about the ever-decreasing lake levels. The Lake Lanier Association has kept us apprised of the ongoing decisions made by the Army Corps. We would like: -for the Corps to allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1, regulating the water levels accordingly during the rainy season;

Comment ID: 413
Author Name: Perry Darsey
Organization:

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 414
Author Name: Pat Darsey
Organization:

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 416
Author Name: robert Busser
Organization:

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 417
Author Name: Mary Thompson
Organization: Mary Thompson Appraisals

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 418
Author Name: Mary Thompson
Organization: Mary Thompson Appraisals

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 419
Author Name: Jayne Olderman
Organization:

1. During the rainy season the Corp should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1st

---

Comment ID: 420
Author Name: Allen Gresham
Organization:

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 421
Author Name: Pat Darsey
Organization:

4. During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 452

Author Name: James & Shannon Lince
Organization:

During raining season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 460
Author Name: Peter Collins
Organization:

* In rainy season corps should fill lake to full pool no later than June

---

Comment ID: 472
Author Name: Mary Kirves
Organization: Lake Property Owner

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 474
Author Name: Mandy C. Harris
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 475
Author Name: Richard N. Harris
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 476
Author Name: Heather Jones
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 477
Author Name: Crow Hunter
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 478
Author Name: Matt Johnston
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 479
Author Name: Stephanie Nakamura
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than

June 1.

Comment ID: 486
Author Name: Jim & Judy Foster
Organization:

and full pool should be reached no later than June I!

Comment ID: 487
Author Name: Melvyn & Gail Smith
Organization:

2-Lake Lanier should be at full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 493
Author Name: Thomas Vivelo
Organization:

3. When the rainy season arrives the lake should be allowed to fill by no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 496
Author Name: James & Martha Burwell
Organization:

The Corps must act promptly and permanently to allow Lanier to reach full pool by June 1 with near or above normal rainfall during the first five months of the year. Time is of the essence in turning around the current stress on Lake Lanier. Sincerely, 8375 Lake Hollow Drive Gainesville, GA 30506 770-886-1467

Comment ID: 498
Author Name: James & Pamela Norman
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1. In fact, without exceptional reason to do so, Lanier should be maintained within a few feet of full pool. Management triggers must be in place for Lake Lanier withdrawals during times of drought.

Comment ID: 507
Author Name: Trace Erge
Organization:

Please consider the following when making your plan to control the water in Lake Lanier. 1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 508
Author Name: Robert Tate
Organization:

To whom it may concern: Please consider adding the following in the Manual Update: 1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 510
Author Name: Michael Muenchen
Organization:

Please consider adding the following in the Manual Update: 1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 511
Author Name: John Muenchen
Organization:

Please consider adding the following in the Manual Update: 1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1

Comment ID: 518
Author Name: Raymond Smith
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 520
Author Name: Michael P Harney
Organization:

Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 521
Author Name: John O'Donnell
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 522
Author Name: Tim Muenchen
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 524
Author Name: Palmer
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 525
Author Name: Walt Banasik
Organization:

1. Must allow the lake to reach full pool no later than June 1

Comment ID: 527
Author Name: Terry Simpson
Organization:

a commitment to allowing Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than the first of June each year.

Comment ID: 528
Author Name:
Organization: Resident

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 529
Author Name: Tim Altman
Organization: Timberidge on Lanier Condominium Association

1)During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 530

Author Name: Lisa H. Howell
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 531
Author Name:
Organization:

The Corp needs to try and have lake a full pool at least by the end of May and the lake should not be drawn down to send water down stream to the Apalachicola River.

Comment ID: 534
Author Name: Ebby Hamby
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 535
Author Name: Stacy Wade
Organization: LLA

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 536
Author Name: Ellen Whitaker
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 538
Author Name: George N. Slappey, DDS
Organization:

This lake should reach full pool by early summer always

Comment ID: 539
Author Name: Ken Fields
Organization:

Allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool not later than June 1.

Comment ID: 540
Author Name: Charlie Nugent
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool
no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 544
Author Name: Raymond F. Egan
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 551
Author Name:
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 552
Author Name: Leo and Marie Anne Van de Vall
Organization:

- Please, allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1during the rainy season;

Comment ID: 556
Author Name: Guy Caldwell
Organization: Possible NOW

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full
pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 557
Author Name: Terry Donnenwirth
Organization:

We believe that during the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 559
Author Name: Roy Beavers
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1st.

Comment ID: 560
Author Name:
Organization: Windsong Sailing Academy

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 561
Author Name: Jay Martin
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 562
Author Name:
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 564
Author Name: S.M. Chassner
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 595
Author Name: Susan Banasik
Organization:

. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 596
Author Name: Dale Smart
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 599
Author Name: Don Turner
Organization:

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE let this Lake get healthy again. How you can continue to let water out after big rains when everything downstream is full pool goes beyond the bounds of common sense.

I respectfully request:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 601
Author Name: James Inglis
Organization: none

1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 01

Comment ID: 602
Author Name: Mack Butler
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 610
Author Name: Marvin Fisher
Organization:

1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 611
Author Name: Bob Kaufman
Organization: Harbour Point Dock Chairman

- During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 612
Author Name:
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 615
Author Name: Judy Humphreys
Organization:

I beg you to let the Lake up to full pool by June 1

Comment ID: 617
Author Name: Robert Skrypek
Organization: Lake Lanier area resident

allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool prior to June 1

Comment ID: 618
Author Name: Barry Smith
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 626
Author Name: Carl & Rae-Lynne Swigart
Organization:

1. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1 and be drawn down in smaller increments after September depending on rain forecasts for winter/spring and watch for the drought cycles which usually come in 6 year cycles in Georgia.

Comment ID: 627
Author Name: Chad Hargett
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1

Comment ID: 628
Author Name: Art McGovern
Organization:

During the rainy season the Corp should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1st.

Comment ID: 629
Author Name: Brantley Burns
Organization:

4.During the rainy season, the corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 630
Author Name: Art McGovern
Organization:

1. During the rainy season the Corp should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1st

---

Comment ID: 632
Author Name: Tony
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 648
Author Name: Trey
Organization: Wakeboarder

Every other lake in GA recovered except Lanier. Nobody cares about the mussels... Stop letting

the water out, when it rains. Thanks!

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 649
Author Name: Trey
Organization: Wakeboarder

Stop letting the water out of Lanier!!!

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 651
Author Name: Bert Sykes
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 653
Author Name: Bruce Margol
Organization:

The corps should allow Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1st

---

Comment ID: 667
Author Name:
Organization: lake Lanier association

REACH FULL POOL BY APRIL 1.

Comment ID: 693
Author Name: James & Teresa Coryell
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 701
Author Name: Richard P. Sandoz
Organization: Property Owner

Please allow the lake to reach its fullest possible level in the shortest possible time; certainly before the beginning of June.

Comment ID: 702
Author Name: Julie Starling
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 703
Author Name: Allen DuPont
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 704
Author Name: Allen DuPont

Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1.

Comment ID: 706
Author Name:
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 711
Author Name:
Organization: Self

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 712
Author Name:
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 713
Author Name: Bob McLeod
Organization:

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 725
Author Name:
Organization:

During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 731
Author Name: Phil Sutton
Organization: Hall County Board of Commissioners

-During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1;

Comment ID: 764
Author Name: Fran Bonner Habeeb
Organization:

The Corps must change their controls to ensure the lake provides the necessary means to it's constituents. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1. Additionally, Lake Lanier should not be drawn down for mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River. Also,
management triggers must be in place for Lake Lanier withdrawals during times of drought.

Management Triggers (General - Manual)

Comment ID: 52
Author Name: V.M. Perry, Jr.
Organization: Lake Lanier Association

Institute Lake Lanier-Specific Management Triggers The Revised Interim Operating Plan ("RIOP") currently in place contains no Lake Lanier-specific trigger points for storing or releasing water. It is possible for the composite storage level of all reservoirs to be in Zone 3 or even higher while Lanier is still in Zone 4 due to its much slower refill rate. Downstream reservoirs not only naturally refill much more rapidly than Lanier, they do so even more quickly when rainfall is greater in the ACF watershed south of Buford Dam than north of it. This makes it not only possible but highly probable that the other ACF reservoirs will recover fully while Lanier is still as low as Zone 4, as has happened through much of 2008. The RIOP provides for specialized management of West Point Lake and Lake Walter F. George by allowing temporary storage above the winter pool rule curve under certain conditions. The new WCP should incorporate specialized provisions for managing Lake Lanier that reflect its distinctive characteristics and management needs. Without them, Lake Lanier is destined to be disproportionately impacted by draw-downs for downstream management, without an ability to remain near full pool or to refill. We request that the new WCP include provisions that will allow the retention of basin inflow above Buford Dam to the maximum extent possible under all conditions. The purpose of this is to allow Lake Lanier to realize the benefits intended for it under the original authorizing legislation by remaining at or near full pool whenever possible. This can best be accomplished with Lake Lanier-specific management triggers that are independent of the triggers for the entire ACF system. We request that the new WCP incorporate Lake Lanier-specific management triggers that will maximize water storage in Lake Lanier when it falls below Zone 1 and allow the Corps to store a higher percentage of basin inflow above Buford Dam when composite storage is in Zones 2, 3, and 4. We recognize that Lanier-specific triggers would need to be coordinated with triggers for the rest of the system, but the triggers in the RIOP clearly fail to accommodate Lake Lanier's unique disproportion of storage volume and drainage area in comparison to the other reservoirs in the ACF.

it has become obvious that the new WCP needs to be designed for Lanier to be able to refill as quickly as possible to recover from MRF augmentation flows and be able to sustain its intended benefits, including recreation and the economy that is dependent on that industry. In order to accomplish that, we request that the Corps incorporate in the new WCP a Lake Lanier-specific trigger to disengage Lanier as a source of MRF augmentation, from the point at which Lanier's level declines to Action Zone 3 until it returns to the top of Action Zone 2.

it has become obvious that the new WCP needs to be designed for Lanier to be able to refill as quickly as possible to recover from MRF augmentation flows and be able to sustain its intended benefits, including recreation and the economy that is dependent on that industry. In order to accomplish that, we request that the Corps incorporate in the new WCP a Lake Lanier-specific trigger to disengage Lanier as a source of MRF augmentation, from the point at which Lanier's level declines to Action Zone 3 until it returns to the top of Action Zone 2.

We therefore request that the Corps include a Lanier-specific trigger to reduce discharges from Buford Dam to the Atlanta metro water supply and quality minimum of 650 cfs whenever these water levels are reached. We understand that, due to the Corps' operations downstream, structural design limitations may affect the Corps' ability to use such a trigger under certain circumstances. Should the structural design limits of the ACF facilities be inadequate to accommodate this trigger, we would request that the Corps invest in whatever infrastructure changes are necessary to support it.

Comment ID: 598
Author Name: Brian Otte
Organization:

When Lake Lanier hits a certain lower level - say around 1061 (or 10 feet low) - then no more water should be released than is coming into the lake.

Comment ID: 628
Author Name: Art McGovern
Organization:

Management "triggers" should be in place for Lake Lanier's withdrawals regarding: a. drought conditions, b. water quality requirements, c. water supply requirements. 4. The ACF Water Control Manual should address and recognize the following issues for Lake Lanier: a. Drought

conditions, b. Lake Lanier's small basin area, c. Requirements for downstream water quality, d. Requirements for downstream water supply.

Comment ID: 764
Author Name: Fran Bonner Habeeb
Organization:

The Corps must change their controls to ensure the lake provides the necessary means to it's constituents. During the rainy season, the Corps should allow Lake Lanier to reach full pool no later than June 1. Additionally, Lake Lanier should not be drawn down for mussels and other endangered species in the Apalachicola River. Also,
management triggers must be in place for Lake Lanier withdrawals during times of drought.

New Reservoirs (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 3
Author Name: Gayle O\\\'Neal
Organization:

From the presentations I have listened to at the Scoping meeting in LaGrange on 10-22-08, I submit the following: Reservoirs should be built along he Flint River to help with the Lake Seminole Area since all the water just keeps going.

Comment ID: 21
Author Name: Bill Bierbower
Organization: Fishmaster, Inc

With the growth of Atlanta's population as well as continued / increasing demands from Florida and Alabama it seems obvious to me we need another reservoir to support the water demand that is currently expected only from Lake Lanier.

Comment ID: 83
Author Name: Steven Voige
Organization:

Additional water sheds should be developed to keep up with population growth!

Comment ID: 106
Author Name: ELMON L. GARNER
Organization:

I was a City Manager in the Atlanta area in the early 80's and the Atlanta Regional Commission had a plan, supported by then Senator Zell Miller, later Governor and Senator, to install dams in the Young Harris area that would have provided adequate water for the metro Atlanta area, and would have prevented the current crises we are now facing.

Comment ID: 164
Author Name: Otto Korth
Organization:

We've GOT to create a series of dams on the Flint River system to help control and provide water flows to Florida. This will take some of the pressure off the Chattahoochee River and West Point Lake that is carrying that burden now.

Comment ID: 187
Author Name: Wayne Anderson
Organization:

The flint river basin is a huge water resource for Southern GA. Efforts must be made to provide flood and water flow options for this river.

Comment ID: 223
Author Name: Dr. George M Henry

Organization:

A new impoundment on the upper Flynt, while attractive to some in the longterm hope of reservoir supply for metro Atlanta growth, forebodes severe ecological damage to the bioregion and threat to the balance between aquifer and surface flow in the lower Flynt.

Comment ID: 232
Author Name: Todd Vinson
Organization:

A large dam on the Flint River would help to conserve water up stream as well as maintain a good flow of water in times of a drought.

Comment ID: 241
Author Name:
Organization:

I like the possibility of building smaller dams on the creeks of the Flint River instead of damming the Flint.

Comment ID: 260
Author Name: Randy Norred
Organization:

A project on the Flint could ease the strain on the Chattahoochee.

Comment ID: 313
Author Name: Peter Edwards
Organization:

When one looks at the basin maps, it pops out very clearly that the real issue that we need to be addressing is the fact that the Flint River Basin is not being used as was part of the original design for the ACF River Basin and the projects that have been built on the basin since its inception back in the '50s.
When you compare the 6 percent of the total basin that Lake Lanier retains or has available to it, and the 53 percent that's included in the Flint River Basin, you basically come up with a nine-to-one ratio of potential contribution to supply all of the needs of the tri-state area. And we know for a fact that the only storage facility at the end of the Flint River Basin is Lake Seminole, and we also know that Flint River has the ability to supply much more storage than Lake Lanier ever could in order to help assist the supply to all three states.
So I would suggest that the Corps, while it cannot plead to Congress to include new dams, works, or whatever for the Flint River Basin, that they would be abandoning their engineering effort if they omit the issue that part of the original design for the ACF Basin was to include multiple dams on the Flint River. And that issue should be strongly involved and heavily documented in whatever engineering studies and updates to the water manuals that the Corps intends to take upon with this current effort and in the future. Because that, I suggest, would be the long-term solution to this Tri-State Water Wars, and once and for all provide a solution that can be accommodating to all three of the states going down the road in the future.

Comment ID: 350
Author Name: *Tim Ward
Organization:

Need to build a large lake on the Flint River to help control the water needed down stream.

Comment ID: 390
Author Name: Kent Bennett
Organization:

Why not Dam the Flint to help with water distribution to Florida and flooding?

Comment ID: 438
Author Name: Steven Voige
Organization:

Additional Lakes are needed to equal population growth.

Comment ID: 445
Author Name: David Sargent
Organization:

* Build reservoirs above and below Buford Dam

Comment ID: 450
Author Name: Sidell Tilghman
Organization:

While our current lack of water is due to the drought and the amount of rain is out of our control, the unmitigated growth and lack of planning for our water needs is very much in our control but has been ignored and when you ignore problems, they don't go away. I have lived in Georgia since 1975 and have heard about water needs since I arrived. So, why don't we dig out some of the lake while it is down and what ever happened to that fast tracking of those reservoirs? What have we got so far- the one in Griffin? I mean with all the legalize that will have to go on before one can be started, let alone the funding, we need to get going now so some can be built in the next 10, 15 or who knows how many years.

Comment ID: 460
Author Name: Peter Collins
Organization:

*More reservoirs need to be created

Comment ID: 505
Author Name: John and Jodi Wacho
Organization:

8) Other reservoirs need to be considered in this overall planning scheme. The state of Georgia has discussed it many times, but to no avail. This needs to be considered since there is an abundant amount of water in North Georgia that could be tapped into. This should be looked at in Northern Alabama, as well as Northern Florida. Northern Florida should consider tapping from the ocean as it does in some areas of that state.

Comment ID: 532
Author Name: Jim Geist
Organization:

Secondly, additional reservoirs (plural) should be created down stream. Again I admit I have not done and site selection work, but at least two more reservoirs in Georgia south of Atlanta, two possibly three in Alabama and two in Florida would allow for the retention of rain from a much greater area then what is currently available. This year is a great example of where we have allowed billions of gallons of water to run into the Gulf of Mexico from rain that fell south of Atlanta while the drought in the water shed has persisted and now that the rain south of us has seasonally slowed down the system looks to continue to pull down the lake at an unsustainable rate. This is an avoidable situation.

Comment ID: 559
Author Name: Roy Beavers
Organization:

Also, areas between Lanier and the Gulf should be encouraged to construct additional reservoirs as outlined in the plans that date back to the 1960's. These additional bodies of water could also minimize the effects of a drought on the entire region.

Comment ID: 568
Author Name: William E. Carrol
Organization:

4).Demand for additional drinking water for Metropolitan Atlanta will continue to increase in the future, however there is only a relatively small drainage basin from which to draw its water needs from. Additional sources of water located north of Atlanta are desperately needed.

Comment ID: 603
Author Name: Wm T Schwendler Jr
Organization: part-time resident, boater

4. I understand 2-3 dams were once proposed for the Flint River, but were vetoed by then President Jimmy Carter. Is this true? Would the dams have helped alleviate today's challenges?

Comment ID: 710
Author Name: Mike Sullivan
Organization: City Council for City of Sugar Hill

I understand that the FLINT river has little to no reservoir capacity. In times of drought, this can result in an extra burden being put onto the Chattahoochee river. There are more reservoirs needed, hopefully the Flint river can have reservoirs built to help the ACF river basin in times of drought.

Comment ID: 772
Author Name: Lionel Graves
Organization:

For the last decade, and possibly back to 1980 it is clear that the average annual rainfall in the Lake Lanier catchment area is frequently not attained. The reliance on the storage in Lake Lanier tends to be at its greatest when rainfall is least. Unfortunately the capacity at Lanier is a huge part of the ACT system, while its catchment is extremely small Obviously reliance on Lanier in the long term is unsustainable. Immediate consideration should be given to creating water storage along the Flint River, and in the long term sea water desalination for users in the lower part of the system will probably be required.

Restore Natural Flow Regime (Water Resources)

Comment ID: 71
Author Name: Steven J. Herrington
Organization: The Nature Conservancy

Reaching consensus on environmental flow requirements is a complex process. It involves scientists and engineers from many disciplines using existing data to define the basic flow regime required to support the native fauna and functions of the river ecosystem.

Comment ID: 263
Author Name: Daniel H. Cox
Organization:

Fresh water flows at historic levels must be restored to the Apalachicola river.

Comment ID: 282
Author Name: Lesley Cox
Organization:

Water data have been collected for the past 25 years. I know because I have been involved in the demand for water for downstream users of the ACF Waterway since 1983. I was a board member of the Chipola Basin Protective Group which sued and won the case for removal of the Dead Lakes Dam on the Chipola River in 1988 that resulted in increased water flow to the Apalachicola River.
We need water in our river!!! Compare pre-dam and post-dam data. We need the pre-dam water regime in the Apalachicola River and Bay to sustain our important food and livelihood source.

Comment ID: 624
Author Name: George Coons

Organization:

Additionally, I am aware of the fragile nature of environmental systems generally, and how humans, however well intentioned, can negatively impact ecosystems they are partially in control of. The River needs to be returned to the fresh water flows it had, before human intervention. I am frankly amazed that this isn't a Federal requirement already, that rivers should not be used by one state (Georgia) to the determent of a down-river state (Florida)

Comment ID: 700
Author Name: Mary Ann Durrer
Organization:

During the last year, since the water flow has been reduced so drastically in the Apalachicola River we have seen a number of adverse effects. Salt water predators have moved into our bay, since it is so much more salty with the reduced fresh water flow, and are devouring the oysters. I have heard that we now have sharks all of the way up the river to the dam. This was unheard of before. Tupelo honey grows in the swamps up river and the trees are dying now because they do not have enough fresh water to survive. Our whole way of life down here is being destroyed. We are facing the death of the most productive bay on the east coast.

Restrict Interbasin Transfers (Water Resources)

Comment ID: 302
Author Name: Chris Gray
Organization:

With the rapid growth of NE Georgia over the pasted decade, interbasin transfers have been increasing dramatically. Municipals have partnered across the divide and are putting increased demand on the Chattahoochee river basin by supplying water to customers which discharge outside of the basin's natural flow. The level of Lake Lanier over the past several years has dropped due to many variables, however the most controllable variable is to restrict withdrawal that does not return to river and stream systems from which they have been drawn. The battles over releases from the dam to downstream will only increase if these transfers are not better regulated. Current regulations by the State allow for a one county distance for these basin transfers, however the affect may be seen many counties away as increased and decreased waterflows are altered. Growth in NE Georgia and other areas will continue to modify water levels within their respective basins, and appropriate checks and measures need to be designed to quantity the flow in the ACF. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Desalination (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 40
Author Name: Paul M. Flood
Organization:

7. Over the next ten to twenty years, the Southeastern United States will continue to grow economically and in population; particularly in Georgia, Florida and Alabama. Greater Atlanta alone is projected to grow from 5.5 million to over 7.5 million within the next ten to fifteen years. This is an increase of over 35%! There is a simple solution to insure that the water needs of all regions of the ACF are met. This includes Atlanta, the agricultural interests in South Georgia and Alabama, the real estate and
fishing industries in Florida, as well as a the economic development of North Georgia. Keep Lake Lanier full at all times! The solution? There are trillions of gallons of water within the boundaries of the State of Georgia. This water is better known as the Atlantic Ocean! The concept is simple - run a water pipe from Savannah to Gainesville and Lake Lanier along the right-of-way of Interstate 20 and Interstate 85. Build a nuclear power plant near Savannah to desalinate the sea water, and then pump the desalinated water from the Atlantic to Lake Lanier to keep it full at all times. The Corps could sponsor a feasibility study to determine construction and annual operating costs of such a system. The City of Tampa, Florida could assist in determining the cost of a conventional desalinization plant, and the Southern Company could provide input into a nuclear-powered energy/desalinization plant. Colonial Pipeline could aid in determining the cost of constructing and maintaining the pipeline, as they have built oil and gas

pipelines from Texas and Oklahoma to New England. The development and construction costs may be $2 billion to $10 billion dollars. However, this one-time cost may be relatively inexpensive compared to the annual cost of not doing it; particularly if one considers that the lack of an adequate water supply could hinder Atlanta growth by a whopping 50% in the next ten to fifteen years or longer! Based upon projections of an increase of two million people in the relative near future, this equates to lost growth of one million people. The economic impact on the Gross Domestic Product (GOP) of Atlanta could be almost totally disastrous, if you consider that 50% of the potential one-million people lost in population growth contributes to the working population of Atlanta; the others are spouses and children. The one-half million workers moving to the
Atlanta would be coming here to take advantage of the many high-tech, research and development, marketing and manufacturing opportunities. These jobs could pay $60,000 or more per year, resulting in annual labor costs of $30 billion (500,000 X $60,000 per year). If labor costs are fifty percent of the goods and services produced, the annual Atlanta GOP lost is $60 billion each year! As previously indicated, the economic consequences of not having a full and clean Lake Lanier can be disastrous on Atlanta, North Georgia and the Southeastern United States. Therefore, it is vitally important the Corps of Engineers coordinate, develop and implement a plan in the immediate future to keep Lake Lanier full and clean on a year-round basis. I am a Board member of the Lake Lanier Association and Chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee. Although I am not speaking for the Association in this letter, I know that LLA is more than happy to work with the Corps on this important endeavor. Respectfully Submitted, Paul M. Flood, CMC

Comment ID: 486
Author Name: Jim & Judy Foster
Organization:

Those areas with salt water access should be forced to develop desalinization!

Comment ID: 513
Author Name: Jansen
Organization: Riverfront Therapy Inc.

Why can we not learn from other countries about water distribution plants. I was vacationing on an island called Bon Aire which is owned by the Dutch. They have NO fresh water source at all yet they provide for the entire island by means of a desalination plant. Huge mounds of salt are removed from the ocean water and provide clean fresh drinking water. Why can Georgia not take some land from their coast and pipe in water from the ocean and create a plant which can provide unlimited amounts? It can been done so perhaps government funding could to create an opportunity? It would create a new job market and there would be no arguing over who loses. Its a win win situation which could start a trend for California droughts!

Comment ID: 772
Author Name: Lionel Graves
Organization:

For the last decade, and possibly back to 1980 it is clear that the average annual rainfall in the Lake Lanier catchment area is frequently not attained. The reliance on the storage in Lake Lanier tends to be at its greatest when rainfall is least. Unfortunately the capacity at Lanier is a huge part of the ACT system, while its catchment is extremely small Obviously reliance on Lanier in the long term is unsustainable. Immediate consideration should be given to creating water storage along the Flint River, and in the long term sea water desalination for users in the lower part of the system will probably be required.

Avoid Dam Construction on Flint River (Water Resources)

Comment ID: 2
Author Name:
Organization:

My family and I enjoy outdoor and recreational activities on many parts of the Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, not just near our home. Our chief concern at present is maintaining and preserving the Flint in its present

---

natural"" state to the greatest extent possible. I don't favor further damming of the Flint if it can be avoided.

Tennessee River (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 301
Author Name: Jud Davis
Organization:

In a seemingly non-connected issue, Georgia and Tennessee have had a lengthy property line dispute that has lasted for hundreds of years. Congress set the property line dividing the states at the 35th parallel. A survey back in the 1800s set the line in the wrong place, effectively locating a sliver of Georgia into Tennessee. This sliver includes part of the Tennessee River.

A simple pipeline from the massive Tennessee River, bringing water into Georgia's drought stricken regions, would forever solve the water wars issues between Georgia, Florida and Alabama.

I feel that Georgia should quit claim any disputed property to Tennessee in return for a tap into the Tenn River. We could then use Interstate -75 right of way for a pipeline down to a "T" with one leg going east into the Lake Lanier watershed (and the ACF River system), and a second leg continuing down I-75 into the Allatoona watershed.

This plan effectively ends the decades old Water Wars dispute between the southern states. Here's how:

Tennessee wins: They have their disputed land free and clear. The tap is a few miles from the Alabama line. Tenn has enjoyed full use of the Tenn River resource by this point. They won't miss a drop. No more disputes with Georgia.

Alabama wins: They won't miss the miniscule withdrawal. The Tenn River is huge. They will gain a forever full river system along the Chattahoochee River (ACF system) along the Alabama boarder with Georgia. Tons of water for their Dothan plant. No more disputes with Georgia.

Florida wins: Florida will forever have water flows keeping their sturgeon and mussels watered. Florida's oyster industry can now have the water with no more drought flow reductions. No more disputes with Georgia.

This pipeline project is tiny compared to similar projects in Alaska (oil & gas pipelines) and Los Angeles (drinking water aquifers). This pipeline solves many problems amongst the states and provides several benefits for all of the states.

From Senator Shafer - Duluth, Ga; he says that the TVA has already performed an impact study of the needed withdrawals. According to the Senator, no adverse problems were identified. A joint effort involving USACE and TVA working together to solve a regional water supply problem would be a huge win for all!

An effective end to the water wars AND a reliable water source for the ACF system. Many thanks for your time and efforts and your service to this great nation! Sincerely, Jud Davis, Gainesville, Ga

---

Comment ID: 317
Author Name: Kenneth Davis
Organization:

I'm wondering if it was a possibility for the Corps to negotiate with the states of Tennessee and Georgia to possibly purchase some of the water in the Nickajack Lake reservoir -- not as a gift or not as a boundary dispute -- or even possibly let the city of Atlanta, which uses most of the water from Lake Lanier -- could we not let the city of Atlanta have a bond referendum and possibly pay for a very large pipe to transfer water from Nickajack reservoir into Lake Lanier for use by the city of Atlanta and surrounding areas?

Comment ID: 568

Author Name: William E. Carrol
Organization:

5). Obtaining additional drinking water for Metropolitan Atlanta from the Tennessee River or from other sources must be found within the not too distant future. The Corps of Engineers should direct its efforts to accommodate this end result. Please refer to the letter which is attached for a more detailed discourse regarding my views on this matter.

Comment ID: 604
Author Name: FRED ROBBE
Organization:

I would also like to see some way to share some of the Tennessee River, which seems to be overflowing all the time, even when we are having droughts.

Close Bob Sikes Cut (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 66
Author Name: Wilton Rooks
Organization:

4. The water control plan should not stop at the Woodruff Dam for control purposes. If the oysters and endangered species are to become a basis for operational decision making then factors in the Apalachicola River and Bay that effect those elements should be included in the control mechanism. Require Florida to block Sikes Cut and to remove the straightening that has occurred in the Apalachicola River that was done for barge traffic convenience.

Comment ID: 84
Author Name: Ronnie Segree
Organization:

Problem not enough fresh water from the Apalachicola river into the Apalachicola Bay.

Solution- Close Bob Sikes cut distrusting the fresh water east and west in the bay keep what fresh that you have in the bay longer.

Problem - Old fill(Bird Sanctuary) sets East of the new St. George Island bridge. to much nitrogen run off into the bay. the birds have the Little St. George Island and St. Vincent Island to nest on. average 1 Sea Gull eating one pound of shrimp in one day x 1000 when you don’t have shrimp your not gonna have Red Fish or Speckel Trout or other game fish

Solutions- either take out this man made bird Sanctuary or cut channels where the current can fowl how it used to flow.

East rived flows from the Apalachicola River. this is what is know as the log jam. excavate and clean out these areas. when they was plenty of water these places was cleaned out by the high rises of the River, now they need our help. un-stop the glogged up stream and allow more water to flow down to the bay.

Comment ID: 694
Author Name:
Organization:

dig out sam's cutoff in east river and damm up the bob sikes cut so the freshwater that we are able to get can be diverted into the bay because right now the bay is not getting enough. I realize that we cant all get what we want when it's not there to get. our oysters are dying and what's left of the oysterman here is just going to be the last of a dying breed. and that is what hurts the worst. please help fast!

Excavate Log Jam on East River (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 84
Author Name: Ronnie Segree
Organization:

Problem not enough fresh water from the Apalachicola river into the Apalachicola Bay.

Solution- Close Bob Sikes cut distrusting the fresh water east and west in the bay keep what fresh that you have in the bay longer.

Problem - Old fill(Bird Sanctuary) sets East of the new St. George Island bridge. to much nitrogen run off into the bay. the birds have the Little St. George Island and St. Vincent Island to nest on. average 1 Sea Gull eating one pound of shrimp in one day x 1000 when you don't have shrimp your not gonna have Red Fish or Speckel Trout or other game fish

Solutions- either take out this man made bird Sanctuary or cut channels where the current can fowl how it used to flow.

East rived flows from the Apalachicola River. this is what is know as the log jam. excavate and clean out these areas. when they was plenty of water these places was cleaned out by the high rises of the River, now they need our help. un-stop the glogged up stream and allow more water to flow down to the bay.

Comment ID: 694
Author Name:
Organization:

dig out sam's cutoff in east river and damm up the bob sikes cut so the freshwater that we are able to get can be diverted into the bay because right now the bay is not getting enough. I realize that we cant all get what we want when it's not there to get. our oysters are dying and what's left of the oysterman here is just going to be the last of a dying breed. and that is what hurts the worst. please help fast!

Groundwater (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 89
Author Name: Charles Chapman
Organization:

Georgia should not be bailed out of their lack in effectively planning water management. If Lake Lanier is the only resource from which the Metro-Atlanta area can draw from, then certainly they need to embark on more research endeavors. Proper water management controls and alternative water resources are surely available (i.e. offshore drilling debate) Florida needs water too, and Georgia should look at their own ability to tap into the ground water sources, or better control their waste water. Poor Planning on Georgia's part should not penalize Floridians.

Comment ID: 399
Author Name: Jane Browder
Organization: lake property owner

If Florida wants to protect their species over human needs. Then they should develop a plan to pump water from their vast networks of underground water resources to help with their survival. Just like an aquarium would do...this could become their out door aquatic park if that is what's driving their problem.

Eliminate Effects of Bird Islands in Apalachicola Bay (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 84
Author Name: Ronnie Segree

Organization:

Problem not enough fresh water from the Apalachicola river into the Apalachicola Bay.

Solution- Close Bob Sikes cut distrusting the fresh water east and west in the bay keep what fresh that you have in the bay longer.

Problem - Old fill(Bird Sanctuary) sets East of the new St. George Island bridge. to much nitrogen run off into the bay. the birds have the Little St. George Island and St. Vincent Island to nest on. average 1 Sea Gull eating one pound of shrimp in one day x 1000 when you don't have shrimp your not gonna have Red Fish or Speckel Trout or other game fish

Solutions- either take out this man made bird Sanctuary or cut channels where the current can fowl how it used to flow.

East rived flows from the Apalachicola River. this is what is know as the log jam. excavate and clean out these areas. when they was plenty of water these places was cleaned out by the high rises of the River, now they need our help. un-stop the glogged up stream and allow more water to flow down to the bay.

Additional Uses for Existing Reservoirs (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 270
Author Name: dan forrest
Organization:

We can also serve as a drinking water source for areas in the South Atlanta Metro area in order to take pressure off the limited resources of Lake Lanier.

Lake Lanier Pumpback (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 271
Author Name: Carl C. Staley, Jr.
Organization:

Assuming that there is excess flow has consideration been given to piping water back to Lake Lanier? With the time estimates to refill Lake Lanier to normal pool with normal rainfall being what they are someone needs to be looking for alternative sources of water. It appears that the original design of Lake Lanier with its limited watershed has created a situation that will be a recurring concern that needs to be addressed.

Interbasin Transfers (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 284
Author Name: James Bishop
Organization:

This drought has gone on for over three years. We can only hope and pray that it will end. We may have to eventually rely on interbasin transfers. Due to the pending Supreme Court review of the GA/AL/FL water problem. No one knows what the outcome of this will be.

Restore Degrade Habitat (Water Resources - Mitigation)

Comment ID: 26
Author Name: Donald Smiley
Organization:

I would like to see a lot of the damage that's been done repaired, fixed, and I would like to see the water quality improved the way it used to be.

Changes at West Point Lake (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 23
Author Name: Mr. Tom and Chris Hunkele
Organization: Lakeside Fitness & Therapy LLC

By copy of this letter - both of us designate the West Point Lake Advisory Council to represent our views on the serious issues facing West Point lake. We are requesting that changes to the Corps control and operation of West Point Lake include:• Maintaining a minimum lake level of between 633 and 635 MSL • Maximize positive economic impact • Manage the Lake consistent with Congressionally authorized purposes • Restoring and maintaining recreational facilities • Ensure recreational access fore low-income and minority families.

Comment ID: 24
Author Name: Unknown
Organization:

Level 633 winter

Comment ID: 67
Author Name: Jeff Lukken
Organization: Mayor of LaGrange

A full pool 633-635 MSL- "Run of the River" alternative must be
considered to adequately address the needs of the families and individuals and to comply with the letter of Executive Order 12898 that applies to Environmental
Justice. Simply put, shoreline and water borne recreation are less desirable, inaccessible, are more dangerous or is eliminated totally during draw downs.
• Action zones at the West Point project must be eliminated or significantly reduced in their magnitude. The harshness and severity of action zones at West Point are
far worse than any otter lakes on the ACF system. Their use as a resource management tool compounds problems and makes the recreational use difficult if
not impossible to achieve due to their widely ranging elevations. The use of these harsh action zones is made worse by the geographical relief that shapes the lake.
West Point's location in the piedmont and its associated topography that shapes it like a salad bowl, exacerbate the massive differential in action zone elevations.
The result is West Point is often left to being an unusable mud flat, while the action zone management tool proceeds to remove water form the lake to address
other questionable non authorized uses in other parts of the basin.
We ask that as an alternative to current operations that action zones be eliminated in there entirety or be reduced to a complete range with a level never lower than
633 MSL- except for dire emergency. This basically puts the lake in the category of a "run of the river lake" with a constant stabile elevation to meet the
Congressional authorizations for the project.

Comment ID: 68
Author Name: Dick Timmerberg
Organization: West Point Lake Coalition

It is essential that the full pool! run of the river alternative be considered to adequately address the needs of the families and individuals and to comply with the letter of the Executive Order that applies to Environmental Justice.
Simply put, shoreline and water borne recreation are less desirable, inaccessible, and more dangerous, if not totally eliminated, during draw downs.
• Action zones at the West Point project must be significantly reduced in their magnitude. The harshness and severity of action zones at West Point are far worse than other lakes on the ACF system. Their use as a resource management tool compounds problems and makes year round recreational use difficult, if not impossible to achieve, due to their widely ranging elevations. The use of these harsh action zones is made worse by the geography that forms the lake. West Point's location in the piedmont and its associated topography shape it like a salad bowl and exacerbate the massive differential in action zone elevations. The result is that West Point Lake is often left as a largely unusable mud flat, while the action zone management tool proceeds to remove water from the lake to address other questionable and non authorized uses in other

parts of the basin. At a winter drawdown of7 feet, 20% of West Point's surface area or 5,249 acres are exposed causing continual soil erosion and sedimentation.

Comment ID: 69
Author Name: Jeff Brown
Organization: Troup County Chamber of Commerce

A full pool 633-635 MSL- "Run of the River" alternative must be considered to adequately address the needs of the families and individuals and to comply with the letter of Executive Order 12898 that applies to Environmental Justice. Simply put, shoreline and water borne recreation are less desirable, inaccessible, are more dangerous or is eliminated totally during draw downs.
• Action zones at the West Point project must be eliminated or significantly reduced in their magnitude. The harshness and severity of action zones at West Point are far worse than any other lakes on the ACF system. Their use as a resource management tool compounds problems and makes the recreational use difficult if not impossible to achieve due to their widely ranging elevations. The use of these harsh action zones is made worse by the geographical relief that shapes the lake. West Point's location in the piedmont and its associated topography that shapes it like a salad bowl, exacerbate the massive differential in action zone elevations. The result is West Point is often left to being an unusable mud flat, while the action zone management tool proceeds to remove water from the lake to address other questionable non authorized uses in other parts of the basin.
We ask that as an alternative to current operations that action zones be eliminated in their entirety or be reduced to a complete range with a level never lower than 633 MSL- except for dire emergency. This basically puts the lake in the category of a "run of the river lake" with a constant stable elevation to meet the Congressional authorizations for the project.

Comment ID: 110
Author Name: Tom & Helene Bohannon
Organization:

1Lake Levels: Minimal 633 during the wintertime; minimal 635 during the summer.

Comment ID: 112
Author Name: Marlene Timmerberg
Organization:

We want the lake to be managed at a level of 633 to 635 for a safe recreational lake for which it was proposed.

Comment ID: 113
Author Name: West Point Lake Advisory Council
Organization: West Point Lake Advisory Council

1. Maintain minimum lake level of 633 to 635 msl

Comment ID: 121
Author Name: Jack Struble
Organization:

As a resident of Troup County and a property owner on West Point Lake, I would like to give you a few thought son the rewriting of the manuals for the operation of the lake and the basin in general. First keeping the lake at a level of 633-635msl will store enough water in case of a real emergency in Florida in relation to environmental concerns.

Comment ID: 132
Author Name: DANIEL PRICE
Organization:

PLEASE MANAGE THE LAKE AT THE 633 TO 635MSL. THIS LEVEL IS CRITICAL TO THE AESTHETIC, RECREATIONAL AND ECONOMIC WELL BEING OF THE LOCAL AND

REGIONAL ECONOMY.

Comment ID: 135
Author Name: Diane
Organization:

This lake must maintain a minimum lake level of 633-635MSL.

Comment ID: 136
Author Name: Phil Coulton
Organization:

Maintain a minimum lake level of 633-635 MSL.

Comment ID: 140
Author Name: Ian Ramsay
Organization:

I agree with the six major issues on the blue handout. my most important issue is a constant lake level between 633 and 635 MSL.

Comment ID: 156
Author Name:
Organization:

PLEASE MAINTAIN MIN. LAKE LEVEL AT FULL POOL OF BETWEEN 633-635.

Comment ID: 159
Author Name: Janet Fox
Organization:

The water level has been wonderful this year. Everyone could enjoy the West Point Lake more if the minimum level was not less than 633.

Comment ID: 161
Author Name: Joy
Organization:

his can only be done if the lake is maintained at 633-635 feet above sea level year round
--
This can only be done if the lake is maintained at 633-635 feet above sea level year round.

Comment ID: 165
Author Name: Michael Bailey
Organization:

I would like to see the winter pool level to be higher and the lake level at full pool during summer months.

Comment ID: 170
Author Name: Sammy Bailey Jr.
Organization:

As a local home owner on West Point Lake. I would like to see our lake to stay at a minimum pool of 632.

Comment ID: 171
Author Name: Gary Grizzle
Organization:

West Point Lake should be kept at a minimum lake level of 633-635 msl to ensure safety on the lake and greatest opportunity to enjoy the lake.

Comment ID: 173

Author Name: Gail A Poole
Organization:

We need to keep the lake to a min lake level of 633ft.

Comment ID: 176
Author Name: Janice Grizzle
Organization:

West Point Lake should be maintained at 633 - 635 msl at all times to insure access for recreational purposes.

Comment ID: 188
Author Name: Janet Neal
Organization:

The lake needs to be maintained at a 633 to 635 MSL in order to support water quality for the population of West Georgia.

Comment ID: 189
Author Name: Joel Upchurch
Organization:

the action zones on West Point Lake should be changed to meet the rest of the lakes on the basin there isn't a logical reason that we should have such dramatic fluctuations

---

Comment ID: 190
Author Name: Charles Prestridge
Organization:

Thanks for your help in keeping the lake level up this year. I know that you cannot predict weather patterns, but keeping the winter pool up at about 632-633 should help make sure that summer/fall pools are higher.

Comment ID: 194
Author Name: William Robinson
Organization:

Control the level of West Point Lake at 633 - 635 feet.

Comment ID: 197
Author Name: Michael Edwards
Organization:

Please consider keeping the lake level at 635 all year.

Comment ID: 201
Author Name: James A. Stinson
Organization:

Please maintain minimum lake levels of 633 msl during the winter months.

Comment ID: 211
Author Name: Kyle W Crawford
Organization:

I John Crawford think that we I mean the lake should have more water. Like the water should always have the same amount of water not like lowering the water every two or three maybe even four mouths. I just don't like it that much and it makes boating dangerous.

Comment ID: 212
Author Name: Andy Fritchley
Organization:

West Point Lake is essential for drinking water and maintaining a consistent water level (633 - 635) is critical for residents.

Comment ID: 214
Author Name: Dr. George M Henry
Organization:

I live near West Point Lake adjacent to Ringer Park. During the present drought, until a few months ago we saw the water level so low as to be dangerous for boaters and swimmers, inaccessible to docks and unattractive for other recreational uses. By balancing outflow with thankfully better inflow this summer, the level was kept at or near full pool since spring . However, the current policy permitting this one lake to carry a markedly disproportionate burden in maintaining downstream flow threatens the water quality, power generation, and economic viability of the entire area. This current policy violates the original rationale and promises made when the impoundment was developed. A lake level of 633-635 MSL is known to be the necessary minimum for West Point Lake.

George Henry, MD

Comment ID: 219
Author Name: Todd Vinson
Organization:

The plan needs to be updated so the lake can be maintained at a full pool level for more months during the year.

Comment ID: 221
Author Name: Carol Todd
Organization:

I strongly believe that the Corps should keep the lake levels at West Point Lake between 633-635 msl.

Comment ID: 225
Author Name: Patrick Crews
Organization:

I ask that the Corp consider allowing the lake to stay at 635 year round.

Comment ID: 227
Author Name:
Organization:

Keeping winter(off-season) elevation at 632 would allow much better utilization of the lake and would increase the value of the resource compared to lower elevations, but would still provide large amounts of storage for flood control.

Comment ID: 230
Author Name: Scott Harris
Organization:

I think we need to keep the lake levels at

the minimum levels, 633.

Comment ID: 233
Author Name: Terry McMillian
Organization:

To this end, please maintain our lake level a 633-635 ms

Comment ID: 240
Author Name: Jeff Todd

Organization:

Serious study should be given to leveling out our action zones, and raising the winter pool to 633. We think that flood control would not suffer as a result, and that having that extra storage in WPL when the flows are truly needed downstream would be very positive.

Comment ID: 243
Author Name: Peter Houghton
Organization:

We need a water level of around 632 ft. winter and summer to be able to use the lake year around. Any lower and we cannot launch our boats.

Comment ID: 246
Author Name: Rich Gibson
Organization:

I would like to see the Corps manage West Point Lake at levels from 633-635 msl.

Comment ID: 247
Author Name: Rich Gibson
Organization:

By maintaining West Point Lake from 633-635 msl year round, drought conditions will not cause such a dramatic effect during the summer.

Comment ID: 250
Author Name: Rich Gibson
Organization:

By changing the Action Zones to levels between 633-635 msl, we can help to ensure better water quality.

Comment ID: 257
Author Name: Phil Horton
Organization:

Consideration should be given to reducing the draw-down of West Point Lake in the future and/or drawing down the lake a month or two later in the year. Drawing down the lake in November seems premature considering most of this area's heavy, flood producing rains usually occur in the months of January through April.

Comment ID: 258
Author Name: Tim Gay
Organization:

I agree with the recommendation to maintain lake levels at 633-635 msl.

Comment ID: 265
Author Name: ray roesel
Organization:

maintain water lake level of 633-635

Comment ID: 266
Author Name: Ralph Peery
Organization:

Maintaining a lake level of 633-635.

Comment ID: 267
Author Name: doug pauley
Organization:

I would like to see this lake maintained at 633 msl or higher year round

---

Comment ID: 272
Author Name: Marsha Woodward
Organization:

I sincerely hope that the corps can find a way to keep our lake at no less than 630' year round, it would drop a little more but then would put all boats and people at risk that use the lake year round like the local residents, not to mention the business that is lost in the county. Please do what you can to help us. Thank You Marsha

---

Comment ID: 285
Author Name: Daniel Houghton
Organization:

I can't think of any reason not to change the winter pool level to 633msl and around 635 msl summer pool but, if that can't be done I would like someone to explain it to me.

Comment ID: 286
Author Name: Raymond Newman
Organization:

West Point Lake need to be maintained at minimum lever of 623-635 MSL. The lake was authorized by Congress for the purpose of general recreation use. It should be maintained at levers that serve that purpose.

Comment ID: 287
Author Name: Raymond Newman
Organization:

The West Point Lake should be maintained at the minimum level of 633-635 MSL.

Comment ID: 289
Author Name: Eugene Gatwood
Organization:

Please maintain the lake level between 633-635 feet winter pool due primarily to sediment build up.

Comment ID: 308
Author Name: Michael J. Mcbride
Organization:

Through information from the scoping meeting and from the West Point Lake Advisory Council it is my understanding the Corps has some discretion in what the levels should be between 641' and 620'. Further this decision is based not only on current weather conditions but also on studies and data that is decades old.

The Advisory Council has funded a current study recommending a 633-635' level be maintained. At the scoping meeting I inquired if the Corps could adopt this study and was told it did not fit the Corps' criteria. Further I was told if the lake levels policy is to be changed a multi million dollar three year government study would have to be done.

Advisory Council members have advised me they are currently working on having their study fit the Corps' criteria. Hopefully this can be accomplished in short order and adopted by the Corps.

Comment ID: 314
Author Name: Charles S. Neely
Organization:

I believe winter pool level should exceed 628 MSL and history over the last 30 years would indicate that lower winter pool level could span a shorter period of time than has been the case.

The 2008 level this fall seems far more realistic in terms of meeting all of the purposes for which the lake was impounded

---

Comment ID: 334
Author Name: Sarah Beth Mallory
Organization:

Please assure that the minimum lake level of WestPoint lake is maintained at 635 msl.

Comment ID: 335
Author Name: Sue & Tim Christolm
Organization:

We believe that the minimum lake level should be maintained at 633-635.

Comment ID: 336
Author Name: Terry McMillian
Organization:

Please maintain our lake level of 633-635 msl.

Comment ID: 337
Author Name: Terri Brooke
Organization:

Manage the lake to maintain a level of 633.

Comment ID: 341
Author Name: Rick Mallory
Organization:

1. Maintain minimum lake level of 633-635 year round.

Comment ID: 344
Author Name: *Debbie Burdette
Organization:

maintain lake level 633-635 winter

Comment ID: 345
Author Name: *Charis Acree
Organization:

I have lived on West Point Lake for 20 years and want to voice my concern for maintaining the lake level at 633-635 msl.

Comment ID: 349
Author Name: *Marlene Timmerberg
Organization:

We want the lake to be managed at a level of 633 to 635 for a safe recreational lake for which is was proposed. We are tired of our lake being used for flood control by the corps.

Comment ID: 354
Author Name: *Barbara Keller
Organization:

The level of the Lake as influenced by rainfall and drought are acts of nature which require a management approach. This fact leads me to request that West Point be maintained at the level of 633-635 msl.

Comment ID: 355
Author Name: *Daniel Houghton
Organization:

1. Maintain water level at 635 summer 633 msl winter.

Comment ID: 356
Author Name: *Robert Parker
Organization:

Keep lake levels @ 630 in winter and full in summer.

Comment ID: 360
Author Name: *Mickey McCoy
Organization:

Maintain minimum lake level of 633-635 msl;

Comment ID: 362
Author Name: *Pam Ramsay
Organization:

I am concerned about maintaining the Lake Level at a consistent level of ^365 msl

---

Comment ID: 364
Author Name: *Marsha Woodward
Organization:

Keep lake levels at 630-635

Comment ID: 388
Author Name: Kent Bennett
Organization:

Too much fluctuation in the lake levels. I would like to see the limits be set at 633 to 635 feet if that helps with the fluctuations. Even thought that affects the Winter fishing.

Comment ID: 409
Author Name: Frank Russo
Organization:

maintain a minimum lake level of 633-635 msl

Comment ID: 430
Author Name: Kathi Wilson
Organization:

As a resident in the LaGrange community and owner of a home on West Point lake I have seen the impact that lower lake levels have on the community. I believe that if the lake levels were to be maintained between 633MSL and 635MSL as shown in the study completed by Basile Baumann Prost Cole & Associates it would not only be an economic asset to the community and the state of Georgia but will also be maintained as it was originally intended.

Comment ID: 431
Author Name: Ted Wilson
Organization:

From a lake front resident and Treasurer of Holbrook Pointe Property Owners Associations point of view I believe the economic impact on our community is driven by West Point Lake level remaining between 635MSL and 633MSL. (Based on the study by Basile Baumann Prost Cole & Associates)

Comment ID: 468
Author Name: Ethyl L. Ault
Organization:

* Maintain minimum lake levels of 633 - 635

Comment ID: 469
Author Name: Robbie Nichols
Organization:

1. Maintain 633 - 635 lake level

Comment ID: 574
Author Name: G. Eucle Vickery
Organization:

[1. Maintain minimum lake level of633 to 635 feet above mean sea level.]

Comment ID: 574
Author Name: G. Eucle Vickery
Organization:

The Corps must find a new approach to managing water levels to ensure year-round minimum levels of633 to 635 msl.

Comment ID: 575
Author Name: Dolly Martin
Organization:

2) The winter pool should be maintained at or about 633 MSL. This would allow 12-month recreational use of the lake and store water for the dry summer months.

Comment ID: 576
Author Name: Dave Marting
Organization:

2) The winter pool should be maintained at or about 633 MSL. This would allow 12-month recreational use of the lake and store water for the dry summer months.

Comment ID: 577
Author Name: Brenda Harris
Organization:

2) The winter pool should be maintained at or about 633 MSL. This would allow 12-month recreational use of the lake and store water for the dry summer months.

Comment ID: 578
Author Name: Billy Harris
Organization:

2) The winter pool should be maintained at or about 633 MSL. This would allow 12-month recreational use of the lake and store water for the dry summer months.

Comment ID: 583
Author Name: Elizabeth Johnson
Organization:

The major concerns that I have regarding West Point Lake are: 1]. Keeping the lake at an optimum level of 633 -635 feet year round.

Comment ID: 584
Author Name: Charles Johnson
Organization:

The major concerns that I have regarding West Point Lake are: 1]. Keeping the lake at 633 -635 feet year round.

Comment ID: 637

Author Name: Gene Davis
Organization:

Would like to see Winter Pool on Lake West Point to go no lower than 631' and summer level to stay at 635.

Comment ID: 638
Author Name: Sylvia Davis
Organization:

Concern over lake level - good this year but was that due to new management or rainfall - like to see it above 633 ft.

Comment ID: 639
Author Name: Patrick Brock
Organization:

Maintain minimum lake level to 633-635'

Comment ID: 642
Author Name: Katie Van Schoor
Organization:

Please maintain our lake @ a level of 633-635 MSL!

Comment ID: 643
Author Name: William Robinson
Organization:

Keep level @ 633'-635' to maximize recreational & economic liability of lake.

Comment ID: 701
Author Name: Richard P. Sandoz
Organization: Property Owner

Please allow the lake to reach 1073 ft in elevation if weather conditions can accommodate.

Comment ID: 723
Author Name: Jim Aspinwall
Organization:

Please change the winter pool level up 2 feet from the manual for better drought control.

Comment ID: 753
Author Name: Allan Mitchell
Organization: Mitchell Marine, Inc.

A minimum water level needs to be maintained!!!

The lake should be kept around 633 to 635.

Especially during times of drought there should be no more flowing out than there is flowing in!! If the dam was not built, the mussels and sturgeon would not be getting anymore than the good Lord was flowing down the river anyway.

Comment ID: 817
Author Name: GENE JONES
Organization:

West Point Lake should have it's water level maintained at 635 during the summer and while it may need to be lower during the winter, I believe that 628 is too low!!!!! It definitely needs to remain above 630 at all times. 633 to 635 would be wonderful. The lake level definitely needs to be maintained better during the spring so that the fish can spawn.

Changes at Lanier (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 8
Author Name: Tiffany Stone
Organization: Lake Lanier Resident

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 11
Author Name: Tom & Patti Montijo
Organization:

Raising full pool to something higher than 1071.

Comment ID: 14
Author Name: Al Pope
Organization:

Adjust a full pool level of 1073

Comment ID: 16
Author Name: William D. Rezak
Organization:

And finally, please raise the full pool from 1071' to 1073' above sea level.

Comment ID: 17
Author Name: Marguerite Daniel
Organization: Athens Boat Club, Inc.

4. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft. thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 36
Author Name: Tony Owens
Organization: MeadWestvaco

Circumstances in North Georgia have changed dramatically since the 1940s and 1950s. Atlanta and its surrounding communities consume more water than they used to, and they clearly want to consume even more in the future. Further, a local economy based on recreation and waterfront property values has developed around Lake Lanier. Like TRWDA, MWV understands and appreciates the difficulties created when water quantity in Lake Lanier is insufficient to fully serve those ancillary purposes. However, while circumstances in the Atlanta area may have changed, the legal principles governing operation of Lake Lanier have not. The fact that upstream communities have become dependent on the federal resource is certainly problematic in times of water shortages, but the Corps still cannot lawfully address local shortages by allowing unauthorized diversions from Lake Lanier, thus creating further problems downstream.

Comment ID: 40
Author Name: Paul M. Flood
Organization:

2. During the rainy season, have Lake Lanier reach full pool no later than June 1st each year.

6. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool level from 1071 feet to 1073 feet above sea level as soon as natural rainfall is sufficient to do so, which will add an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the Lake. I understand that this is more water than Lake Apalachicola has at full pool! Since Lake Lanier has been as high as 1077 feet in the past (without any long-term adverse effects), the Lake should be filled to 1073 feet as soon as possible. The proposed Corps study can be completed when the Corps has time to finish it, and the conclusions can be implemented at that time after the Lake has been filled.

Comment ID: 53

Author Name: Ron Seder
Organization:

The bottom of the Lanier conversation pool has been identified as 1035’ msl, which is 36 feet below full pool. Lake economic benefits are curtailed long before the 1035’ level would be reached. Lanier economic benefits are seriously diminished when the lake falls below 1060. Raising the Lake Lanier full pool level above 1071’ msl appears to be a relatively inexpensive and safe way to provide additional reservoir water storage. The minimum water quality Chattahoochee River flow at Peachtree Creek of 750 cfs should be reduced as the quality of Atlanta Area sewer plant discharges is improved. Head requirements at Woodruff Dam should be revisited to see if something can be done to improve them, thereby reducing the Woodruff release requirements during rain events, allowing more water to be stored in the reservoirs. Ronald Seder 6355 Barberry Hill Place Gainesville, GA 30506 770-889-1088

Comment ID: 65
Author Name: Vicky Ginn
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake. We respectfully request that these measures be seriously considered and implemented. Sincerely, David and Vicky Ginn

---

Comment ID: 79
Author Name: James Griffin
Organization:

- Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 80
Author Name: Greg and Mary Drummer
Organization:

-to raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.
Please heed our requests and keep Lake Lanier the great resource that it has been for years.

Comment ID: 108
Author Name: William McCalley
Organization:

3. Raise the lake level to 1,073 feet.

Comment ID: 333
Author Name:
Organization:

1. Full pool should be raised to 1073 ft.

Comment ID: 372
Author Name: Nancy Niekro
Organization:

One immediate solution would be to raise the level of the lake by at least 3 feet.

Comment ID: 394
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

b) Raise the Lanier level to 1073 (The pro's far outweigh any con's).

Comment ID: 397
Author Name: Cile Gierhahn
Organization: Lakefront Homeowner

Raise LL full pool from 1071 ft, an unreasonable level!

Comment ID: 399
Author Name: Jane Browder
Organization: lake property owner

Since Lake Lanier is fed by a very small water shed that relies on rain in the North Ga area to feed it. It has become essential for the level to be raised to 1072 and maintained year round with only a 4 to 6 foot variance.
We can not always count on Mother Nature to provide and adjustments must be made in times of droughts to protect our water rights.

Comment ID: 400
Author Name: Chuck Hall
Organization: Lake Lanier Homeowners Assoc.

Let's face it 1080 msl is better than 1050 msl that's a no brainer! We can't make it rain but we can always let it out!

Comment ID: 407
Author Name: Tim Watford
Organization: The Lake Lanier Association

I would like to see the full pool level of Lake Lanier be increased to create greater storage capacity in anticipation of dry/drought years. Maybe as much as 2' or 3' feet. This would reduce the impact on drawdown in future years.

Comment ID: 412
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association County Commissioners of Georgia

This should include raising Lake Lanier’s full pool from 1,071 feet above sea level to 1,073 feet to enable the system to meet its downstream requirements in times of severe drought.

Comment ID: 413
Author Name: Perry Darsey
Organization:

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 414
Author Name: Pat Darsey
Organization:

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 416
Author Name: robert Busser
Organization:

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 417
Author Name: Mary Thompson
Organization: Mary Thompson Appraisals

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 418
Author Name: Mary Thompson
Organization: Mary Thompson Appraisals

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 419
Author Name: Jayne Olderman
Organization:

2. Raise the full pool level to 1,073 feet thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to Lake Lanier

---

Comment ID: 420
Author Name: Allen Gresham
Organization:

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 421
Author Name: Pat Darsey
Organization:

2. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 422
Author Name: Jerry Collins
Organization:

I urge the "full pool" be raised 2 feet to 1073.

I've been utilizing Lake Lanier since 1960. My family has had lakefront property on Lanier for over 40 years. I seen many droughts come and go.

With the population growth of North Georgia, Lake Lanier is a vital resource and must be expanded to have larger storage capacity.

Comment ID: 424
Author Name: James Klass
Organization:

Increase full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 427
Author Name: Mark Condon
Organization:

I would like to urge the Corps to raise the full pool level from 1071 to 1073. I understand that this increase in depth, while disruptive to me and many others that live on the lake, would add an additional 26 billion gallons of water and create an additional buffer against future droughts.

Comment ID: 441
Author Name: Miller Stevens
Organization:

Raise water level to 1073

Comment ID: 450
Author Name: Sidell Tilghman
Organization:

As I understand it, the proposal to increase the full pool of Lake Lanier to 1073 has to be okayed by Congress and all you need is 3 years(unbelievable)to put this new Manual together so isn't that enough time for Washington to act?

Comment ID: 452
Author Name: James & Shannon Lince
Organization:

. Raise Lake Lanier's full pool to 1073.

Comment ID: 460
Author Name: Peter Collins
Organization:

*Raise full pool to get more storage capacity.

Comment ID: 461
Author Name: RPM
Organization: Boat Dealer

Raise the lake level to 1073 or 1074,

Comment ID: 467
Author Name: Susan Garchow
Organization:

Increase full pool from 1071 to 1073.

Comment ID: 472
Author Name: Mary Kirves
Organization: Lake Property Owner

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft. above sea level to 1073 ft., thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 474
Author Name: Mandy C. Harris
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1973 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 475
Author Name: Richard N. Harris
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1973 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 476
Author Name: Heather Jones
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1973 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 477
Author Name: Crow Hunter
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1973 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 478
Author Name: Matt Johnston
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1973 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 479
Author Name: Stephanie Nakamura
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1973 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 481
Author Name:
Organization:

he full pool setting of 1071 Feet - Change it to 1073 feet; just do it!!!

Comment ID: 483
Author Name: Steve Warlick
Organization:

We need to raise the level for full pool to 1075 ft.

Comment ID: 486
Author Name: Jim & Judy Foster
Organization:

The full pool number should be raised to accommodate seasons of good rainfall

---

Comment ID: 487
Author Name: Melvyn & Gail Smith
Organization:

1-Raise Lake Lanier full poof from 1071ft above sea level to 1073 ft above sea level;

Comment ID: 491
Author Name: Terri Jondahl
Organization:

In my previously submitted comments I forgot to include that I strongly support the idea of increasing Lake Lanier capacity by raising full pool to 1073 feet.

This provides significant additional reservoir cushion when the drought ends at a very marginal cost.

Comment ID: 493
Author Name: Thomas Vivelo
Organization:

4. If we allow the lake to fill to 1073 in stead of the current 1071 full pool it will give that much more storage to mitigate future droughts.

Comment ID: 495
Author Name: Christopher Seeley
Organization:

4) Raise the full pool level of Lake Lanier from 1071 to 1073. Ft above sea level, thereby adding an additional 26 BILLION gallons of water to the lake. This is very simple, but effective measure that would have minimal negative impact and would have tremendous upside potential. In other words, a no brainer.

Comment ID: 496
Author Name: James & Martha Burwell
Organization:

he Corps should raise Lanier's full pool level to 1073 ft above sea level, adding 26 billion gallons of water to the lake to support all citizens who depend on Lake Lanier as a resource.

Comment ID: 498
Author Name: James & Pamela Norman
Organization:

Most important to us is a request that the Corps please raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake. We believe this will also increase the safety of boating on Lanier and preserve property values, recreational opportunities and economic benefits derived from the lake. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Comment ID: 505
Author Name: John and Jodi Wacho
Organization:

7) The full pool level of the Lake needs to be raised to 1073 above sea level due to the increase use of the water from the Lake, for drinking water and sewage disposal.

Comment ID: 506
Author Name: Marilyn Haight
Organization:

I definitely am in favor of raising Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft to 1073 ft.

Comment ID: 507
Author Name: Trace Erge
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 508
Author Name: Robert Tate
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake. Thank You for your consideration.

Comment ID: 510
Author Name: Michael Muenchen
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 511
Author Name: John Muenchen
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 512
Author Name: Will Daniel
Organization:

I also support moving the full level to 1073.

Comment ID: 517
Author Name: Scott Carper
Organization:

4. Please consider raising Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 518
Author Name: Raymond Smith
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 519
Author Name: Brad Jordan
Organization:

such as raising Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 521
Author Name: John O'Donnell
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 522
Author Name: Tim Muenchen
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 524
Author Name: Palmer
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 525
Author Name: Walt Banasik
Organization:

4. Raise full pool to 1073 adding 26 billion gallons of water

---

Comment ID: 526
Author Name: Sam Boggs
Organization: citizen

Follow Lake Lanier Assn's. suggestions especially 1073 level.

Comment ID: 527
Author Name: Terry Simpson
Organization:

In this light I would still like to see the recommendations of groups such as Lake Lanier Association and 1071 Coalition reflected in the new management plan. Specifically, I hope the plan will include provisions for raising the summer pool from 1071 to 1073,

---

Comment ID: 528
Author Name:
Organization: Resident

That the Lake Lanier full pool levels be raised from 1071 ft. above sea level to 1073 ft., thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 529
Author Name: Tim Altman
Organization: Timberidge on Lanier Condominium Association

4) Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 530
Author Name: Lisa H. Howell
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 531
Author Name:
Organization:

Also full pool should be changed to 1073.

Comment ID: 532
Author Name: Jim Geist
Organization:

know that raising the full pool level of the lake from 1071 to 1073 has been put on the table. Admitting that I am not knowledgeable of the full consequences of this action I would suggest that even a high level, maybe 1075 be considered.

Comment ID: 533
Author Name: Jeanne Beachler
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 535
Author Name: Stacy Wade
Organization: LLA

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.-

---

Comment ID: 536
Author Name: Ellen Whitaker
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 537
Author Name: Charles Mann
Organization:

3-If the full pool level is increased to 1073, it would be a tremendous amount of water in reserve to help with downstream requirements during droughts.

Comment ID: 538
Author Name: George N. Slappey, DDS
Organization:

Please raise Lanier's full level to 1073! It is so overdue!

Comment ID: 539
Author Name: Ken Fields
Organization:

Raise Lanier’s full pool from 1071 to 1073. We will need the additional water.

Comment ID: 540
Author Name: Charlie Nugent
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby
adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 541
Author Name: Donald C Pauley
Organization:

1. Lake Lanier should be allowed to rise to 1073 feet by June 1 each year.

Comment ID: 544
Author Name: Raymond F. Egan
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an
additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 550
Author Name: Todd Bitzer
Organization:

Additionally, we should increase the full pool level of the lake to add further protection in the
event of future drought conditions.

Comment ID: 551
Author Name:
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an
additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 552
Author Name: Leo and Marie Anne Van de Vall
Organization:

-Please, raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an
additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 556
Author Name: Guy Caldwell
Organization: Possible NOW

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft,
thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 557
Author Name: Terry Donnenwirth
Organization:

We also believe the Lanier full pool should be raised to 1073 ft. adding water to the lake. The

---

Comment ID: 559
Author Name: Roy Beavers
Organization:

I also support any efforts to raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft I understand that the additional volume would be in the neighborhood of an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake. This can only help the overall effectiveness of the lake and every area downstream, especially during times of a rain shortfall.

Comment ID: 560
Author Name:
Organization: Windsong Sailing Academy

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 561
Author Name: Jay Martin
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 562
Author Name:
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 564
Author Name: S.M. Chassner
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 566
Author Name: Tom Riggle
Organization:

Stop the continue release of water now and don't release any water until the lake reaches 1073. Then, basically, only release the amount of water that comes in as natures provides. Allow a fluctuation of not more than two feet. If the level drops to 1071, no more releases beyond what comes in each day. That would restore the natural flow.

Comment ID: 571
Author Name: Robert Kopp
Organization:

b). Raise the Lanier level to 1073. (The pro's for outweigh any con's.)

Comment ID: 595
Author Name: Susan Banasik
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 596
Author Name: Dale Smart
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 599
Author Name: Don Turner
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 601
Author Name: James Inglis
Organization: none

4. Please raise the full pool from 1071 ft. above sea level to 1073 ft., thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake
Thank you,

Comment ID: 602
Author Name: Mack Butler
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake

---

Comment ID: 604
Author Name: FRED ROBBE
Organization:

The proposal to increase the full pool to 1073 makes a lot of sense and would be just like adding a new reservoir for almost free.

Comment ID: 605
Author Name: Rick Smathers
Organization:

The level of West Point Lake must be managed within 2-3 feet of full (635 feet).

Comment ID: 610
Author Name: Marvin Fisher
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 611
Author Name: Bob Kaufman
Organization: Harbour Point Dock Chairman

- Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake

---

Comment ID: 612
Author Name:
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 616
Author Name: Craig Grier

Organization:

Raising Lanier's levels to 1073 from the current 1071. This allows billions of gallons for the needs down stream.

Comment ID: 617
Author Name: Robert Skrypek
Organization: Lake Lanier area resident

raise Lake Lanier full pool level to 1073' to maintain additional water capacity

---

Comment ID: 618
Author Name: Barry Smith
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 620
Author Name: Jerry Griffin
Organization: Association of County Commissioners of GA

In summary, ACCG urges that any new Water Control Plan not simply tweak or replicate the Corps' existing operations. Instead, alternative operating plans must be developed using modem inflow forecasting and modeling to meet the agreed upon performance measures that will manage our shared water resources much more effectively both now and into the future. This should include raising Lake Lanier's full pool from 1,071 feet above sea level to 1,073 feet to enable the system to meet its downstream requirements in times of severe drought.

Comment ID: 626
Author Name: Carl & Rae-Lynne Swigart
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 627
Author Name: Chad Hargett
Organization:

Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake

---

Comment ID: 628
Author Name: Art McGovern
Organization:

Raise the full pool level to 1,073 feet thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to Lake Lanier

---

Comment ID: 629
Author Name: Brantley Burns
Organization:

1. I am in favor of raising the full pool to 1073. This makes very good sense in view of the vast amount of increased storage this gives for little or no cost.

Comment ID: 630
Author Name: Art McGovern
Organization:

2. Raise the full pool level to 1,073 feet thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water

to Lake Lanier

Comment ID: 632
Author Name: Tony
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 633
Author Name: David Vogelpohl
Organization:

We need to seriously consider raising full pool to 1073 or greater. This will allow for additional storage which when combined with lower releases during drought periods will keep the lake fuller.

Comment ID: 648
Author Name: Trey
Organization: Wakeboarder

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft,
thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 649
Author Name: Trey
Organization: Wakeboarder

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft,
thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 651
Author Name: Bert Sykes
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 653
Author Name: Bruce Margol
Organization:

Lake Lanier's full pool should be raised
from 1071 to 1073 adding additional useable water to the lake.

Comment ID: 660
Author Name:
Organization:

6)Is the Corps seriously considering adjusting the full pool level of Lanier to 1073? Or 1072?

Comment ID: 667
Author Name:
Organization: lake Lanier association

RAISE FULL POOL TO 1073 FT.

Comment ID: 672
Author Name: David Volpe
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an

additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 673
Author Name: Masry Jean Volpe
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 674
Author Name: Michael Volpe
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 675
Author Name: Jennifer Volpe
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 676
Author Name: Evelyn Volpe
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 677
Author Name: Kristie Myers
Organization: Lake Lanier Resident

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 680
Author Name: John Tierney
Organization:

- Please raise the "full-pool" level to 1073' from the current 1071' level. This makes sense as it will provide more than 26B gallons of additional water reservoir to the entire system.

Comment ID: 682
Author Name: Bob Kruer
Organization:

How would I change the management? First increase the storage capacity of all the lakes in place by raising normal pool levels and increased dredging

---

Comment ID: 684
Author Name: MICHAEL MC-KEITHEN
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft,
thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 697
Author Name: Beverly Bibikan-Koenig
Organization: LLA

LAKE LANIER, BEING A MAJOR WATER SOURCE FOR ATLANTA SHOULD BE RAISED AND MANAGED TO A LEVEL OF 1073 FEET ONCE IT FILLS AGAIN. THIS WILL GIVE A

BUFFER TO CARRY US THROUGH DROUGHT CONDITIONS GOING FORWARD. THE WATER CONTROL UPDATES YOU ARE PLANNING SHOULD INCLUDE NEW MANAGEMENT AT THIS LEVEL.

THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS MATTER.

Comment ID: 702
Author Name: Julie Starling
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.
please please add more water back into our lake! it affects everyone!

Comment ID: 703
Author Name: Allen DuPont
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 704
Author Name: Allen DuPont
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 705
Author Name: Jim Purdy
Organization:

Also would suggest the full level be increased to 1073.

Comment ID: 706
Author Name:
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 707
Author Name: Vicki Bentley
Organization:

However, I DO NOT support the idea of increasing the lake level of full pool to 1073'. I live in a lake front house, with a heavily forested strip of USACE land between my yard and the lake's edge. I estimate that raising the full pool level might result in the deaths of as many as 20 trees along the shoreline. I do not believe that USACE will have the funding to remove any trees killed by an increase in the level of full pool. Thus, I will have to pay for tree removal, or else suffer further damages to my property (I already have experience in this matter!!!)
--
However, I DO NOT support the idea of increasing the lake level of full pool to 1073'.

Comment ID: 711
Author Name:
Organization: Self

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 712
Author Name:
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 713
Author Name: Bob McLeod
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 717
Author Name: Mr. and Mrs. John McCarthy
Organization:

EPA/EPD Eco all the buzz about regulating water, building more storage and we have the ability here on Lanier to hold more water - a 25MM gallon lake by adding 2 ft to Lanier with minimal impact.

Comment ID: 724
Author Name: D Head
Organization: boater

When Lanier ever gets back to full pool (1071 or 1073) implement a policy of what comes in is what goes out.

Comment ID: 725
Author Name:
Organization:

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 731
Author Name: Phil Sutton
Organization: Hall County Board of Commissioners

-Raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 745
Author Name: rob Lehman
Organization:

Wouldn't it be better to raise the full pool level a few feet to offset such water loss in times of drought or less than normal rain fall? Wouldn't this help with our increasing demand downstream and in our neighboring states? Seems like a fairly logical solution.

Comment ID: 764
Author Name: Fran Bonner Habeeb
Organization:

Lastly,
they should raise Lake Lanier's full pool from 1071 ft above sea level to 1073 ft, thereby adding an additional 26 billion gallons of water to the lake.

Comment ID: 786
Author Name: David Vaughan
Organization:

Raise the full pool for Lanier to 1073. This will cause a temporary inconvenience for a few people [including my family], but it will increase the storage capacity significantly. Moreover, the lake will seldom stay at this level for a significant length of time. Average levels are usually two feet or more below full pool anyway, so any inconvenience will be minimized.

Couple raising the lake level with redefining management zones for Lanier. A new Zone 1, in which levels could vary freely, should be between 1070 and 1073. A new Zone 2, in which discharges should be carefully monitored and regulated, should be between 1067 and 1070. In a new Zone 3, between 1065 and 1067, discharges should be permitted only in compelling circumstances and in accordance with established guidelines. Below 1065, discharges should be prohibited unless there is a threat to life or health.

Comment ID: 795
Author Name: Blake Whitney
Organization: tax payer resident

Increase full pool to 1071

Multiple Reservoirs (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 759
Author Name: Billy R. Mayes
Organization: Dothan Utilities

5. Evaluate the need to increase reservoir volumes at WestPoint, George, Andrews and other locations to help meet the needs of the river basin.

Comment ID: 763
Author Name: James H. Phillips
Organization: Middle Chattahoochee Water Coalition

Evaluate the need to increase reservoir volumes at West Point, George and other locations to help meet the needs of the river basin.

Changes at Andrews (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 759
Author Name: Billy R. Mayes
Organization: Dothan Utilities

11. George W. Andrews Lake and dam needs to be listed for water supply purposes.

Evaluate Alternatives (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 493
Author Name: Thomas Vivelo
Organization:

These are not the only actions that need to be taken, but are actions that The Corps of Engineers can indorse and enforce now. Other actions must be taken by the State of Georgia, the City of Atlanta, and all the counties that rely on Lake Lanier for their water supply. They should include: 1). Limit growth and development until water resources that can meet the demand are found and taped. 2). Institute strong conservation regulations to force any individual or company that draws water from Lake Lanier to reduce their consumption. 3)The city of Atlanta must find an additional secure water source or be charged at rates that will force growth to be curtailed. 4). More reservoirs must be built quickly to ease the burden on Lake Lanier in times of drought. Thank you for considering my thoughts. Thomas Vivelo 5985 Nachoochee Tr. Flowery ,Branch, GA 30542

Comment ID: 609
Author Name: Paul Kelman
Organization: Central Atlanta Progress/Atlanta Downtown Improvement District

] The Corps should not be constrained by legal arguments about its authority to change existing operations. The Corps should study alternatives to determine the highest and best use of reservoir storage given current conditions in the basin. We strongly believe that water supply is the highest and best use of storage in Lake Lanier. To the extent Congressional approval might be required to implement the preferred Water Control Plan resulting from this study, the Corps

should then seek such approval. The Water Control Plan must be based on facts and sound science

---

Change Federal Policy (Outside Federal Authorizations)

Comment ID: 445
Author Name: David Sargent
Organization:

* Change Federal Policy (1958) to match modern needs