

APPENDIX B
COMMENTS LISTED IN THE LAKE SIDNEY LANIER
FINAL SCOPING REPORT

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Issue: Aesthetics

Impact on Lake's Appearance from Water Level

LL.117

During normal water levels the lake looks good.

LL.123 FG-BO

One person mentioned that the lake's aesthetic beauty has suffered because of the low water levels. Clear-cutting trees in front of homes also contributes to the decline in aesthetic beauty at the lake.

Improve Lake's Appearance

LL.102

In years past, this cove was pristine and was home to nesting ducks, geese, other waterfowl, and turtles. It is a sad sight to behold now.

LL.39

What recreation and aesthetics. There are none. What is there is at best an afterthought or little used. Even the boat ramp docks are out of the water!

LL.48

Lake is ugly and dangerous to boaters and swimmers.

Support for Current Lake Management Activities

LL.110

Outstanding – OP-SL is forever improving on current facilities.

LL.86

The Corps does a good job of protecting the aesthetic appeal and native environment of the shoreline.

Water Quality

LL.3

This is a crucial part of the lake's economical value; therefore, preserving the lake's aesthetics & ecology should be highest in priority when looking at recreation and aesthetics.

Issue: Boat Docks

Fees

LL.15

Could we raise funds to help protect the lake (primarily water quality) by raising boat dock fees? They're incredibly inexpensive and I'd bet the owners would pay more to receive a healthier lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Issue: Boat Docks

Accessibility

LL.39

In regard to this and the shore management plan, the absolutist prohibition on any structure that would allow one to reach the dock during full pool and low water times is nuts. Either let people build modest access paths or walkways to their dock or keep the water level constant.

LL.78

Extend the ramps since the winter level is going to be significantly lower.

Allow longer steps since the water level is going to be a lower level on an average.

I also think the standard 40-foot walkway rule is ridiculous for shallow cove areas where the Corps allows runoff to make it shallower and more docks than the area can support.

LL.82

Should allow difficult lots access via golf cart or 4 wheeler on privately paved path.

Allow More Boat Docks

LL.22

My prime comment to this whole situation is that USACE and Hall County Tax Office need to coordinate better. Anyone who is paying "water front" tax rates should be permitted to have a dock.

LL.47

Again, dock permits should be permitted on the east side of the Baldrige Creek mouth point. This area would be better protected from boater trash as well as better maintained for dead trees etc plus would add revenue for the state.

LL.68

They are a good thing...they hold fish when the weather gets hot. Seriously, I do not understand how boat docks could be detrimental to our lake...Lake Sidney Lanier is anything, but...a wilderness impoundment.

Community Docks

LL.116

If you can't stop issuing new permits, issue community docks only.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Regarding community docks, the residents feel that community docks should not be forced onto individuals in lieu of allowing private boat docks. However, most feel that community docks afford a higher level of maintenance than do private docks. Many residents support limiting the number of slips allowed in community docks to control their size and appearance.

LL.122 FG-RLU

One person said that community docks should be regularly inspected for size and capacity.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.27

Can moorings for property owners play a role here, i.e., small docks with moorings as an alternative to large docks with lifts.

How about allowing residents to pool their resources and construct "community" docks or shared use docks rather than each property owner having a dock. Some property owners might do this as an economic measure and it could reduce the number of docks.

I see a lot of dock spacings that appear to be too close to each other.

LL.3

The Corps should promote community (multi-family) docks and deter the building of so many individual boat docks.

LL.7

There should be a direct advantage for groups of dock owners to switch to community docks.

Dock Maintenance

LL.108

Suggest inspection for dilapidated docks with revocation of permits in cases of compliance failure. Subsequent removal by contractor with billing to dock owner for cases of noncompliance.

LL.113

Some boat docks are in poor repair and even dangerous. Additional personnel could help alleviate this problem.

LL.12

Keep docks in good shape, so the parts aren't floating around our lake.

LL.121

Many residents are very concerned about the deteriorated condition of older boat docks and feel that the Corps should take a more proactive approach to enforcing maintenance rules.

LL.122 FG-RLU

The issues expressed by the recreational users related to boat docks include the lack of boat maintenance and the size of docks. Many believe that the Corps should restrict the allowable size of boat docks and impose a size limit on the boats allowed at those docks. Someone also mentioned that boats not being used and old rusty boats should be removed.

LL.123 FG-BO

Older boat docks should be maintained better. The group agreed that maintenance and enforcement are a must. However, cost and the lack of enforcement staff are barriers to maintenance.

LL.15

Enforcement of minimum standards (like float height, general condition, etc.)

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.31

Need a program to better monitor boat dock conditions. Many docks are abandoned or in poor repair.

LL.38

Unsafe docks where they fall into the lake should be ticketed.

LL.41

Lighting on the boat ramps could be improved. Many parks have lights, but the ramps are not lit very well to put your boat on the trailer after dark. Also, some of the ramps could be cleaned of sediments that have accumulated on the end which makes getting in and out more difficult. Many of the docks at the parks are fixed to land therefore they could not be pushed out as the level of the lake dropped. Could a dock be floated to allow people easier access to their boats once in the water? (I dumped my mother-in-law this year while she was trying to disembark to land at Big Creek. I'm not complaining though!!)

LL.46

Empower the residents to notify the Corps of docks in need of repair by the owner. There are numerous docks that lose flotation and it drifts about creating hazards for boaters.

LL.50

Dilapidated docks and other shoreline structures should be required to be demolished.

LL.59

There are many older docks on the lake that are in ill repair. The owners should be made to fix these or have them removed. When boats are sinking or sunk, the owner should have them removed.

LL.62

Dock owners who do not take care of their docks should be fined when they are allowed to breakup on the shoreline as the water recedes and also standards need to be developed for the upkeep of docks.

LL.69

Lots of "junkers" and eyesores that need to be removed!

LL.7

Dock builders should be licensed. Docks should be engineered certified to specific loads and strengths.

LL.77

There has been much debris from poorly maintained docks, both styrofoam and wood. Need regulations to require owners to fix, since this is both an environmental hazard and a public safety hazard for boaters.

LL.80

I think all docks should be stayed by sufficient cables and augers to the property so that the dock isn't swept away during storms. This would prevent trashing someone else's property and this might limit the damage done.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.89

Dock owners should be held to certain standards; i.e., flotation.

LL.93

There should be common architectural standards that would need to be met by a certain future date.

LL.94

Dock quality.

LL.96

Minimum standards for personal docks. The low levels have created a lot of broken docks and loose white styrofoam floats which need to be removed. Encourage individual docks to reduce high-density housing.

Dock Spacing

LL.108

Suggest 50 foot separation requirements be as measured from a lower lake level such as 1054; also on aesthetic issue.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several residents believe that the distance allowed between boat docks should be increased to create safer boating conditions and a more pleasing visual aspect of the dock areas. However, one resident feels that there should be no restrictions on the distance between docks or the size of docks. Most residents are concerned that the privilege of having a boat dock might be revoked or taken away in the future as a result of the EIS.

LL.123 FG-BO

Another boat dock issue mentioned was overcrowding

LL.27

I see a lot of dock spacings that appear to be too close to each other.

LL.49

When the water goes down people on outside (end docks) of coves need to be made to move their docks so the rest of us can push out, I have two stubborn neighbors who will not move. The three inside docks get trapped. One of these was just issued a permit last year but will not work with neighbors.

LL.70

None of these new docks meet the 50 foot apart rule and the cove cannot support these additions. I just want to know who got paid off that allowed this decision that violates the published "rules."

LL.73

At least require a larger distance between new docks to cut down on future dock permits.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.94

Floating separation.

LL.96

50-foot spacing excellent idea!

LL.98

Increase distance between docks and enforce policy to 100 feet.

Enforce current 50 feet policy in lake shoreline management plan. Enforce no dock crossovers.

Encapsulated Foam from Deteriorating Boat Docks

LL.116

Require project wide encapsulated foam now. Charge an appropriate permit fee. Prohibit any enclosure including grandfathered docks.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Deteriorating boat docks often lead to Styrofoam trash in the lake or unsafe boating conditions.

LL.123 FG-BO

As old docks begin deteriorating, the Styrofoam from the structure falls off into the lake, causing both trash and aesthetic problems.

LL.15

Increase standards with regard to polluting the lake (styrofoam floats, etc.)

LL.24

From my experience, this is reasonably well managed. I think more could be accomplished in the area of "foam replacement" if a partnership was formed in the removal and disposal space. It is common knowledge that disposal is a catch 22 and the easy method is cut it loose under the cover of dark. I am supportive of having a limit on the overall number of docks permitted and I am supportive of the trade-off methods being employed with regard to large developments. This needs to be managed in fairness to the property owners at large and with respect to maintaining quality of the resource. By and large, this how I perceive you are managing it.

LL.4

Enforce proper disposal of non-encapsulated dock floats.

LL.49

Need to get rid of Styrofoam—I floated in ten large pieces during Shore Sweep. Didn't really put a dent in the problem. Shoreline is literally littered with Styrofoam in Little River-Wahoo-Chattahoochee area.

LL.50

Phaseout of unprotected Styrofoam flotation should speed up.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.72

I am also concerned about the dilapidated docks with crumbling Styrofoam floats which are breaking apart and polluting the lake.

LL.74

Condemn and remove at owner's expense all docks with uncontained Styrofoam.

LL.78

Force owners to go to black floats 100 percent. Allow longer steps since the water level is going to be a lower level on an average.

LL.83

The Corps should immediately require the replacement of any docks that do not use encapsulated foam. As a participant in Shore Sweep, I see firsthand how this is a significant problem.

LL.86

The requirement to encapsulate foam under docks is necessary; but still there are large pieces of scrap Styrofoam floating in the lake and washed up on shore. They need to be removed regularly by whichever agency is responsible, not left where they are as safety and environmental hazards.

LL.87

There probably are rules set for proper discharge of replaced Styrofoam blocks of docks. These rules are obviously not enforced effectively since at last Shore Sweep we hauled plenty of Styrofoam to Sunrise Cove Marina. If these had been discharged in the right way these blocks would not have been floating in the lake or have been on several different shores where we (among others) found them.

LL.97

All old white Styrofoam floats should have a deadline to be replaced. In the spring the lake is covered with foam icebergs.

More Consistent Enforcement of Boat Dock Regulations

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several residents believe that the Corps rangers need to take a more consistent approach to enforcing the rules and regulations surrounding dock building, dock sizes, maintenance, and other issues. Some residents feel that different rangers enforce the rules differently.

Relax Some Restrictions

LL.122 FG-RLU

In addition to carrying capacity issues, one person said that some of the regulations are too strict, such as the rules on the type of carpet and ladders on vessels.

LL.39

A reasonable approach is what I see but the prohibition of covered docks makes no sense; if it is a dock, it is a dock; all this rule does is expose boats to the weather and vandalism.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.74

Less controls on the limitation of power. I need more outlets.

Size Restrictions

LL.123 FG-BO

Another boat dock issue mentioned was restrictions on the size of boats at docks.

Support for Current Boat Dock Management Activities

LL.118

There are plenty of boat ramps located evenly around the lake.

LL.28

Very happy with current program.

LL.44

Less of a problem if Lake is full, but again the Corps does a good job here.

LL.56

No complaints—I think this is managed well.

LL.58

Seem ok to me.

LL.61

Fine.

Too Many Docks

LL.111

Should not allow any more docks. Too MANY! The docks are way too big and too close together. The public cannot access the shoreline, without worrying if they are on private property. Makes the lake look trashy.

LL.112

Lanier has too many docks. Public land should be for the public not for individuals to enhance their property values.

LL.114

Too many—visually unattractive. Recommend offsite storage.

LL.115

Very unattractive along the shoreline, too many!!!

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.116

Stop issuing new permits.

LL.117

Too many boat docks. You can't pull up to the shoreline anymore without people from nearby home yelling at you. Docks are much too big. Boats should be at marinas.

LL.118

I feel that there is too many boat docks around Lake Lanier. Any additions to the number of docks around the lake would only take away from the beauty of the lake.

LL.119

Too many docks - ruins the look of the lake.

LL.12

I do think the number of docks need to be controlled, how far apart they are, the construction.

LL.123 FG-BO

When asked about concerns related to boat docks, some of the focus group participants said that there should be fewer boat docks.

LL.3

Boat docks should be considered an encroachment to the buffer and should be limited.

LL.35

The Corps is allowing too many docks, too close together, and too large docks in coves and places that obstruct the channels during CORPS draw downs—it is also obvious that money talks.

LL.38

A number of boat docks look unsafe, water line is so low.

LL.4

Increase where coves are running out of capacity or suitable locations for docks, advise the current landowner that a dock will not be permitted. Once a new owner buys the lot, it will be very difficult to deny him a dock permit.

LL.5

There are too many docks on the lake that take up valuable boating & fishing space. Need to measure how docks impact recreation space.

LL.54

I support moratoriums!!! Control growth...I don't want the lake to be gone before it's time...we don't need to be in the predicament that Lake Allatona is!

LL.60

Need to limit the number of boat docks on the lake. Shorelines are too crowded.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.70

This is a REAL sore point. We live in a shallow cove and were told when we bought our property ten years ago that no more docks would be permitted BECAUSE it is a shallow cove. Five years ago, someone bought a nearby wooded areas and created three "lakefront" lots by having a 10-foot strip touch Corps property. They were then successful in obtaining two additional dock permits. One neighbor continues to move the yellow/green triangles around so he can put his dock where ever he chooses. The Corps told this man where to put his dock, but will not enforce the fact that he puts it where he chooses (even when the lake is up).

LL.73

I would favor putting an immediate moratorium on new boat dock permits.

LL.83

Consider efforts to preserve shoreline, limit number of boat docks.

Corps should consider strictly limiting the number of new docks added to the lake.

LL.95

This is a very important issue. We feel there are currently more than enough docks. The shoreline is becoming unsightly and over crowded. Either extend distance between docks, or no more single dock permits!

Water Level

LL.122 FG-RLU

One person mentioned that low lake levels affect docks.

Issue: Boats

Enforcement and Control of Water Traffic

LL.113

Would like to see more enforcement and control of water traffic (speedboats, jet skis, etc.)

Impact of House Boats on the Lake

LL.124 FG-EO

Several people expressed concerns about houseboats. Their primary concerns are safety concerns related to oversized boats and houseboats at docks. The enormous size of these vessels makes it difficult for other boats to navigate around them, creating unsafe conditions. They asked that the Corps better enforce laws that prohibit people from establishing permanent residences on houseboats. Several people also expressed concern about the problem with heating of lake water from new cooling systems installed on houseboats. The warmer water disrupts aquatic life.

Impact of Large Boats on the Lake

LL.1

Is there any plan to limit the size of the boats & waves they make on the lake?

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.108

EIS should examine effects of large boats (not house boats) on shoreline erosion and other boating activity in such a relatively confined space.

LL.109

Maybe get a weight/size limit on boats. They are getting way too big for this lake.

LL.114

Boats are too big.

LL.116

Establish maximum horsepower for Lanier vessels.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Most of the Lake-Area Residents focus group think that there are simply too many large boats on the lake, especially during peak periods. They are concerned that these large boats lead to congestion and compromise human safety. They also contribute to noise and visual pollution.

LL.124 FG-EO

Bank erosion and the lack of vegetation caused by boats.

LL.21

Ban the 45 foot yachts that have no business on Lake Lanier. They are dangerous and their toilets pollute. Their owners are usually rich, drunk partiers who do not care one bit for Lake S. Lanier. Pay back the conservationist fisherman who are the only people who protect the Lake daily. Who does Bald Ridge Marina think they are with all their rules? Do they run the lake, or do you? According to them they own the water around their docks – 300ft into the lake from the Corps line??? Who did they pay to get the whole tributary declared a no wake zone??? Again, wasteful rich yacht owners who wouldn't know the concept of right of way if it bit them in the hindside.

LL.60

Need to limit the number and size of boats on the lake. Large boat wakes damage docks.

LL.67

It is not only the number of boats, but the size. The very large "cabin cruisers" seem to run at speeds that create ocean size wakes. These wakes in turn make their way to the shores causing erosion, etc. It may be time to consider a boat size limitation on the lake – either in gross weight, length or horsepower. The houseboats don't seem to be a big problem, they don't leave their marinas regularly and when under power, they don't create the wake problems the really large boats do.

LL.73

If there is any way to discourage the proliferation of the "large" cruisers, I would strongly favor it. These cruisers are causing massive siltation and erosion problems.

LL.77

Limit the size of boats that can use the lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.86

However, the increasing use of large, ocean-size boats and cabin cruisers on the Lake, with the tremendous wakes they create, are eroding the shoreline at an ever-increasing rate. Since the Lake is not the ocean or one of the Great Lakes, the size of boats on Lake Lanier should be restricted (at a certain length, for example).

LL.88

Boat size and power should be limited. The large cruisers create huge wakes which tear up docks and wreak havoc on the shoreline. Houseboats are fine at slow speeds.

License Boat Operators

LL.123 FG-BO

One person brought up an interesting issue about captain's licenses for boat operation. This person said that the regulations that govern a captain's license should be changed to follow Coast Guard standards to deter illegal activity on the lake, such as bootlegging operations. Another participant's response to this was that even if Coast Guard regulations are imposed on the lake, there is no enforcement authority because the Coast Guard's jurisdiction is in coastal areas. Another person suggested establishing new standards or expanding the existing ones.

More Strict Pollution Regulations

LL.124 FG-EO

The sale of 2-stroke-engine vessels should be reduced, along with stricter gasoline spill control and enforcement of Coast Guard regulations.

No Ski Zones

LL.31

Implement more non ski zones in narrow areas of lake.

No Wake Zones

LL.114

Boats wakes are damaging to environments and users.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many residents feel that the number of no-wake zones needs to be increased to prevent reckless driving.

LL.31

Also mark more no wake zones in narrower areas of lake.

LL.4

PWC and muscle boats make waves (causing shoreline erosion). Can we limit their use?

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.58

Thankfully, the slow/no wake markers have been moved further out from my dock at Sunrise Cove. Boat traffic outside the markers still causes excessive bounce in the slips. Thus, more Styrofoam blocks escape and moored boats stand to get damaged.

LL.75

Increase the number of No Wake areas.

LL.87

Please think of a ban for jet skis and race boats for the smaller secluded lake coves or at least find a way to enforce the no wake zones that are in place.

Noise Control

LL.108

Mufflers on boats.

LL.12

A noise control for the loud boats with these huge engines.

LL.120

Above water mufflers (cigarette boats), jet skis- any decibel/range limit.

LL.24

Even though I have owned a jet ski, I would like to see some form of noise pollution control on the lake. Boats and jet skis don't need to be loud to be fun and go fast, and noise pollution is a growing concern.

LL.4

PWC and muscle boats make noise (disturbing the peace). Can we limit their use or require high-quality mufflers on all water vehicles? Can we accelerate the Federal outboard/inboard engine standards?

LL.46

Enforce noise ordinances! Maybe consider deputizing the residents to assist. The above water line exhaust systems should be eliminated as they are a burden to the residents and the wildlife.

LL.54

Can't we do anything about noise pollution....!??

LL.64

What is being done to enforce the disturbing-the-peace sound level limits for unmuffled boats?

LL.66

The size of the engines on boats and their noise level should be restricted.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.82

Noise limits should be imposed and enforced.

LL.84

Either enforce a noise ordinance or do not allow open exhaust system. These boats with full open exhaust systems are a source of noise pollution; this practice must be eliminated. Other lakes have adapted this policy with kits that are available to remedy this very offensive pollution. The only time open exhaust should be allowed would be to test or run professional type racing events.

LL.86

I have heard from reliable sources that some of the marinas/boat maintenance facilities will remove the noise control devices (some kind of muffling device) or even install some new devices to make the above-mentioned boats even louder, since their owners apparently want everyone else to see them. This is very inconsiderate and unfair to the other boaters and homeowners, however, who do not wish to hear them. Limit speed of boats and the noise they generate. The noise they generate is an environmental hazard as well as a quality of life issue. When one of those boats passes by, while I am in my boat or even in my house, we cannot even converse because of the deafening noise.

LL.87

Instead of enjoying the quietness of these areas we are forced to hear the loudest of motor sounds when these speeders race into the cove and out again (not to speak of the wake and erosion problem that comes with that speeding).

LL.93

Noise level standards also need to be set and enforced.

LL.98

Noise control.

Other

LL.120

"Y" valves on boats/house boats/people living on boats in marinas—sewage, trash being dumped into the lake

Overcrowding of Boats on the Lake

LL.119

The lake is beautiful—wish there weren't quite so many boats!

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many people feel that the size and number of the boats allowed on the lake and at private docks and marinas should be limited.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.122 FG-RLU

The recreational focus group participants mentioned that more development on the lake increases boat congestion and traffic. The number of boats should depend on the results of the carrying capacity study.

LL.67

I live in the south part of the lake and fear that the lake has become too busy on the weekends. It is very uncomfortable and not very enjoyable to boat on Saturday or Sunday.

LL.77

Restrictions should be considered which limit the number of boats and PWCs that can be permanently docked at permitted docks, limit or stop the issuance of new dock permits, limit the number of day use launches at each ramp.

LL.82

Peak access periods should be limited.

LL.83

The Corps should consider limiting the number of individuals who can use or launch from any given park in any given day. The lake is becoming too congested and safety hazards are rampant.

Personal Watercraft

LL.1

Is there any plan to regulate the amount of "jet skis," "wave runners" where they can "roam."

LL.104

I am almost fearful of the jet skis when I am out on my boat.

LL.108

Effect on PWCs on other lake uses.

LL.111

Too many jet skis. Jet skis are hazardous to many boats, skiers, and swimmers. A jet ski would not be fun to drive if driven correctly, therefore are a hazard. Need stronger rules and restrictions on them. Prorate annual passes.

LL.12

I think a person should be able to water ski on a 2 seater jet ski with mirrors.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several people believe that there are too many wave runners in use on the lake and that most people who operate them do not use them in a safe manner.

LL.13

Ban all PWCs.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.6

Jet skis are a noisy annoyance for homeowners near the lake. We would appreciate a focus group to address this issue.

LL.70

Jet skis continue to terrorize our cove and we never see any patrols in BR6.

LL.75

Limit the use of personal watercraft.

LL.8

Can something be done about the noise that comes from Jet Skis? We lose our peaceful environment when they are used on Johnson Creek, which is quite narrow.

LL.86

The proliferation of jet skis also needs to be addressed. They are often noisy, too fast, and a nuisance to homeowners and boaters. Some lakes are beginning to restrict them to certain areas or prohibit them completely; and Lake Lanier would benefit from that approach.

Safety Concerns

LL.80

We need to step up the patrols on the lake for violators of the boating and water safety laws.

Size Limit for Watercraft

LL.124 FG-EO

Focus group members representing the environmental organizations agreed that a size limit for boats should also be established.

Speed Limit for Watercraft

LL.12

I think there should be a speed limit for all watercrafts.

LL.122 FG-RLU

The focus groups expressed concern about impacts of speeding, such as bank erosion, noise, and safety for everyone using the lake.

LL.124 FG-EO

The focus group members agreed that a speed limit should be established for all boats.

LL.64

A speed limit of 45MPH should be enforced on Lanier and all inland lakes for that matter.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.82

Speed limits should be imposed and enforced.

LL.86

It has become much more common to see loud, fast, racing boats (sometimes called "cigarette boats") on the lake. These boats operate at high speeds, creating serious safety hazards for slower, smaller boats, such as the pontoon boat I have. The lake again is not the ocean, and it is not an appropriate environment for boats running at speeds up to 100 MPH.

LL.93

Speed limits should be set and enforced.

LL.98

Somehow impress violators to observe the idle speed rule, speed control.

Issue: Commercial Activities

Expand Commercial Activity

LL.109

Need more fun venues! Stuff for people to do - restaurants, shopping.

LL.24

Where you already do allow commercial activities, i.e., riprap, you need to encourage greater competition (more suppliers) so the costs make the benefits more attractive to more homeowners. Anything to encourage this type of result would encourage greater private investment in the lake.

LL.31

Allow restaurants in several areas near marinas or major highways. Lease land for these ventures, and use the proceeds on lake issues.

LL.32a and LL.32b

I understand we have over 22 million visitors a year. Las Vegas has only 30 million. Just think if they each spent just \$2 more. Please promote recreation. We want more: Docks; Food; Theme parks; Sports; Events; Arts; Crafts; etc. With water quality and natural beauty first. (Good luck:->)

LL.39

I see no plan here; the Pine Isle area is the only development on the lake. There should be several hotels/restaurants etc on the lake to take advantage of its great view.

LL.68

Commercial resorts, restaurants and marinas contribute to the value of experiencing Lake Lanier...I want to see more.

LL.96

Restaurants and supply stores for boaters would be nice at Gainesville marina! We like Aqualand restaurant and Up the Creek.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.98

Development, development, development. Good luck.

Impact From Low Water Level

LL.123 FG-BO

Even though water levels will not be analyzed in the EIS, they are a major concern to the business owners and operators. They blame negative media coverage about the low water levels for the economic market decline and diminished opportunities for business on the lake. Some of the participants expressed concern about the adverse impacts of the water levels at 1,065 feet, such as occupancy access, ramps, hazards, and business effects.

LL.44

Negatively affected by low water levels.

Increase Number of Restaurants with Boat Docks

LL.105

Allow more restaurants accessible via water.

LL.24

I do believe allowing some form of docking for restaurants would improve the overall experience, although I am sure it could be argued to not be in the lake's best interests. Even Lake front restaurants without "boat docking" but with waterside dining would be a welcomed addition. Perhaps you could set aside a few "special view" locations and allow the leasing of the land for this purpose and apply the funding to other areas you need to support, like more rangers. This is commonplace in federal park systems and I would suspect highly desirable for the restaurateurs, general public and local economy.

LL.69

Would like to see more "drive-up" restaurants with dock space.

LL.75

We could use more waterfront restaurants with dockage.

LL.8

A nice restaurant we can take our boat to for lunch and/or dinner.

LL.80

We could use a few more food service places on the lake.

Limit Commercial Activity

LL.113

There is too much commercial activity.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.117

Getting a bit too large. Marinas seem to expand.

LL.3

Opposed to all commercial activities.

LL.5

At what point does commercial activity impact aesthetic values on the lake. Lanier is definitely over developed.

LL.56

I hope that there will not be any business permits issued for businesses to operate around the shoreline of Lake Lanier.

LL.70

We don't need anymore. They only cause pollution, traffic problems (water and road) and trouble, especially if there is not going to be a consistent, dependable lake level. More parks and FREE places for families to go and enjoy the lake, you betcha. More commercialism NO WAY!!

LL.97

Limit commercial development.

Marina Growth

LL.108

The current practice of grouping docks into developer marinas is good but has effect of increasing marina density.

LL.111

Marinas are way too big and too expensive. There needs to be stronger rules for them too!! They keep getting bigger and bigger and more expensive. It's a big competition between them and not fair to the public.

LL.112

We have enough marinas.

LL.114

No more marinas.

LL.116

Add marine services on the Chestatee River. Prohibit maximum growth of existing marinas.

LL.118

I feel there is plenty of marinas.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.119

Marinas are awfully big which accounts for too many boats!

LL.12

I don't think the marinas on the lake should be able to expand with no limits.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several residents believe that the size and number of marinas allowed on the lake have a negative impact on the lake's resources.

LL.60

Discourage growth of marinas.

LL.67

I learned at the meeting that the marinas are at 77% capacity. I shutter to think how it would be if they were permitted to expand to 100%. With 10,000 boats docked now, what would happen if everyone decided to take their boat out for a ride on the same day? Lazy Days has been expanded about 1000% in the past three years and it has had a detrimental effect to those of us living around this area, and those who used to use Big Creek Park to launch their boats. Water flow in and out of our cove has been diminished, it takes a great deal longer for debris and mud to settle out of the water after heavy rains. It is my understanding that Lazy Days has approval for additional 60' docks that would be placed in our cove. Not only would this make navigation in our cove difficult, it would also mean trees would be removed on the shore to allow access and another parking lot built. More runoff and destruction of the environment. I would not like to see expansion of any of the marinas on the lake.

LL.97

Limit enlargement of marinas.

Marina Inspections

LL.123 FG-BO

The business focus group participants mentioned that there should be more marina inspections and some sort of spill protection regulation.

No Heavy Industry

LL.68

I don't want any industrial paper mills or utility power plants.

Practice Environmentally Friendly Maintenance Activities

LL.123 FG-BO

The participants agreed that good business practices on the lake make good economic sense. Improvements and protection of the lake's water quality should be through environmentally friendly maintenance activities, such as using less-toxic paints and environmentally safe detergents.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Prohibit Commercial Activity from Parks

LL.115

Need to be kept out of parks. Such as jet ski rental at boat ramps.

LL.116

Do not allow commercialization of project parks.

LL.67

I also heard that Lake Lanier Islands was going to close the camping areas for a new hotel and golf course. Not good news, if true. Clearing land for this kind of expansion would again mean destruction of trees, erosion, runoff of chemicals needed to maintain golf courses. I don't know if the Corps has any control over this type of commercial development, but if we are to manage the lake to keep it a viable resource, thought must be given to not "using it to death." The Corps may have no control over how this land is developed, but I wanted to mention it anyway.

LL.79

I am a resident on Lake Lanier on the cove behind Mary Alice Park. I am writing in response to the EIS being done in the area. I am disappointed that only one public session was held in a county that the Mary Alice Park study has no impact. I am writing in strong opposition to the project since this is would put a hotel and amphitheater in my back yard and most traffic through my front yard.

Mary Alice Park is only accessed through residential neighborhoods with no direct access to any major road or highway. Due to the current environmental problems in Atlanta no new road improvements for Forsyth County and GA 400 can be approved currently so this means access will be through residential streets. The City limits of Cumming do not extend out to Mary Alice Park. My subdivision Park Shore is between the city limits and the park and we have no intentions of being annexed to support this improvement.

I personally moved to a lake side community with my property backing up to Army Corps property so nothing would be built in my back yard. I moved here 2 1/2 years ago from East Cobb which did not care about its residents and only big business. The only improvements that should be made to Mary Alice Park is to enforce the boat parking for vehicles with trailers and that the beachfront parking is for all other people visiting the part. I would support more picnic areas around the park. I do not support any commercial usages of this park.

Prohibit Races on the Lake

LL.82

Commercially sponsored races such as the "Poker Run" on Lake Lanier should be strictly prohibited.

Regulate Activities

LL.110

I feel that when a marina asks for something added to their area, it is automatically approved. Master plan may have requested the addition. But times and usage have changed. (Example Big Creek area.)

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.116

Require dock builders and adjacent businesses that use Lanier to have a license.

LL.12

This needs to be controlled strictly. I don't think the marinas on the lake should be allowed to expand with no limits.

LL.24

Restaurant access and limited additional gas dock and pump out station access would be beneficial.

LL.27

Should be limited, including boat rental locations which put a lot of dangerous boaters on the water.

LL.58

Seem ok. Commercial activities are regulated and monitored more than private activities.

LL.59

I feel some commercial activities are good as long as it doesn't get out of hand. I enjoy being able to get in my boat and go out to dinner. A few more restaurants would be good. Even though I live on the south end of the lake I feel the north end could use some gas docks.

LL.7

Must be regulated but it almost all is set aside for the big guys. There should be more for the little guys like ice cream truck, vendors, what ever.

LL.8

We need a marina that will sell gas around 53 & Bolling Bridge.

LL.81

The lake should not be intended to support any commercial activities outside of recreational conveniences, i.e. marinas, fuel docks, and power generation as it was specified when chartered.

LL.83

In light of heavy use the lake already receives, new commercial activities need to be strictly scrutinized and probably severely curtailed.

LL.95

Welcomed, but controlled.

Stay at Current Level of Commercial Activity

LL.108

I suggest that current commercial activities are sufficient for a lake of this size - exceptions may be restaurants.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.16

I appreciate the control the Corps of Engineers has exerted in this area. What we have now of resorts, restaurants and marinas is good. More of these will hurt the lake.

LL.28

I own my own business and am reliant upon local businesses. I own an air conditioning maintenance company. Without commercial activity I would have to move. The lake provides the business that keeps me here.

LL.50

No additional commercial activities should be allowed on the lake. (See comments below regarding commercial dredging.)

LL.56

No complaints.

LL.61

Fine.

Issue: Drinking Water Supply

City of Gainesville's Drinking Water Plant

LL.120

What is the effect going to be on the lake when they start pulling the water out?

Concerned About Gwinnett County's Discharge of Treated Sewage

LL.120

What are the fail-safe backups? When are Hall County and others going to start doing the same thing once this precedence has been set?

Water Allocation

LL.17

If Alabama needs water from Lanier then they should let us run a pipe (and help pay for it) to the Tennessee river in order to ensure adequate water level in Lanier during drought years.

LL.66

Is there no limit to the amount of water that Gwinnett can siphon off? If 25% of their land mass is in the Chattahoochee Basin, then why do they get 60% of their water from this basin? Make them find water elsewhere.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.92

Lake Lanier's role in the Apalachicola-Flint-Chattahoochee (ACF) River System has been under consideration by Alabama, Florida and Georgia for many years. Some of the past proposals for managing the ACF would take Lake Lanier down 36 feet to the bottom of its conservation pool at 1035' msl. That would be a tremendous environmental impact on Lake Lanier and virtually eliminate lake recreation, as we know it today. The EIS should include the environmental impact of the lake at various levels.

Water Supply

LL.16

I believe water supply is the main emphasis of keeping and developing Lake Lanier.

LL.63

Lake Lanier is the major source of water supply for the greater metropolitan Atlanta area and much of north Georgia and should be protected.

LL.76

Lake Lanier is the primary source of drinking water supply for the Metropolitan Atlanta region and should be operated accordingly to sustain availability of the supply.

LL.83

The Lake needs to be operated first and foremost to provide a water source for metro Atlanta and then for recreation. As a water source, the chief concerns should be water quality and quantity. With regard to quality, an assessment should be done of the quality and then steps taken to increase the quality of the water in the lake. With regard to quantity, the lake should be kept at full pool to the maximum extent possible so that reserves are available in periods of drought. More attention needs to be paid to shoreline erosion (increased no wake zones) and development activities that silt in the lake as well.

The Lake needs to be operated to provide a water source for metro Atlanta. As a water source, the chief concerns should be water quality and quantity. With regard to quality, an assessment should be done of the quality and then steps taken to increase the quality of the water in the lake. With regard to quantity, the lake should be kept at full pool to the maximum extent possible so that reserves are available in periods of drought. More attention needs to be paid to shoreline erosion (increased no wake zones) and development activities that silt in the lake as well.

Water Supply/Recreation

LL.50

Lake Lanier should be used only for water source and recreation.

Issue: Management Activities

Additional Staff Needed

LL.113

Excellent– but could use more staff for such a large operation.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Fees

LL.7

Instead of fines and BUI. People should generate more monies by usage fee/ramp fees/donation campaigns/dock fees.

Financial Support for Enforcement Activites

LL.123 FG-BO

The group discussed the need for more financial support for enforcement on the lake and mentioned that the resource managers at Lake Lanier do a good job considering the lack of funds available.

Management Activities Need To Be Revised

LL.43

Very upset about priority uses of lake.

Meeting Location and Frequency

LL.122 FG-RLU

Need to make sure the public knows about meetings and focus groups.

LL.13

Before even a rough draft of the EIS is generated, a scoping meeting in Gainesville must occur! Lake Lanier is not in Gwinnett Co., it is in Hall Co. People who live in Gwinnett Co. are only weekend users of the lake, They don't have to care about the water quality. If it gets bad enough, they'll just stop coming to Lanier and go somewhere else. Having a meeting in Gwinnett County about Lake Lanier is like asking the wolves "what should we do with the sheep?" The Lake Lanier Association currently has a lawsuit against Gwinnett Co. to keep them from dumping up to 120 million gallons of "treated" sewage into Lanier - daily (even though the treatment plan is nearly finished).

I am 44 years old and have been on or around Lake Lanier since 1973 (plus or minus). I can only hope and pray that we all can get a dose of common sense and do whatever is necessary to make sure that my kids and your kids can enjoy Lake Lanier in their future.

Look up the Lake Lanier Association on the Internet. Also try www.lakelanier.org.webmaster.

LL.31

Hold more local meetings for this statement prior to formulating initial statement. The one meeting that was held was held too far from the lake, in a county that has demonstrated lack of concern for the future of the lake, and the meeting was held without enough time to allow many people to accommodate their schedules.

LL.37

I request that periodic public meetings be held to provide the public with progress reports on the EIS and allow for additional public comments to be provided as issues and circumstances on and around the lake change with time.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.85

Our first recommendation is that you conduct another Scoping Meeting in a location that encourages more Lake Lanier knowledgeable people to attend and provide their input. The Duluth, Georgia, location of the August 16th meeting was illogical and caused some of our members to wonder if it was not intentionally chosen to discourage attendance by those closest to the lake. Duluth is several miles below the Lake Lanier watershed in a county that has only about three square miles of its geography on the Lake Lanier watershed. The Duluth location is an hour or more from many people living in the Lake Lanier area that know most about the history of the lake, and the concerns that deserve attention. Hall and Forsyth Counties, having most of the Lake Lanier shoreline, are much more logical locations for the scoping meeting, and they have many facilities that could accommodate the meeting.

LL.92

In summary, we suggest that there be another scoping meeting conducted in closer proximity to the lake; there be a focus on the past and future growing population's contribution to the changing quality of Lake Lanier's water; and there be an assessment of the environmental impacts caused by different Lake Lanier levels.

Our first recommendation is that you conduct another Scoping Meeting in a location that encourages more Lake Lanier knowledgeable people to attend and provide their input. The Duluth, Georgia location of the August 16th meeting was illogical and caused some of our members to wonder if it was not intentionally chosen to discourage attendance by those closest to the lake. Duluth is several miles below the Lake Lanier watershed in a County that has only about three square miles of its geography on the Lake Lanier watershed. The Duluth location is an hour or more from many people living in the Lake Lanier area that know most about the history of the lake, and the concerns that deserve attention. Hall and Forsyth Counties, having most of the Lake Lanier shoreline, are much more logical locations for the scoping meeting, and they have many facilities that could accommodate the meeting.

Other Policy Suggestions

LL.116

Close Buford Dam Road to through traffic. Remove all existing grandfather items on Lake Lanier.

LL.48

It is very difficult to conceive that the CORPS even has a PLAN for Lanier. IF they have one, they should seek guidance from non government entities to amend same. Based on current Corps management the lake will be destroyed within ten years or less.

Other Suggestions

LL.68

Great place to live, visit and fish (so far); but things seem to be out of control and going DOWN-HILL over the past two years. I blame it on the politics!

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.91

The EIS, last updated in 1974, identifies, evaluates and documents the environmental and socioeconomic effects of the Corps's program to operate and maintain the lake. Corps spokesman Pat Robbins said the EIS process takes about a year or 18 months. "We'll do what we call a draft environmental impact statement, and at that point and time it goes out for public comment," said Robbins. Robbins said that EIS only deals with Lake Lanier and that the tri-state water talks, which include water in Lanier, have their own programmatic EIS. The Scoping meeting for public input is scheduled for August 16 from 8:00 am. to 9 p.m. at the Gwinnett Civic and Cultural Center in Duluth. Robbins said the Thursday session is being held throughout the day so people can drop in when their schedule allows it. Robbins said the Corps knows there are certain things it need to look at in the EIS, including water quality, fisheries, recreation, overall management of project land, safety and other environmental topics. "What we hope from the public and what we often find from the public is by their attending these meetings, they point out issues that we may not be fully aware of or would not have thought of considering in the EIS," said Robbins.

LL.97

Most of my comments are common sense and the Corps should have realized this from working the lake.

Public Education

LL.121 FG-LAR

Most residents in the focus group feel strongly that the Corps should increase the level of public education on how, why, and when water levels are lowered and raised in the lake.

LL.123 FG-BO

The group agreed that the Corps should provide more educational opportunities for lake users to learn about how to improve and protect the lake's water quality. Several business owners and operators volunteered, with the Corp's support, to facilitate activities to educate their customers. One participant said that using boat dealers to distribute educational pamphlets and brochures was a possible means to heighten awareness about the lake environment. According one person, it is important that the public understand what it takes to operate, maintain, and protect the lake because the knowledge will enhance their overall experience when they visit the lake.

Public Involvement

LL.12

I think the homeowner and public need to be involved with all operations and maintenance.

LL.7

There could be more done. Maybe work could be contracted to the public. (People should pay more to use the lake. Property owners should pay more.)

LL.9

Develop a strong public participation program. Get buy-in from environmental organization. Focus on groups such as the Georgia Conservancy.

LL.93

All Corps rules, decisions, plans, etc., should be published and easily located on the Internet

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Standardize Enforcement Regulations

LL.124

Most of the residents feel that politics plays too large a role in how the lake is managed. If someone has the money to pay fines or get around the rules, no action is taken against them.

LL.124 FG-EO

According to many there seems to be a problem with local enforcement of state regulations. They believe a Lake Lanier enforcement authority should be considered to standardize the regulations.

Support for Current Lake Management Activities

LL.109

The Corps does a great job with the mandate they currently have.

LL.110

Overall this program is working well.

LL.113

Excellent

LL.119

I think the Corps of Engineers is doing a super job maintaining the lake!

LL.28

I appreciate and respect the hard work done by the Corps. I hope you continue to work with the residents and community to maintain our lifestyle.

LL.34

Overall, I think the lake is managed well - given the demands made upon it.

LL.44

Other than water level, a good job is done.

LL.56

No complaints.

LL.58

Good luck to all those who are paid to look after the lake. Under the circumstances of how the water has to be used, the lake is probably managed as well as it can be.

Seems ok.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.61

Fine.

Fine.

Water Quality/Recreation

LL.50

The lake should be managed primarily as a water and recreation facility.

Watershed Management/Water Quality/Recreation

LL.77

Lake priorities should be watershed and natural resources management, water quality, recreation quality and drought relief. Production of electricity should be very low priority. Enabling barge traffic on the lower Chattahoochee should not even be considered.

zOther

LL.39

Nonexistent as far as I can see.

Issue: Real Estate

Clairify Property Ownership

LL.124

The Corps needs to clarify rules on the "ownership" of property in front of the actual property the landowner owns. Residents don't feel that it's fair to sell a permit to someone who does not actually own the property in front of the permitted property.

Development Concerns

LL.106

We were concerned with the Truman Mt. Watershed which empties into Lake Lanier along the Chestatee River. To date we have been successful in stopping several commercial enterprises. Everyone must be made aware of the dangers of over development, poor development, and non-concern for our water sources.

LL.108

I believe natural resources are suffering as population density increases. I'm in favor of reasonable tightening to protect wildlife. Corps rangers do a very good job.

LL.112

We need the natural area protected. Over building is taking away so much from the beauty of the area.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many attendees feel that less development would help to improve the quality of the water in the lake. Many of them support some type of rezoning in the watershed that would slow or restrict development to help improve water infiltration and reduce storm water runoff.

LL.24

The management of the shoreline from a development point of view has greatly enhanced the "natural beauty" of this manmade resource. Excellent!

LL.32b

I understand developers and builders are taking their money now and the other forces like you and me need to look out for the lake of the future. I help some but you can help more than most. Please do what is right for the future. What you know in your heart is right.

LL.60

Minimize further residential development.

LL.70

We need more parks that are free to the public, not more houses or commercial property that prohibit the general public from enjoying the lake.

LL.80

We need to build up the park areas around the lake and reduce the house building. There are enough home sites on and near the lake. We could use more sites that introduce people to hiking and "How To Do" wilderness camping and survival techniques.

LL.85, LL.92

The growing population of the area and continuing rapid development of the Lake Lanier watershed is the greatest threat to the quality of water in Lake Lanier. The Atlanta Metropolitan Area has grown tremendously during the past 25 years, and that along with the attractiveness of the Lake Lanier have caused much of the watershed development. Lake Lanier is becoming more and more an integral part of Metropolitan Atlanta. More businesses are moving to the watershed and there are more Lake Lanier area residents commuting to employment or businesses in other parts of Metro Atlanta. The EIS certainly must assess the environmental impacts of past and projected population growth for the Lake Lanier area and its watershed.

Other Suggestions

LL.48

If a private commercial business had managed Lake Lanier to its present state of deterioration, I sincerely believe that the CORPS would sue them for malfeasance. The CORPS truly should be ashamed of their record on this formerly beautiful lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Issue: Recreation

Boat Ramp Regulations

LL.122 FG-RLU

Several recreational lake users expressed concern about parking areas at the boat ramps. They said that the regulations for parking areas that already exist for cars and trailers should be more stringently enforced. Only trailers and trucks with boats should be allowed to park at the ramps.

Fees

LL.121 FG-LAR

Residents support raising permit, boat ramp, and user fees to pay for increased ranger presence.

LL.122 FG-RLU

The group expressed concern about how the park entrance fees are spent. They believe the revenues from these fees should be spent on lakeshore maintenance, improvements, and resource protection activities.

LL.18

Dock permits cost only \$5.00 per year for 24 hour year round access, yet access to launch a boat or visit a park for someone who does not live on the lake costs \$3.00 per day or \$25.00 year.

LL.27

Consider charging use fees for those who use the lake on a temporary basis - fees sufficient to pick up and haul away the trash they generate.

LL.35

There should be a entrance fee on all parks, a fee to launch at all boat ramps - this money could be used to keep the trash cleaned up and to enhance the enforcement on the lake.

LL.84

Use docks as a source of revenue, establish a \$500 fee per year for a period of five years, then back to \$250 per year in order to have a pool of money. This money will help fund erosion control, dredging, dock inspection and water quality assurance. Survey the docks so others may enjoy the privilege. Many of the docks have been located as to block others from having a dock. An example of this is those that set the dock at the farthest corner of their lot so as to block others from having space to place theirs. Decrease space from 50 feet to 30 feet or 40 feet.

Impact From Low Water Level

LL.38

Beaches are neglected as a result of the low water level.

LL.44

Recreation is seriously reduced by low water levels.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.77

Recreation and aesthetics are down significantly this year with the water levels.

Increased Access

LL.124

Residents feel that the Corps should allow more year-round use of public parks. One person mentioned that because some parks are closed at certain times of the year, other parks experience increased use and parking needs.

LL.124 FG-EO

Residents feel that the Corps should allow more year-round use of public parks. One person mentioned that because some parks are closed at certain times of the year, other parks experience increased use and parking needs. Others believe the Corps should increase the presence of rangers at parks and other areas of the shoreline to ensure public safety and to enforce shoreline management rules and regulations.

In addition, several residents feel that the Corps should allow some means for dispute resolution as it relates to shoreline use. The Corps is often too strict when it comes to shoreline encroachment and other shoreline use issues and should allow residents some way to dispute their rulings.

The Corps needs to clarify rules on the "ownership" of property in front of the actual property the landowner owns. Residents don't feel that it's fair to sell a permit to someone who does not actually own the property in front of the permitted property.

One resident mentioned the need to clarify allowable personal uses (e.g., irrigation) of lake water. Most of the residents feel that politics play too large a role in how the lake is managed. They believe that if someone has the money to pay fines or get around the rules, no action is taken against them. In addition, several attendees noted that the Corps should step up its enforcement of boundaries so that there are fewer encroachment issues and less clear-cutting. They would like to see more patrol by rangers to enforce boundary regulations.

LL.2

Would like to see camping season extended most especially old federal campground. We use campgrounds extensively and always enjoy.

LL.47

There are some protected areas (Public Recreation Areas) on the lake that I feel should, in part be classified as Limited Development. Those areas that are classified as Public Recreation should be open to the public but since there is no access to the area in question it should be reclassified. I'm speaking in particular of the 100 acres at the mouth of Baldrige Creek. This area has been labeled Public Recreation for many years but there are no parks, boat ramps or recreation on this land. If this is to stay Protected then it should be reclassified as Protected Lakeshore area and parts open for Limited development. If this were to occur the lakeshore would be better protected because now boaters' park on the shore and leave debris everywhere. If, at least on the east side of this point there were dock permits issued the shore would be better maintained.

LL.7

There are a lot of people here. They need recreation and they look toward the lake for it.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.92

The LLA view is that Lake Lanier was built with public funds and should be enjoyed by the public. On nice summer weekends the lake is busy with boat traffic, but during the non-summer season and on Monday through Friday during the summer season boat activity on the lake is minimal. So, a lot more recreation and boat traffic can be accommodated on the lake. We think there will be a self-limiting amount of activity on the lake as the increased usage makes an individual's recreation experience less desirable.

More Money for Education

LL.89

More money for education.

More Rangers to Enforce Regulations

LL.121 FG-LAR

At the same time, the residents support an increase in ranger presence on the lake and the shoreline to better enforce regulations. One resident mentioned that the Corps staff is very knowledgeable and helpful.

Some people believe that the Corps should have a greater presence on the lake to help prevent unsafe conditions.

LL.124

Some residents feel that the Corps should increase the presence of rangers at parks and other areas of the shoreline to ensure public safety and to enforce shoreline management rules and regulations.

Needs Improvement

LL.69

Lots of room for improvement.

Other Suggestions

LL.122 FG-RLU

Several recreational users feel that the purity of the mountain water that flows into the lake should be protected. Other participants also expressed their lack of trust of the Corps. According to some of the recreational users, the Corps needs to admit when they make mistakes because this honesty builds trust. One person said "be honest, even if the news is bad." The Corps also should do more to educate the public about why water release decisions are made. Another person suggested that there be more meetings with interest groups. Additionally, the group expressed a need for the DNR to do more inspections for Y-valves and a need for more communication and coordination between the DNR and the Corps. The loss of wildlife habitat around the lake also concerns the recreational users.

LL.39

Hey, how about some tours of the dam? Maybe think about improving the area behind the dam and coordinating with the state on putting in some downstream takeouts on the river behind the dam? It's time to change the mission, people!

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Overuse

LL.18

Parks near the dam fill up to capacity and park rangers block access. Park visitors need to be given greater incentive to go to parks further north and less used on the lake.

LL.27

Too much money has been spent improving Federal Recreation areas on the lake—i.e., campgrounds, beaches, etc. which simply attracts more people to an already overused lake.

LL.3

Current recreation is high. Economical advantages are high, too. Why not promote a recreation tax (very small) to pay for public education—showing how some recreation can be detrimental to the lake's ecology?

LL.77

Also, the lake is overused. It cannot sustain continued growth. Restrictions should be considered which limit the number of boats and PWCs that can be permanently docked at permitted docks, limit or stop the issuance of new dock permits, limit the number of day use launches at each ramp, limit the size of boats that can use the lake.

Parks—Fewer Facilities

LL.116

Add more passive recreation features. Do not operate lake parks as "city parks." Rather the visitor should expect a more natural environment. Encourage more maintenance dredging.

LL.68

I would like to see more walking, jogging and bike paths. Plenty of parks...if you want to picnic, camp or launch a boat; but not much to encourage visitors to stop by every evening and enjoy the lake as they get a little exercise.

Parks—Maintenance

LL.114

Campgrounds need rehab. Paving and impact areas are worn out and are becoming safety hazards.

LL.115

More funding is needed to maintain and improve existing facilities.

LL.80

To keep our parks clean and useful to the general public. The home owners on the lake front properties should keep the shore line property clean. Firm enforcement, through citations to the property owners, with fines and community services and, repeat violators, jail time might do the trick.

LL.86

The Corps seems to have abandoned some of the park areas around the Lake. One of them, Beaver Ruin Church Road, is not maintained except for occasional trash pick-up. Areas like that should be improved, better maintained, and patrolled by law enforcement.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.94

Keeping parks clean and neat.

Parks—More Facilities

LL.7

The government parks should offer more. They are beautiful parks. But everything else is at Lake Lanier Islands. More involved parks could generate much more income (horseback riding) concerts/events/picnics.

LL.84

We need sanitation facilities at all pay boat launch areas.

Parks—More Public Outreach About Activities

LL.15

More publicity about programs, trails. Not enough people know.

Public Involvement

LL.70

Given the resources the Corps has, I am sure they are doing the very best they can, unfortunately given the population explosion, it isn't enough to cover the demand and usage of the lake. My recommendation is the Corps invest in volunteer programs. Many residents and others would gladly volunteer our time, if it would be used wisely. Work WITH other non-profit groups and embrace their help. We are here to help, but the Corps has to ask for (and permit) our help. Anyone who owns property that touches the Corps property has a vested interest to protect the lake. We live here because we like the lake life style and the natural beauty—we would just like to see the natural beauty again.

Recreation

LL.16

The lake has evolved into a prime recreational area which has attracted people and industry to this area. Lake Lanier may have been started to be mainly a source of power and flood control but these concerns have been eclipsed by recreational needs.

LL.24

Recreational benefit - quality of life and LOCAL economic benefit - after all local people gave up their properties to build it

LL.59

I feel that recreation should be moved to a higher priority than it has been in the past. From everything I have read, the lake brings over \$2 billion a year to the local economy. When the lake is below 1066, this drops by 40%. They could rent a whole lots of trucks for that kind of money when they want to float a barge in a drought situation.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.62

Lake Lanier should be managed as a recreation area so that the water quality standards are the highest that they can be.

LL.71

More importance needs to be given to the importance of recreation when establishing policies regarding the lake.

LL.81

More consideration for recreation needs to be included. Water levels, water quality i.e., sewage, will affect the recreational quality and recreation of this precious resource.

Recreation/Flood Control

LL.82

Should be recreational and flood control, not power generation

Recreation/Water Supply

LL.39

The lake is being managed for 50-year-old goals that are out of step with current needs and priorities. Recreation and a reliable, high-quality water supply for Atlanta, South Georgia, parts of Alabama and Apalachicola Bay are today's priorities.

Regulate Boating Rules

LL.122 FG-RLU

This group feels that a group other than the Georgia Department of Natural Resource (GA DNR) should regulate boating rules.

Rule Enforcement

LL.121 FG-RLU

They also suggested that a cooperative agreement be established between the Corps and nearby county law enforcement agencies to patrol the lake for people who violate park rules.

LL.18

Use of METAL DETECTORS is currently restricted to a handful of areas. These areas should be expanded to all public beaches and perhaps to islands and other areas with natural sand. It is understood that some areas may have cultural resources or items of historical value. These areas can remain restricted. Aside from recreation aspect of metal detecting it also serves to help remove trash from the lake and shore.

LL.27

Too much money has been spent improving Federal Recreation areas on the lake – i.e. campgrounds, beaches, etc. which simply attracts more people to an already overused lake. Spend your money wisely and add Rangers and staff to properly supervise what exists.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.35

Use fees to keep the trash cleaned up and to enhance the enforcement on the lake - Better enforcement of parking violations and more boat trailer parking is necessary - use the local sheriff if necessary and give them permission to write tickets on Corps property.

LL.95

Obviously very important to us, however, people do not observe all the rules. Recreation brings in a lot of revenue, but rules must be enforced for safety and the aesthetics.

Support for Current Recreation Management Activities

LL.111

Parks and campgrounds always look neat and clean. Landscape is beautiful! Corps does a wonderful job in handling the rules in the park and they are strictly enforced. Wonderful.

LL.112

Overall the lake is managed very well. The parks and public facilities look nice and are well maintained.

Most all recreation areas are well placed on the lake and are very well kept. More recreation areas and less private interests would be great.

LL.113

Excellent. Staff does a very good job with the limited number of staff.

LL.117

All parks and recreation areas look great.

LL.118

The parks compared to other government parks are highly maintained. The appearance is neat and clean. I feel safe to take my son to any Corps of Engineer operated park.

LL.119

The parks always look neat and clean! I really enjoy the facilities. Restrooms great!

LL.12

To me, Lake Lanier is the most beautiful lake, the enjoyment and pleasure I receive can't be expressed in words. I'll do anything I can to maintain this wonderful lake.

The park system does a wonderful job.

LL.24

This is the best recreational water resource I have ever had the pleasure of using. The park system and boat launch facilities allow tremendous access to the general public. There are days I wish it weren't so, but overall it's the right thing for all.

The park systems and sponsored activities are excellent. You have done a great job of making a terrific resource even better.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.28

Extremely happy. This is why we live here. We moved from Connecticut and chose this lake.

LL.50

This is a very important aspect of the lake. The local economies benefit greatly from the recreational use of the lake.

LL.56

No complaints.

LL.61

Fine.

LL.7

Lake Lanier is a Georgia jewel. This should be a must. People work hard and this is something they really need.

LL.96

We love the campgrounds and day use areas. Especially Shadygrove and Little Hall.

Trout Populations

LL.20

By now it's obvious I'm primarily a trout fisherman. The trout fishing provided by the Lake Lanier tailrace is fabulous. The reproduction of brown trout is encouraging, and the stocking of rainbow trout has filled in many gaps.

Water Level

LL.58

I have been skiing on Lake Lanier since 1964 and sailing on the lake since 1974. I can still remember what the lake looks like when it gets full. And, we have not seen that happen in the last few years partly because of lack of rain, but mostly because of the down stream requirements of:

(1) the City of Atlanta and other downstream cities; (2) the newer navigational requirements for the Chattahoochee River south of Columbus; (3) the need for hydro power and water intake (at Plant Farley) for electric power generation; and (4) the maintenance of the (sadly polluted) oyster beds where the river enters the Gulf. So many entities have needs for the precious water stored in the lake. It seems, however, that the recreational users are way down on the priority list of users.

LL.77

Public docks have been out of the water and not usable all summer. Consider adding cables to allow docks to move out with the water. With the low lake levels, Corps should post, on the web site, lake elevations at which ramps will be closed. Instead of simply posting whether or not the specific ramp is open, include the elevation at which the ramp will be closed. That information will allow boat owners planning time to remove boats.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Water Quality/Recreation

LL.37

I would like to see the recreational/commercial needs of the north Georgia area be the second highest priority just behind maintaining water quality down the Chattahoochee River. Maintaining barge traffic down river seems to be an overall economic mistake considering the negative impact those water releases have on the upstream economy and recreational needs.

Water Supply/Recreation

LL.50

Lake Lanier should be used only for water source and recreation.

Issue: Shoreline Management

Allow for Prompt Enforcement of Shoreline Regulations

LL.110

Needs to be written so that corrective action can be done with promptness and efficiently.

Allow Residents to Make Improvements in the Buffer Zone

LL.37

Speaking as an immediate family member of a lake resident I have to recommend that the COE re-evaluate the restriction policies on Corps land with respect to minor aesthetic landscaping. In some cases I have seen denials by the COE of requests for tree, brush and limb removals that would have no impact on the natural habitat around the lake shoreline. I request the EIS look at other similar lakes where restrictions are less stringent and assess the environmental impact of those less restrictive policies on that local area.

LL.69

We should be allowed to make improvements.

LL.74

Poorly marked boundaries. Boundaries that are way beyond the natural preservation of nature. Allow underbrush removal and the removal of dead and fallen trees.

Concerned About Litter

LL.109

Trash pick-up on island, not just wait for shoresweep.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several residents were concerned about the amount of trash that can be found at parks and campsites and would like to see the Corps take a more proactive approach to trash removal.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.122 FG-RLU

Other shoreline management concerns were related to the need to promote volunteer cleanup activities.

LL.28

Not sure of current status. If this is cleanliness then the Clean Sweep program has done a great job.

LL.49

I think the DNR should fine boaters and picnickers for littering - don't know how, but something needs to be done. Too many people who use the lake obviously don't care about it.

LL.70

Add more trash cans to all boat ramp areas and remind them to "Put it here."

LL.84

The Corps should start a public program to remind people not to litter. Also, I would like to see Georgia adopt the bottle and can return system.

LL.87

What a shame and a waste of time and money that we actually have to do a Shore Sweep. And one is not even enough to clean up other people's mess. We need to have and enforce a no litter law for the lake!

Hall Clean Council (now Keep Hall Beautiful) and the Hall County Sheriff have in use a vehicle litter incident report that concerned residents can fill out when they see a litter incident take place and send the report to the Hall County Sheriff, who will follow up on the report. Maybe something similar can be worked out for the lake.

With all the required safety equipment that boaters have to have with them, why not add the requirement of having at least one litterbag on board and depending on the size of the boat more than one.

And provide more than one trash container at the parks that have a boat ramp, so that boaters can leave the trash behind in a proper place and not run the chance of having it blown off the back of an open truck or out of the open boat on the trailer while driving home for that trash will then still end up in the lake one day. Not having to clean up anymore will save a ton of money in work hours and equipment and also in annoyance.

Consistent Enforcement of Shoreline Regulations

LL.108

Desire ability of requiring counties to enforce the same set back requirements from the Corps line as required for separation from other property owners.

LL.111

People (adjacent landowners) get exceptions to the lakeshore management plan and it's not fair to others. The plan is not enforced on some people, so why have a plan.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.112

The plan is very good, but should be enforced with no exceptions.

LL.123 FG-BO

The fines assessed to homeowners when they are caught cutting down trees in front of their property are not a deterrent because multimillionaire homeowners who perpetrate such acts can afford to pay for them. In addition to fines, the penalty for violating the clear-cutting rules should be that the homeowners must replant the trees that they remove.

LL.15

Too many people violate rules and get away with it. We see/hear stories every day about people who throw money at violations to make them go away.

LL.3

The lake not only needs stricter buffer regulations, but the current regs must be enforced—or at least provide citizens who are concerned the correct addresses and contact info for people who are in the Georgia legislative.

LL.35

The Corps has not been following its own plan. They allow docks in places that exceed the channel obstruction limits in their own plan and they do not consider the impact of THEIR draw downs on channel obstructions. The fine for cutting trees and vegetation without Corps permission should be dramatically increased. Again those with large money just pay the pittance and get their unobstructed views

LL.49

Corps does a good job - just feel that everyone with lake property should abide by rules - too many disregard and do what they want to. I have a neighbor who has a blatant disrespect for the Corps and just does as he pleases. So far he has gotten away with cutting brush and dumping.

I have a huge buffer between my land and the lake and I follow Corps rules. It bothers me that while I am in compliance, many just clear away and also do not use silt fences. Too many people have no regard for the lake or its lifespan. I think the rules should be enforced so that all the clearing stops and silt/erosion must be controlled.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.70

I'm sure there is a plan, but I have not seen it. I have read the information, but I see violations by my neighbors and when we call, NOTHING is EVER done about it!! It is a sad joke these days. The Corps did nothing about construction runoff into the lake and our cove is now 1.5 feet shallower. For 3 years we called the Corps, the EPA, the building inspector and the Sheriff. All we got was finger pointing by each agency to another and the builders were allowed to do whatever they pleased. We were recently told we could have a dredge permit, however, who is going to pay the thousands of dollars it will take to clean up this mess? A mess created by all the various public agencies not enforcing the rules or laws. We are affected by this lack of response and enforcement of the rules and now have to live with it or spend a small fortune fixing the problem. The worst part is, even if we do come up with the money, there is no protection that it won't happen again. I cannot control my neighbors and the governing bodies will not enforce the laws. Personally, I think the Corps and EPA should fix the problem they have allowed to be created by not enforcing the laws. There is a rule so he can move it to drive on Corps property and even though we call, no one stops this man. Our new neighbors think they can do anything they like—and obviously they can because NOTHING EVER happens and he and his friends and family continue to do whatever they please whenever and however they please. Have you considered working with the counties to get some of the SPLOST money to assist with certain projects around the lake? If rules and laws are going to be made, then only make a few and ENFORCE them consistently and constantly. Check out Lake Tahoe—they are VERY SERIOUS about keeping that lake crystal clear AND they enforce the rules. As a result, it IS a beautiful lake and will continue to be.

LL.78

Follow the regulations as written and as previously and correctly exercised. Be firm but fair. Do not make up rules that do not exist.

Create a Consistent Buffer Zone

LL.39

Stupid. The existing Corps line looks like it was drawn by a drunk with no reason or rationale; sometimes it is in the water, sometimes a half mile from the shore. Where other lakes allow residents to at least cut trees and landscape so they can see the water, the Corps prohibits it. There needs to be a buffer but what we have now makes no sense to me... People on one side have a clear view, I don't and one next door has a cleared lot. It all depended on the line.

Current Regulations Are Too Strict

LL.122 FG-RLU

Some focus group members feel that shoreline rules should be relaxed. Many feel that not allowing any encroachments on Corps property is simply too strict. Participants also said that the Corps should clarify the boundary lines delineating Corps property because they are confusing.

Dredging

LL.101

Please consider the possibility of dredging some of the smaller cove areas that have been impacted by silt from developments around the lake, or for the purpose of increasing the water storage basin since water will continue to be a serious issue as the region's population increases.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.102

Please consider utilizing federal and/or state funds or grants commonly used for beach and coastal restoration for dredging the silt from shallow cove areas of the lake. This would allow the lake water to more easily flow into all its cove areas and still provide enough water in the larger portion of the lake.

LL.108

Standards for dredging.

LL.109

Need dredging in many areas. Help!

LL.121 FG-LAR

Some residents feel that they should be allowed to dredge their coves to increase the depth of the lake. They feel that this is a service to the Corps that they would pay for themselves and that it improves water quality, reduces siltation, and makes coves and boat dock areas safer to navigate. Others feel that there should be equal treatment by the Corps for marinas and homeowners when it comes to dredging permits. Marinas should not get preferential treatment over homeowners.

LL.123 FG-BO

Several of the business owners/operators expressed concern about the dredging activity at Lake Lanier. They believe that the Corps should loosen dredging restrictions and allow more dredging in all areas. Some would also like the Corps to provide alternatives for dredge spoils, increase the cubic-yard depth that can be dredged in the local permits, and shorten the period for getting approved for a permits. One person also suggested that Congress appropriate funding to the Corps to dredge the lake.

LL.41

During this low level period, I wish some areas could be dredged to improve navigation. The main place I have in mind is south of the bridge to Lanier Islands.

LL.45

Concerned about silt drainage and inability to dredge. Based on current regulations, water-based dredging is cost-prohibitive. Land-based dredging should be allowed if there is no damage to Corps property.

LL.47

Dredging downstream should be eliminated altogether. The cost of dredging in relation to the amount of revenue brought in from the river traffic is too low and isn't warranted.

LL.56

My only complaint is that more efforts and resources (technologies) need to be researched into dredging shallow areas and coves that have been filled up with silt over the years of unchecked runoff. As a homeowner located in a cove on Lake Lanier, I only have 6 feet of depth when the lake is at full pool and I feel that I could gain another 1 to 2 feet if this could be dredged down to the original lake bed. Ideally, since this is one of the largest Corps controlled reservoirs in the country, I would like to see government participation in technologies and FUNDS to help lake homeowners regain additional depth to the water in areas that have been lost to runoff in the past. I feel that this is only proper for the maintenance of this lake for the present and the future.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.57

Residents should be allowed to remove silt from the shore by their docks. The rule that makes them take it 500 feet from the water should be changed. The erosion has caused big ditches going down to the water. The silt should be used to fill in the ditches. Small mechanized equipment could be used without destroying the watershed.

LL.66

I would like to see more dredging allowed, in some cases required. If you can fine a landowner for disturbing vegetation without permission, why can't you fine or require dredging from a landowner that is disturbing his property and has undue levels of sedimentation or erosion affecting Corps property?

LL.80

While we have the lower water levels this is an excellent time to clean up the shoreline and maybe dredge out some channels that have filled with construction silt and build silting traps and charge the cost back to the builders and associates. Perhaps even the cities and counties that have excessive construction can pay for the silt traps since they eventually profit, through taxes, on the buildings and businesses.

LL.89

\$8.2 million was voted on for dredging down stream. Why can't this amount of money be allocated to improve Lake Lanier instead of limited source use like barge traffic?

Siltation will become a major problem. Allow on-the-water dredging. This should be a Corps responsibility.

LL.98

Supervise all individual dredging.

LL.99

Instead of stopping all dredging due to the actions of a few people, let me suggest that dredging be allowed under the supervision of a professional engineer. In my business, we develop real estate all around the southeast. We often develop in environmentally sensitive areas. To be allowed to do this, we are required to follow strict guidelines and to use the services of environmental engineers.

I would be willing to go to this higher level of supervision if I were allowed to dredge my lot on Lake Lanier. Let me also suggest that the dredging might be expanded to include deepening the lake below the silt. The dirt could be stacked on the shoreline instead of hauling it off (which causes damage to the vegetation). Again, an engineered plan would have to be submitted to the Corps and anti-erosion measures would be required to prevent the soil from washing back into the lake. By doing this, the lake would be deepened, creating a larger volume of water in the lake and extending the life of the lake.

Eliminate Orange Survey Markers

LL.66

The orange survey markers are horrible. They are aesthetically ugly and are a potential hazard.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Erosion

LL.109

Let people put in sea walls and breakers. The silt is killing this lake.

LL.12

We need to continue to keep the shoreline intact from erosion and with the lake level so low the mud and silt are a huge problem. We need continued community to clean up the shoreline.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many of the residents feel that shoreline erosion and resulting siltation is a high-priority problem facing the lake. They believe that the Corps should implement more erosion control measures along the shoreline to alleviate the siltation problem.

LL.23

The shoreline and water quality of Lake Lanier are as bad now as I've ever seen them. This is in great part due to the low lake level which exposes the mud and dirt shoreline to rains, facilitating accelerated erosion. The cove where my dock resides has become greatly silt filled in the past 2 years. If the water level doesn't stabilize, this cove will fill in as will countless others. This would have a serious adverse effect on the lake and all those downstream who depend on it. Me paying someone thousands of dollars for shoreline rocks is not a reasonable solution. The Corps needs to seriously address this issue. The fluctuating water level is ruining the resource. Take a look!

LL.24

Maintain balance between "natural setting" and development with the priority being protection of the shoreline to the degree necessary to protect water quality from runoff and silt (quality and quantity of volume). To this end, encourage the use and installation of riprap etc. from a economic point of view, through attitude and regulatory support. Right now the only means to achieve this is too expensive for most homeowners - but it is highly desired from an aesthetic, stability and quality perspective. This is potentially a very undervalued partnership opportunity. In the four years of property ownership at the lake, I have seen a dramatic loss of lake volume due to shoreline erosion. I have personally watched feet of shoreline, three and four feet in height, fall into the lake on a single day during a strong blow in March. A stable shoreline provides significant runoff protection on the landside and erosion protection from boat traffic and wind/waves on the lakeside. This cannot be accomplished by only managing "ground cover" on the shoreline. As well, water level fluctuations allow the shoreline to be significantly impacted through being undermined. Additionally, there needs to be a change in support of removing and recovering water volume through dredging. Once again, community support and investment would be forthcoming given the right atmosphere. There may even be commercial interest in the reclaiming of the silt. This would take a new out of the box approach and, as already mentioned, this would require a more innovative partnership approach. I recognize people will take advantage and this needs to be policed. I would fully support enforcement penalties stiff enough to discourage cheating and large enough to support enforcement resources - \$10,000 fines are ok with me. I would also support public exposure of offenders as a communications and deterrence tool. I would also support permit fees significant enough to help fund resources if low enough not to discourage the homeowner from making the investment. I do not support limiting the potential benefits because people will cheat. That is a reality that needs to be and can be managed. It is an unacceptable excuse for not working this issue. It is far harder to acquire and build a new resource than manage the existing one to the desired full potential.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.27

I believe the current plan works reasonably well. I see a lot of erosion due to rising and falling lake levels coupled with ocean type waves generated by excessive boat traffic. Use fees could also be used to riprap shoreline areas.

LL.31

Need better cooperation with local government (building/zoning) to better control the runoff and unauthorized shoreline use. Implementation of repair and restore in addition to fines. Accelerate program to riprap high-traffic areas to protect shoreline from erosion.

LL.33

Inform us of ways to stop erosion that are environmentally safe and meet your guidelines.

LL.50

Should be managed to ensure clean water. Erosion is a major factor.

LL.58

Erosion control, e.g. riprapped banks, are evident/adequate above full pool levels. Lots of bare shoreline now. I would not know how to effectively minimize erosion on those.

LL.60

Need to adopt plans to manage shore erosion. Large boats create wakes that accelerate erosion and damage docks.

LL.62

Wherever possible action should be taken to help prevent erosion along the shoreline to the lake.

LL.64

The Corps should be responsible for minimizing shoreline erosion (apply riprap), not the homeowners.

LL.67

An area of study I feel is important is a review of the areas of shore now designed as use for docks, recreation, commercial, or held as natural areas not to be disturbed. With the amount of runoff from development, perhaps more areas of shoreline need to be incorporated as natural areas for conservation, regardless of their designation at this point.

LL.75

Keep the water level high. Less erosion and weeds. Encourage homeowners to add riprap to their shorelines.

LL.77

The low lake level has caused significant erosion in shoreline areas not normally exposed to rainfall. The resulting silt cannot be good for the lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.81

Further: local municipalities MUST be held accountable for managing runoff and erosion from development; I have seen literal rivers of mud sliding into the creeks feeding the lake, from residential construction sites with minimal erosion controls in place. This MUST stop within the watershed.

LL.86

The erosion of the shoreline is becoming a serious problem. Perhaps water grasses should be planted around the shoreline to reduce it.

LL.87

Now that we have low water levels in our lake the presence of eroding shorelines is all the more obvious. The erosion also takes place at a greater rate because of the unchecked high-speed boaters and jet skis on the water. Even no wake signs are not observed and the waves have caused a lot of damage on the bare shorelines.

Since the low water levels probably are here to stay, not just because of the present drought, but also after the water pact with Alabama and Florida is finalized, there should be a speed limit set for the lake, or at least for certain areas around the lake. And these limits should be enforced.

LL.9

Reduce erosion.

LL.94

Erosion, directly from docks and especially from development.

LL.97

Keep the lake levels up. All the exposed shoreline erodes into the lake with heavy rains and silts up the lake.

LL.98

Control development erosion.

Increase Amount of Vegetation Surrounding the Lake

LL.116

Revegetate Lanier's immediate watershed. Provide interpretive program that describes project's natural and cultural resources.

Plant trees, remove kudzu, stabilize shoreline, remove silt deposits.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.121 FG-LAR

Residents feel that the Corps should more strictly enforce their own tree cutting regulations. Several residents cited cases where lakeside residents have been allowed to cut down some or all the trees in front of their homes to allow for an unobstructed view of the lake, leading to severe erosion and siltation problems. Many believe that the Corps is too lax when it comes to issuing fines and taking action against these residents.

One resident suggested having a list of appropriate vegetation distributed to all shoreline permit holders so that they could make better-informed decisions regarding shoreline vegetation. Another resident would like to see better management of campsite vegetation. He noted that several campgrounds seem to have extensive erosion control problems and that often campsites contain cleared areas all the way up to the water's edge.

LL.122 FG-RLU

Some recreational users suggested that to deter clear-cutting activity, violators should be required to replant the trees they remove and pay steep fines. Several users believe that violators should be stripped of their dock permits. Several recreational users agreed that the information in surveys relating to the 1,085-foot water level is flawed and suggested that the Corps resurvey by air.

Increase the Use of Riprap

LL.109

Need to have island, shoreline riprap! We have a terrible siltation problem.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several people suggested increasing the use of riprap along erosion-prone areas. One resident even suggested that funding for riprap installation should be shared by the Corps and the states of Florida, Georgia, and Alabama.

LL.24

Where you already do allow commercial activities, i.e., riprap, you need to encourage greater competition (more suppliers) so the costs make the benefits more attractive to more homeowners. Anything to encourage this type of result would encourage greater private investment in the lake.

LL.77

The environmental study should consider plans to prioritize riprap for shoreline areas managed by the Corps and to subsidize or otherwise encourage private owners to riprap their shoreline.

LL.78

Allow riprap installation and silt removal by land as it is much cheaper for the lake residents. Allow riprap on the Corps land where silt is washing into the lake. Work out some financial benefit for the homeowner to install riprap on the bank and above 1072. Allow longer steps to the water. Allow riprap to be installed to a lower lake level to prevent further silt washing into the lake. Be more realistic on the "1085" when the Government followed land lot lines etc. rather than surveying the 1085 line as they should have done.

LL.84

Allow skid loaders on the shoreline and islands to either arrange rocks or add rock to help stem erosion from rain and waves. There are many fallen trees that could be aligned as to temporary block erosion. Also plant native grasses and shrubs.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Protect Vegetation Surrounding the Lake

LL.119

Too many people cutting trees and running folks off the shoreline.

LL.16

Higher fines are needed to control tree and undergrowth destruction.

Provide a System for Addressing Disputes

LL.124

Several residents believe that the Corps should allow some means for dispute resolution as it relates to shoreline use. The Corps is often too strict when it comes to shoreline encroachment and other shoreline use issues and should allow residents some way to dispute their rulings.

Provide Tax Relief for Residents Who Pay for Riprap Installation

LL.105

A tax break on the tens of thousands of dollars I've spent on riprap to save erosion.

LL.68

Not a real problem here...but I would suggest some type of incentive program (tax deduction, etc.) for encouraging lakeside landowners to reinforce the COE's shoreline with rock, etc. You have to do something...the huge weekend volume of large boat (as in BIG BOATS) traffic is destroying the shoreline...and I will remind you, you own the lake shoreline frontage!!! Per current rules and laws...I access the lake and have a dock...only through your generosity, kindness and grace!

LL.88

Cost of installation of riprap is very expensive. It would be great if homeowners could use the cost as a tax deduction since it is a contribution to public property improvements. We have spent over \$15,000 so far.

LL.93

Lake residents who spend tens of thousands of personal dollars to help prevent erosion should be given a federal tax credit to help encourage investment.

Relax Some Restrictions

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several residents believe it is too difficult to get shoreline use permits and would like to see the way they are issued changed to make them easier to get.

Sedimentation/Siltation

LL.102

Over the course of the last 10 years, I have watched an island of silt from the construction of two subdivisions slowly take over a large span of this cove.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.107

Rampant construction around the lake has caused the silt layer to increase to several feet in some places.

LL.111

Counties do a horrible job of protecting the lake for silt! Ex. Ledan Rd. in Gainesville and Hall Co. is supposed to be fixing a culvert under the road. Well, it has been four months and not a thing has been done. That whole cove down there is silted in and they have had this road closed the whole time. The road connects a whole community (a very large one) from accessing a major highway!!

LL.117

When it rains the runoff is full of silt. Counties are doing a poor job of enforcement.

LL.120

Can't the coves be dredged?

LL.25

In summary this is what I would propose:

(1) Assessing impact fees to developers (including individuals) in the form of lakeshore improvements (riprap, drainage provisions across Corps property).

(2) Increase all fees on the lake for the addition of officers to monitor individual efforts for riprap, silt removal, and drainage observation. This would be the officers' sole job and they should be allowed freedom to exercise common sense when it comes to benefits that would improve the lake.

(3) Stop all large-scale commercial develop on the lake UNLESS any lease fee derived from the development is used SOLELY for the purpose of MEASURABLE lake improvements such as riprap along island shorelines, dredging, etc.

(4) Assess a Lake Lanier boaters impact fee to pay for shore improvements, based on boat displacement and horsepower.

LL.31

Implement better programs for removing silt. Target areas that are the result of illegal runoff conditions and force compliance.

LL.35

Building of homes and sites around the lake is causing accelerated silting—the Corps should fine and enforce laws concerning silt fences and removal of silt by homeowners and businesses responsible.

LL.4

Can Corps extend its reach upstream in the many feeder creeks to help control/limit siltation, runoff, poor development, etc.?

LL.53

Do everything possible to reduce sedimentation—enforce runoff restrictions to reduce erosion as much as possible.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.6

We must address the increasing amount of sediment filtering into Lake Lanier because of development near the lake which is not properly controlled. How long before our lake is filled up?

LL.65

How can the homeowners protect their investment without a proven method of silt pollution prevention and riverbed runoff? With area development and lack of erosion prevention, the lake is filling up with silt and dirt. The homeowners of our cove spent over \$100,000 last year to remove only half of the silt that had filled in our cove only to have the heavy rains bring more silt and dirt to our cove this year. There are no protective measures to prevent this from continuing.

I found with our dredging project last summer that the engineers are willing to assist (by allowing the homeowners to remove the silt) but will not take a risk to back the homeowners when they want to come face to face with the violators who created the mudslide. I am so discouraged with the outcome of our efforts, I would never recommend buying or moving into a cove where continued silting is occurring.

LL.70

There is new "construction" on Pilgrim Mill Rd. For example, right next to a stream that feeds the lake. It used to be a real pretty stream—now it is RED with runoff and NO ONE does anything about it.

LL.77

As noted above, silt has been a problem. The TVA publishes water quality metrics for lakes in North Georgia and Tennessee. I have not seen anything published on any of the Lanier web sites. That information would be beneficial.

LL.87

Lower parts of the lake are filling in fast these days. Development being one of the culprits, the ongoing drought another. Where Balus Creek flows in the lake we have now a marsh land with grass growing several feet high. The (former) lake homeowners are left on the dry now.

There should be rules for permits to dredge certain areas of the lake. Especially now the lake is low the dredging should be a lot less difficult than with higher lake levels. Sites in need of dredging can now be exactly identified.

There also should be rules for proper discharge of the silt and enforcement of these rules.

LL.96

The Corps does well at keeping the shoreline green! Enforce regulations to prevent silt from entering lake. Allow silt removal. Riprap good idea if water level comes back up.

Sedimentation/Siltation

LL.122 FG-RLU

Siltation, runoff pollution, bacteria, and the volume of water in Lake Lanier were additional issues raised. Concerns were also expressed about bank erosion, and about the pesticide and fertilizers used on golf courses and home lawns.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Standardize Enforcement Regulations

LL.124

In addition, several attendees feel that the Corps should step up its enforcement of boundaries so that there are fewer encroachment issues and less clear-cutting. They would like to see more patrol by rangers to enforce boundary regulations.

Strictly Enforce Buffer Zone Regulations

LL.115

Very good plan, need more protected areas.

LL.116

"Plan" more shoreline. Do not "grandfather" anything. Do not count islands as protected shoreline, but place them in a "prohibited development" status. Disallow water withdrawal. Disallow electrical service over water.

LL.73

I would favor stricter enforcement of leaving the buffer zone on the lake undisturbed, e.g. no cutting of trees and vegetation.

Support for Current Lake Management Activities

LL.122 FG-RLU

According to some of the participants, shoreline management at Lake Lanier is relatively good.

LL.44

Less of a problem if the lake is full. I think the Corps does an excellent job on this.

LL.58

Seems ok to me.

LL.61

Fine.

Update and Revise Current Plan

LL.114

Needs updating to reinforce protection of the environment including vegetation.

LL.117

Too liberal. Too much shoreline looks like private property. It is public land.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.92

Lake Lanier deserves a current, protective, recreation-encouraging, realistic and enforceable shoreline management plan, especially in light of the rapidly increasing population on its watershed and the entire Metropolitan Atlanta area. The LLA has no recommendations about the number of boats or boat docks on the lake. Perhaps the EIS will provide some factual information to influence these considerations. The LLA view is that Lake Lanier was built with public funds and should be enjoyed by the public. On nice summer weekends the lake is busy with boat traffic, but during the non-summer season and on Monday through Friday during the summer season boat activity on the lake is minimal. So, a lot more recreation and boat traffic can be accommodated on the lake. We think there will be a self-limiting amount of activity on the lake as the increased usage makes an individual's recreation experience less desirable.

LL.95

It's time!

Issue: Water Management

Clarify Allowable Uses of Lake Water

LL.124

One resident mentioned the need to clarify the allowable personal uses (e.g., irrigation) of lake water.

Flood Control

LL.24

Flood control - protection of life and property.

Flood Control/Navigation/Power

LL.81

This reservoir is intended for Flood Control, Navigation, and Power Generation. Yet, 3 times the inflow is being released during weeks like this one, supposedly to flush downstream sewage through the Chattahoochee River. I don't see where that purpose is part of this lake's charter. The only factors to determine releases should be flood control, navigation, and power generation. Nothing else. That's why the dam was built, and any other factor needs to deal with the amount of water that would be flowing downstream had the dam NOT been built.

Flood Control/Water Resource/Recreation

LL.67

The lake was created for flood control, water resource, and lastly recreation. The recreation is fun, produces a lot of revenue, but we cannot lose sight of the other reasons the lake was formed. Atlanta's growth north has taken the lake from rural to suburban, with all the attending problems we see today. Care must be given how we treat the lake, including the watershed, and I trust this EIS statement will give us guidelines toward preserving this resource beyond my children's lifetimes.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Oppose Water Releases

LL.105

How can the lake only go up 1 inch when it rains 4-5 inches? (like it did weeks ago) Are you dumping water down the Chattahoochee needlessly to float some barges downstream? For the cost of dredging, I understand you could use Federal Express to ship whatever is on the barges and save money. Add the value of the extra water that is used to float the barges, then, why are we doing this?

LL.107

One of the most wasteful uses of the water out of Lake Lanier is the surges of water sent from it down the river to float occasional barge traffic.

LL.17

Water should not be released to float barges. Use railroads.

LL.27

Stop using the lake to enable barge traffic downstream. There is no way that the current arrangement can prove to be economic. It is purely a political deal which needs to be ended.

LL.29

You shouldn't let out so much water. I heard you let it out for private industry.

LL.35

Drawing down the lake to float one or two barges a year is ridiculous. The water lost to cities and recreation is far more valuable than the value of the cargo. Three to four feet of draw down in a week is insane.

LL.37

Maintaining barge traffic down river seems to be an overall economic mistake considering the negative impact those water releases have on the upstream economy and recreational needs.

LL.4

Water can't be replaced - encourage buying out of all hydro energy contracts to reduce demand for flow out of Lanier through Buford dam and downstream hydro plants.

LL.43

Also very upset about low lake levels including the ridiculous continuation of the barge traffic down river.

LL.45

I am concerned about water releases for barge traffic and other uses down stream which results in recreational usage problems (for ramps, docks, navigation, swimming etc.).

LL.49

No water releases for barges! They can use trucks or trains. Not a good use for the water.

LL.53

Do everything possible to establish priorities so that the lake stays as full as possible. Floating barges to Columbus is the worst type of pork barrel activity.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.55

Irresponsible behavior on the part of Corps of Engineers in the failure to maintain reasonable lake level. Production of electricity and barge traffic should not receive priority over maintaining a healthy and safe lake environment.

LL.57

The barge traffic should be stopped. It is not a profitable business. We should not be taking water out of the lake to support a bankrupt business. The power company can design parts that are small enough to be hauled on trains and trucks and assembled at the plant if we force them to.

Stop supporting barge traffic.

LL.59

I am a member of the Lake Lanier Association and a home owner on Lake Lanier. I attended the last meeting of the LLA in June. The Corps attended and spoke of changing their policy on water releases at the meeting. They stated there would be minimal water releases until the lake recovers. We have had ample rain recently and it appears it's business as usual on the water releases. We have received significant rainfall in the past several weeks and the lake continues to drop. West Point Lake has been over full since January while lake Lanier is still 8 1/2 feet below full pool. I have been checking your web site frequently and you are still releasing large quantities of water even on days when there is rain and down stream needs don't appear to be in the need.

ACF Action Zones:

The lake has been in zone 4 for most of the past three years but it seems there is more water being released than needed.

Zone 4 indicates that navigation is not supported. A minimum of two hours per day is met for hydropower demands. Water supply and water quality releases are met.

LL.6

The release of tremendous amounts of water for business, like Georgia Power, is unacceptable during times of drought. Our water is critical to our local community, as well as Atlanta and SE Georgia.

LL.72

Stop letting water out of Lake Lanier to support commercial interests south. Many areas are now flooded.

LL.73

I would like water releases for downstream navigation to cease, and for water releases for electricity to be ceased or minimized. I would also favor letting full pool level increase by a couple of feet.

LL.74

The continued and expensive dredging of the lower waterways and then the release of billions of gallons of drinking and recreational water to float barges. It would be less expensive for us as taxpayers to just pay the trucking lines fees to transport these goods.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.77

The water release plan should be to keep the lake filled or overfilled during the winter and spring so there is water available during the dry months of summer. Lake priorities should be watershed and natural resources management, water quality, recreation quality and drought relief. Production of electricity should be very low priority. Enabling barge traffic on the lower Chattahoochee should not even be considered.

LL.78

No barge traffic. That is economically a disaster and is obviously a political pork barrel agreement with the barge people. Suggest or force a fertilizer for grass to be a non-phosphorus on areas that drain into the Lake.

LL.8

Please see previous note regarding barges. In times of drought we depend on the Corps of Engineers to protect our precious water supply, not sell it to the highest bidder! Also, we need you to help us maintain excellent water quality—educate us, help us preserve this wonderful natural resource.

It is inconceivable that our valuable water was wasted sending 8 Georgia Power barges down stream so that GA Power could save money!

LL.80

Of generation of excessive water release for lower river usage during excessive drought conditions that we have experienced these past five to six years.

LL.83

Cut out those wasteful barge traffic releases.

LL.89

Develop an architectural plan for the shoreline. Is downstream barge traffic worth the impact on the lake?

LL.94

Drop down stream barge traffic and only generate power when water level needs let out!

LL.96

Maintain the 1071 lake level - don't need to send water down to the barges - the other GA Corps lakes are above full pool!

Publication of Water Discharges

LL.15

More info to concerned citizens - need to better publish what & when water is used for & how much.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.31

Publicize all water withdrawal permits along with discharge permits.

Publicize any discharge that is required along with the reason for discharge (i.e. peak power demand, sewerage spill, low water conditions downstream). This would help image of the Corps with respect to water releases.

Support Water Releases

LL.20

I support water releases during non-generating hours similar to the existing procedures with sufficient water flow to keep trout healthy in the tailwater.

Water Level

LL.1

Will the water level go back up?

LL.10

Maintain constant water level.

LL.100

On behalf of the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners I am writing this letter to inquire why the water level of Lake Lanier continues to be approximately eight (8) to ten (10) feet below full pool. This part of North Georgia has received more rain this year than in the past two, yet the level of the lake is not coming up. Many citizens have asked Forsyth County why the lake has not come up despite all of the rain and we do not have the answer.

LL.104

Need to keep water level up. Low lake levels are dangerous—plus it looks terrible!

LL.109

Leave the water level up and constant as possible.

LL.11

Maintain a constant lake level - lake level should be established that does not drop below 1064.

LL.118

Water levels too low.

LL.12

It's not fair that the water level hasn't been allowed to come up to full pool this year. We've had more than enough rainfall. It's not fair to lower the levels for others, when people like myself have a love and passion for the lake. The lower lake level affects the erosion, problems with tearing up our boats, aesthetics, safety of water sports, etc. etc. We all have to control the cleanliness and quality of the water. I want everyone to benefit with Lake Lanier, and want it to be live with its beauty another 50 years, and forever.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.120

With the lake being so low—a low amount of vegetation is growing on the banks which will be under water when the lake comes back up. It will rot, smell, and cause a lot of debris.

LL.123 FG-BO

Like most people in the other focus groups, the business owners and operators mentioned the lake's water level as having a huge impact on their business; several believe the level should be maintained at 1,072 feet.

LL.124 FG-EO

If Georgia agrees to lower the minimum maintained lake level to the one suggested by the Tri-State Water Commission (1056 feet), the lake's cove areas may never fill up again even in the best of times. Please try to pursue a stance in your decision making that would enable the lake to keep water in all its cove boundaries in times of normal rainfall.

LL.14

The issue is why Lake Lanier is several feet below full. Much more frequently than the other lakes on the Chattahoochee. It is easy to say, "we haven't had enough rain," but there are other factors that effect lake levels. If the water was allocated fairly, then Lake Lanier would stay below full no more than the other lakes in the watershed. Since this is not the case, I think the agreements that compel you to release the amounts of water that are released should be renegotiated.

LL.19

As a renter for the past two summers and a recreational day-user with my family for the past 23 years, I offer my thoughts on this wonderful resource called Lake Sidney Lanier.

During the next 50 years, Lake Lanier should be primarily dedicated to the conservation of water with the "full pool" as the norm. This will also provide the secondary but important and increasing recreational needs of the region. This will also have its economic benefits to the region as a first class place to spend one's leisure time.

During the next 50 years, Lake Lanier should not have to balance the needs of a river system below Atlanta for commerce purposes. In the past, few have benefited while leaving a metropolitan area of Atlanta and environs hostage to prevailing water restrictions. It is unfair and no longer makes sense.

Lastly, the "Corps Line" should be re-established with modern surveying and aerial photography methods. This line presently serves some people well and for others, the line does not, and is an inconvenience and possibly a hardship. Develop a new standard of offset, possibly from a "high water mark" of "full pool."

LL.21

Why is almost every major reservoir in the southeastern United States at full pool for quite a while now, and we continue to just generate away all the wonderful water God has sent us? Why are we still 10FT down with a huge surplus of rain for the year?

My opinions - the same as every serious fisherman I know.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.24

I recognize you don't want to hear about lake levels in this forum, but you really need to consider the need for lake level management in favor of maintaining and even increasing available volume. Water will be a significant resource issue before most people realize. I believe we have an opportunity through this process to look at raising the lake level, as a means of creating additional volume, by leveraging the community support (recreational and commercial) that is interested in the topic. As a homeowner, resident, and parent, I would be willing to make reasonable investment in partnership to achieve an improved sustainable future resource. Besides I think it is absolutely related to some of the shoreline, dock and water quality issues you are responsible to manage.

It is completely impractical and laughable at times when you try and maintain a position of the lake being a "natural resource" that you must maintain in some zealot way and on the topic of your choice, when in fact it is manmade and always will be. I think you need to broaden your view to include the benefits of continued, manmade improvements and investments beyond the ones you hold today. Creativity and innovation with the support of the landowners and the general public can have a significant positive impact on the lake. Now is the time to try and develop a new set of approaches. The support is there and lake is still relatively healthy.

In fairness to all, we pretty much wrecked the "natural thing" some 50 years ago when it was decided that the benefits to man in the building of the lake were greater than the destruction to nature and personal property. I believe we are challenged once more on the same topic with perhaps a more enlightened view. However, the outcome needs to be the same - benefit to man. We face the ever-growing need for clean water and recreation to maintain and improve the quality of our lives. We no longer require the huge waste of water to float some barges or generate meaningless levels of power. These were right for the time but hugely wasteful and disrespectful to the value of the resource. This time, we need to think carefully about how we want to invest in and improve what we already have, in advance of when we cannot live without it. When I can easily witness dumping, shoreline erosion, political posturing and water level mismanagement as daily threats to a critical resource, while at the same time receiving a letter to remove my canoe from the Corps's shoreline, you just have ask yourself what's wrong with this picture. Let's move to managing the lake for what it truly is to ALL of us - a source of life and pleasure. I have made a truly significant set of investments in "my side of the lake" and as is the case with many new landowners I'm am interested in and supportive of making reasonable investment in "our side of the lake." I believe the Corps can help provide the vision for and priority of future investments, and should be an able and willing partner in this process.

LL.28

I am also concerned about the fact that our lake is low while the others downstream have been full for a long time now. I appears to me (a layperson) that the only reason for the excess flow is to keep the extensive amount of pollution that comes from Atlanta diluted...I also think something should be done about local septic companies doing night dumps and mandatory removal of macerators on the boats on the lake as well. Many times we see large boats leaving trails as they leave the islands after a weekend.

LL.33

I bought my house in the summer of 2000 and was very upset, not to be able to put my boat at my dock, it only took me 22 years to get out of Gwinnett and move here.

LL.42

Keep the level of the lake up so that when dry times the lake levels won't be devastated like they are now.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.44

The lake needs to be brought up to full pool and kept there by tying the release of water to the inflow from the undersized watershed. A reasonable buffer of say four feet could be set, but once the lake drops below four feet down, then releases would be tied to inflow. This would benefit everyone including the other states.

LL.46

It seems that the acreage feet of water released (as provided on the daily recording) is not consistent so as to allow the lake a more normal and steady level.

LL.47

I don't understand the water at its current level. I've lived on the lake for 4 years now and have never seen the level not go up when 25 inches of rain falls within a 3 month period (May to July, Cumming received 23 inches). Usually the lake will come up dramatically with 2 - 3 inches of rain but may fall again but lately it seems that it doesn't move at all. This has been a very mild summer therefore electric generation should not be the cause also with the water ban in place the residential need should not be that great either. I don't understand!!!

LL.49

With the two new intake locations, how much more water will be released?? When will the lake be allowed to come up if there is any rain?

LL.51

Low water level

LL.54

We've been owners at Lake Lanier for three years now. We are very concerned at how much the water levels have dropped and are not comfortable with what has been done so far to assure water levels in the future. The lake generates a great deal of revenue for the surrounding areas as well as Georgia...not to mention jobs it supplies.

Quit dropping the water levels.

LL.55

Irresponsible behavior on the part of Corps of Engineers in the failure to maintain reasonable lake level. Production of electricity and barge traffic should not receive priority over maintaining a healthy and safe lake environment.

LL.56

I feel that the Corps can do more to help maintain the proper lake levels than is currently being done. I know that you are between a "rock and a hard place" with water level management and that the weather (rainfall or lack there of) plays a large part in the scheme. But at this time (August 2001), with most all of the lakes in Georgia at full level and the Chattahoochee (south of the dam) at near full levels, something is wrong with the amount of water that is water that is being released from the dam. We need a bigger "cork"!

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.61

The fact the Corps of Engineers has let the lake level drop and remain at such a low level is criminal. It is also very dangerous. I cannot believe that with all the rain this summer, the lake hasn't come up one inch. My dock is sitting in mud. I realize that people need the water for drinking, etc. But two years in a row at this level is ridiculous. What is being done? The lake needs at least two more feet of water to be close to safe for boating. That part of GA depends on the lake for commerce, do you not care about the residents and businesses losing money because of the mismanagement of the water level?

LL.68

I am extremely concerned over the multiple political institutions that are positioning for control of this valuable, regional resource. It is this writer's opinion that the lake level has been purposefully manipulated this summer by these same political influences. I live here...and we have had plenty of rain...easily enough to fill the lake basin (there is a skunk somewhere in the wood-pile!) NOTE: I have an electronic rain gauge and keep data records...if they would be of use to you.

The low water levels are deterrent to both...and at times dangerous! The regional income from lake recreation supports a significant population in our community and should be a major consideration in governing decisions of lake use and levels.

LL.70

Kind of difficult to "recreate" when you can't get your boat in the water!!! This is the third year we have had NO WATER under our dock. Not even enough to be able to float it to move it.

LL.71

Not enough emphasis on maintaining a full lake level. More attention is required to recreational use of the lake as well as that fact that the lake is valuable resource of water. Since the watershed to the lake is limited the ability to refill the lake is restricted.

LL.74

Water levels should be returned and maintained at full pool. The unnecessary release of water for barge traffic has taken the lake to a dangerously low level. First priority should always be the preservation of water level to protect drinking water and its quality.

LL.75

Please keep the lake at full pool. Our dock used to be in front of our house. Now it is 1/2 mile away, and we have hardly used it these past two summers. It has affected all the property values.

Keep water level high!

LL.85

Holding Lake Lanier levels relatively high provides dry weather insurance for much of Georgia's water supply, maximizes the lake's environmental/aesthetic values and produces the greatest benefit for the lake level sensitive recreation economic contribution.

LL.88

COE does an excellent job, but the large fluctuations in water level contribute more to erosion and sedimentation than if the lake were kept at normal pool elevation where most of the shoreline protection has been installed.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.92

The LLA certainly supports the development of the Lake Lanier EIS and the potential it has for preserving Lake Lanier. Lake Lanier and its Buford Dam releases provide the water supply for 3+ million Georgians, as well as providing a \$2+ billion annual Lake Lanier recreation economic contribution. Holding Lake Lanier levels relatively high provides dry weather insurance for much of Georgia's water supply, maximizes the lake's environmental/aesthetic values and produces the greatest benefit for the lake level sensitive recreation economic contribution

LL.93

Lake level needs to be held constant, at or near full pool.

LL.94

I own two homes and both have docks with grass growing rather than water to float boats.

Protect watershed and get water level up!

LL.95

I know you have been inundated with water level questions. We would like to see a full Lake Lanier every year. Recreation is an important revenue but the beauty of the lake is first and foremost to us! Please keep the lake full.

LL.96

Our main concern is protecting our investment on Lake Lanier. A lake house without water isn't of much value. The Corps has done a great job enforcing boating regulations to make the lake safe. Now lets maintain a 1071 lake level and enforce regulations regarding water quality of the lake.

Issue: Water Quality

Concerned About Gwinnett County's Discharge of Treated Sewage

LL.104

Very important—I swim and boat in this water and as an Atlanta resident, I drink this water. Don't like the idea of filling lake with "treated" water from Gwinnett County. Also, I eat fish out of the lake.

LL.114

Gwinnett County opposed to treated sewage being pumped back into lake. Recommend line be placed behind dam downstream. This will reduce the outflows and Atlanta can use the water.

LL.17

Gwinnett sewage into Lanier should not be allowed. Too many accidental dumps occur.

LL.28

I am very concerned that Gwynnett County will be allowed to dump into the lake with no way to monitor or stop their errors. They have a bad track record and should not be able to do this. My family swims and fishes in this lake many times every week. Please focus on the high quality of this resource.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.29

You guys are crazy if you think letting Gwinnett County dump millions of gallons of treated sewage into the lake isn't going to ruin it! Look at other lakes around the country that have tried that. You can't even swim in them anymore.

LL.43

VERY DISAPPOINTED THAT GWINNETT SEWAGE WILL BE ALLOWED TO DUMP INTO LANIER.

LL.45

Major concerns about allowing other counties to empty treated sewage into Lake Lanier. If Gwinnett County is allowed, then every other county with access to Lake Lanier will attempt to obtain approval also.

LL.47

Gwinnett County shouldn't be allowed to dump so much wastewater in the lake. For as little shoreline as Gwinnett has and as much as they will deteriorate the lake, there should be something done.

LL.49

Gwinnett needs to use a settlement pond BEFORE they release any water into Lake Lanier. Same goes for all sewage treatment facilities.

LL.55

We oppose using the lake as a sewage dump for Gwinnett or any other county.

LL.57

Gwinnett and the surrounding counties should not be allowed to dump treated sewage into the lake. The water quality will never be the same. It will get worse. The counties should build their own reservoir and recycle the water. Since they say it is so clean let them drink it.

LL.59

I am very concerned about Gwinnett County wanting to discharge a total of 40 million gallons per day of treated sewage into Lake Lanier. The water quality would be severely degraded if this is passed as it stands. There have been alternatives proposed and they have been (so far) rejected. That \$2 billion the lake brings to the economy would be "down the toilet" if the lake is turned into a cesspool.

Some of the older treatment plants need to be brought up to current standards and much stronger enforcement needs to be put in place.

When I first moved to the Atlanta area in 1983 the lake supported trout. I was told there isn't enough oxygen in the lake to support these fish anymore. This is a clear indication that the water quality is on the decline. Will the bass population be next??? The fishing in the lake contributes to a large portion of that \$2 billion the lake brings in.

We also need stronger building codes and enforcement to stop the silt and pollution runoff into the lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.69

Water quality and water level do not appear to be high priorities. Runoff and pollution rules are not enforced. Potential of allowing Gwinnett County to dump 40 million gallons a day of treated sewage into the lake should result in the responsible party going to jail! This is criminal. Millions of people depend on this source of drinking water for survival. If the treated sewage is of high quality as good as the lake (as they claim), then let Gwinnett pipe the treated effluent back into their drinking water supply and then be treated for human consumption. At the very least, a retention pond should be put in series between the treatment plant and the lake to prevent the inevitable spill of untreated waste into the lake (last resort). Decades from now, those that preserved the quality of Lake Lanier will be praised. Or will it be those that allowed the slow death of Lake Lanier that will be vilified! Let your conscience be your judge. This is one of the finest natural resources in the country. Please don't let it slip through our fingers.

LL.75

We are not happy about the treated sewage from Gwinnett County.

LL.92

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has given Gwinnett County, which has only about 3 square miles on the Lake Lanier watershed, permission to discharge 40 million gallons per day (mgd) of treated sewage into Lake Lanier because the Chattahoochee River is too polluted to accept it. The LLA is convinced that the sewer discharge poses great danger to the future quality of Lake Lanier water. If that action is allowed to stand we think the precedent will invite another 300 mgd of treated sewage to be discharged into Lake Lanier during the next 50 years, further degrading lake water quality and threatening human health. For its ever-increasing quality of life contributions Lake Lanier water should be kept pure and swimmable.

LL.96

Water quality is more important! We don't need Gwinnett sewage in lake. It could be piped into the river right below the dam.

Restaurants and supply stores for boaters would be nice at Gainesville marina! We like Aqualand restaurant and Up the Creek.

Concerned About Sewage Discharges from Boats

LL.123 FG-BO

Several people in the group agreed that the frequency of boat inspections for pump-out stations should be increased. According to one person there is not adequate enforcement from GA DNR rangers, who are responsible for ensuring that boat owners are discharging sewage in the proper receptacles instead of the lake. In addition to concerns about boat discharges, several participants voiced concern about the impact of sewage inflow from surrounding areas on the lake's water quality.

The participants believe that Lake Lanier is held to a different standard from other lakes, and therefore there should be mandatory high-tech pump-out stations, wash-down areas to protect the water quality, and no discharging from boats in the lake.

LL.124 FG-EO

Sewage discharging was another issue the group brought up. Along with sewage discharges from houseboats, the group said marinas should be charged a service fee for pump-outs, and they should be required to keep a pump-out log.

Waste from boats and other watercrafts.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.3

Motor boats should be checked for oil leakage like cars tested for emissions. If it is illegal for one to pour oil directly into the lake, then why is it legal to operate an outboard engine that leaks oil?

LL.62

Owners of boat rental facilities (houseboats, etc.) need to have all houseboats inspected on a regular basis to make sure that the holding tank being used is onboard the boat and not into the lake. A hefty fine of \$1,000 and up should be charged to any vessel found discharging sewage into the lake.

Concerned About Treated Sewage Discharges From All Sources

LL.107

Local governments are rushing to dump their sewage (supposedly treated unless there is an accident which by the way happens all too often) into the lake.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many residents are also concerned about the inflow of wastewater from existing wastewater treatment plant discharges and the newly proposed 40-MGD discharge from Phase II of the new Gwinnett County Wastewater Treatment Facility. Several feel that the Corps should not grant the county the easement for the discharge pipe.

LL.122 FG-RLU

Most of the recreational users agreed that impact of outflows from wastewater facilities in Gwinnett County and surrounding counties, as well as sewage from chicken operations in Gainesville and Atlanta are major concerns.

LL.124 FG-EO

Several of the participants agreed that there is a lack of enforcement and monitoring of old outdated wastewater facilities. One person believes that the amount of phosphorus in the outflows from the Gwinnett County wastewater plant should be reduced.

LL.21

The lake above Clark's Bridge is the way it should be; there is grass, lots and lots of baitfish and timber in the water.

Stop the millionaires from taking over all the lake property. Manage the resource for the people who use and respect it daily. Punish the Wayne Hill fecal plant for dumping millions of gallons of crap over and over into Flat Creek.

LL.37

I request that the discharge of wastewater into a drinking water source be reevaluated in light of the number of people who use this lake for recreation. The study needs to address the long-term impacts of treated water discharge and assess the environmental impact of a major spill of sewage into the lake.

LL.39

There has been enough raw sewage dumped in Lanier for so long by "approved" plants while the Corps sat back and did nothing. For the future, it is clear the EPD will not enforce any law except the law of the largest contributor to the Governor, so my take is that the Corps should have the federal mandate to enforce the federal Clean Water Act on the lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.4

Existing sewage treatment plants—quality operation needs to be strictly enforced—GA EPD is very lax about this.

LL.51

Wastewater dumping.

LL.52

Are there health risks associated with swimming in the lake after "treated" sewage has been dumped into the lake? When you use the lake for water sports like skiing, diving, or swimming, you are going to drink the lake water.

LL.57

There is a rumor that the Corps is draining water out of Lake Lanier to dilute the sewage being dumped into the Chattahoochee by the city of Atlanta. This is horrible. This should be stopped. Force the city to fix the sewer problems.

LL.64

If Chattahoochee River near the Dam cannot accept treated sewage, why not create a water fountain attraction to aerate the water. This could be an entertainment feature like Tommy Bartlett Dancing Waters in Wisconsin Dells (It was a group of fountains that undulated to organ tunes and colored lights). This could also be done in Lanier, especially at Flat Creek.

LL.68

I am EXTREMELY CONCERNED over the growing sewage effluents discharges that are being permitted...this is INSANE!!!! Other alternatives should be pursued...with the developers having to pay for same.

LL.70

If the lake were at the normal level, the water quality would probably be better, given the theory that the "treated" sewage water would have more water particles to dilute in. Given the low water level and the HUGE amount of wastewater that is being allowed, the lake is dying. I find this harmful to those who depend on the lake water for drinking water and grossly irresponsible government. Just because not everyone reports the problems to the news doesn't mean they are NOT occurring.

LL.85

The increasing pollution washing from the watershed into the lake and the increasing sewer discharges into the lake continue to degrade the quality of Lake Lanier water.

LL.88

We need to limit any further new introduction of treated sanitary waste into the lake. We need to plan for growth and create sedimentation ponds or much higher standards for treated effluent entering lake waters.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.92

The increasing pollution washing from the watershed into the lake and the increasing sewer discharges into the lake continue to degrade the quality of Lake Lanier water. A study done by Limno-Tech, Inc. a few years ago showed that the lake water quality would continue to degrade as watershed development continues, unless things are done differently in the future than they have been done in the past. A Clean Lakes Study, titled "DIAGNOSTIC/FEASIBILITY STUDY OF LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GEORGIA," done by the Carl Vincent Institute of the University of Georgia (UGA), reiterated the same message.

LL.95

Equally as important. Not very happy with treated wastewater dumpage.

Concerned About Treated Sewages Discharges

LL.18

Due to the high recreational use at Lanier treated sewage should not be discharged into Lake Lanier. Perhaps the sewage treated water should be discharged downstream into the river.

Concerned About Treatment Plant Maintenance

LL.72

I am concerned about the maintenance of sewage treatment plants which dump into the lake.

Concerned About Untreated Sewage Discharges From All Sources

LL.13

EPD and EPA need to issue bigger fines and issue them quicker when a sewage treatment plant fails or overflows.

LL.17

South beach water treatment facility is outrageously dumping raw sewage into Baldrige Creek area. Can Corps revoke permit until they conform to water standards?!! Other community sewage systems should be more closely monitored.

LL.24

Water resource—clean drinking water supply. As such, I am very concerned about the dumping of treated sewage. Nationally, local governments prove on an almost daily basis (and no matter where I have ever lived) that they will do more damage to the water resource than anyone. I dare someone to try and prove they will not dump sewage either by accident or design. They always have and will. The only way to prevent this in the lake is to ensure no connection is made directly to an "in process" treatment activity. Treatment to staged holding ponds with "lake let" only from fully treated ponds is the only safe approach. And even then I suspect someday, somehow I will be reading about and dealing with yet another "accidental" dumping into Lake Lanier in the not too distant future. If there was truly a fail-safe solution then the sewage plants would be plumbed directly into the water system and they are not!

LL.33

Inform us of any changes that will affect the lake, i.e., waste management, including dumping in lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.52

Atlanta has already gained a poor reputation for dumping untreated sewage into the Chattahoochee River from a plant that was designed NOT to let that happen. If this plan is allowed to proceed, it is only a matter of time before it happens to Lake Lanier.

We use the lake for recreation and I'm concerned that dumping "treated" sewage into the lake will destroy the pristine waters of Lake Lanier. I think that alternative solutions are available. Other lakes that have used this technology have been severely impacted in a negative way.

LL.64

Sewage treatment plants have too many accidents to allow permitting of additional dumping into Lanier.

South Beach development in Baldrige Creek area has a mismanaged treatment plant dumping raw sewage into Lanier on a regular basis.

Control Waste Disposal from Marinas

LL.24

I think you need to absolutely manage the disposal of waste into the lake from the larger boats and in the marinas. These areas of high concentration have to have a high level of impact on the overall water quality and should be managed accordingly. Albeit fairly.

Desire Higher Standards for Water Quality

LL.15

Standards should be set so that all of the lake is safe for swimming, fish consumption, etc. Private funds/grants could be solicited for more frequent/constant study. Where can we (the public) go to get the facts on testing results, monitoring results? Where can we go to find out about violations? Make this info more accessible to the public—help us fight those who pollute our waters.

LL.26

Both the water level and the water quality are way down. It is discouraging to see the downhill trend as the years go by.

Too much politics and money to be made, and too little consideration for the future of our once beautiful and clean Lake Lanier. Dumping treated sewage will increase the infrastructure and allow for more and more building, making the already rich builders even richer at the expense of the residents of the adjacent counties.

LL.31

Must focus on recreation and improving the water quality back to the level it was 25 years ago. Force counties to improve any existing discharges, point and non-point pollution sources prior to considering any other water requests. Increase the "normal" pool level to allow for slower drain-off after high water occurs. (In other words, do not accelerate drain-off just to lower lake to "full pool".)

LL.32a and LL.32b

I am concerned with the water quality. Please do your best!

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.46

Protect Lake Lanier from becoming a waste dump for the region.

LL.62

Water quality should be maintained at the highest standard possible.

LL.7

We must find a way. It's our duty. There should be a pollution cop working 24 hours a day.

LL.96

Better water quality = healthier fish, turtles, etc. Good job with the Christmas trees!

Desire More Reliable Water Quality Testing

LL.16

I appreciate the information I got at this meeting. I am less concerned about the Gwinnette Co. sewage problem than I was before. I am more concerned about runoff from land in the watershed and its impact on water purity in the lake. I continue to be concerned that accurate testing of water purity in the lake is not being done. I am more grateful for the vigilance the Corps of Engineers has exercised in the last several years than I was when I came here today.

LL.71

With the increased strain on the lake due to population, more effort needs to be given to water quality (more measurements so quality level is really known and strict rules regarding dumping of human waste and runoff.)

LL.72

I am willing to participate in the testing program.

LL.73

I would favor much stricter monitoring of treated effluent streams, and require much lower levels of bacteria, phosphorus and coliform levels for existing facilities. Also limiting new sources of treated effluent.

LL.87

More frequent testing of lake water at more different sites seems to be necessary. The EPD/EPA sets water quality standard for our lake based on minimal testing and there are no other official data to refute their findings.

I strongly recommend working together with volunteers that are already involved in water quality issues through Adopt-A Lake and Adopt-A-Stream programs in the area. The Georgia Adopt-A-Lake Program is working on a database and so is the (older) Adopt-A-Stream Program in which I am involved myself to keep an eye on the quality of several of the tributary waters that go in the lake.

I hope these comments will help in forming an up-to-date shore management plan. If you need extra information I will be glad to give that.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.93

Studies should be done frequently that show improvement or degradation of water quality.

Drinking Water

LL.3

There should be limited access to the lake considering there are many different drinking water intakes in the lake. Considering this, boat docks should be considered an encroachment to the buffer and should be limited. The Corps should promote community (multi-family) docks and deter the building of so many individual docks.

LL.33

The water in Flowery Branch is one hell of a lot better than in Norcross. Don't make me go back to buying bottled water.

LL.36

As several million citizens depend on this water for drinking, it is essential that we protect it from polluting elements as much as possible within the law. This includes siltation and runoff from construction, untreated waste from agricultural and industrial enterprises, and excessive amounts of treated wastewater.

LL.50

Water quality is the number one concern regarding the lake. Since the lake is the major source of drinking water for the greater Atlanta metropolitan area, heavy emphasis should be placed on proper management of this resource. No additional "treated" discharges should be allowed in the lake or its tributaries. Property owners with septic fields that leach into the lake should be made to update their systems. Commercial sand and gravel dredging operations on the lake should be stopped immediately. The dredging operation on the Chestatee, together with upstream development and low water levels, has caused the loss of a great deal of water surface area. Little but the river channel is now open up the Chestatee. Many property owners have been cut off from the channel by reason of the accumulation of silt from the commercial dredging operation and upstream development.

Effects on Downstream Water Quality

LL.121 FG-LAR

The residents are concerned that what occurs in Lake Lanier negatively affects the quality of the water downstream. Changes in temperature, effects on habitat, and water quality degradation are all concerns.

Impact on Quality from Water Level

LL.44

Negatively impacted by low water levels.

Impacts from Personal Watercrafts

LL.30

Detrimental impact of 2-cycle PWCs and the disproportionate amount of petro chemicals exhausted into the lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Implement BMPs to Improve Water Quality

LL.9

Implement as many BMPs as possible on Corps property to improve water quality. Nonpoint pollution control.

Increase Awareness of Commonly Used Pollutants

LL.70

Anyone with property that touches Corps property should be made aware of lawn chemicals that are harmful to the lake and given ideas of other things to use that are not harmful to the lake.

Jet Fuel from Airplanes

LL.120

Lake Lanier is in the glide path for Hartsfield—our houses and boats get covered with a dark "film" from unburned jet fuel.

Lake Conditions Affecting Aquatic Life

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many residents believe that water quality is a very important factor to be considered in the EIS. Among the concerns mentioned is the hypoxic condition in certain areas of lake that effects aquatic life.

Maintain Safe Conditions for Recreational Users

LL.80

Keep the lake and the lake water clean and useful for boating and swimming. People need to have clean water so we don't get sick playing in the water.

Maintenance Requirements for Commercial Operations

LL.15

High-density marinas should be required to pay for/provide constant monitoring of water quality and mitigation activities.

LL.80

The commercial docks that rent slips and repair boats should clean up around the docks and maintain the water and sewer and fuel lines as to not spill into the lake.

More Inspections of Sewage Treatment Plants

LL.108

Wastewater treatment plants should test for heavy metals. Counties adjoining lake should have (require) pervious parking lots and other hard stands for all new construction. Examine effect of golf courses in Lanier basin – require large retention ponds.

LL.89

Need a bigger budget to have more personnel for inspection of sewage treatment plants.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Opposes All Sewage Discharges

LL.2

Have concerns regarding pollution of the lake and oppose any dumping of sewage into the lake.

LL.24

I believe this is the critical issue currently. I am totally opposed to the dumping of even treated sewage for the reasons mentioned earlier. And, I feel the lake is very mismanaged in this area, primarily due to the lack of watershed controls. More needs to be done within the watershed to protect the resource from development impacts and more needs to be done on/in the lake to protect the water quality. Water volumes, shoreline protection, dumping of all kinds are the critical areas to focus on in my opinion. These are the more difficult issues but in the scheme of things obsessing over docks and underbrush removal etc. is measurable but potentially meaningless. When the lake is empty and/or polluted, it doesn't matter what kind of Styrofoam is under a dock.

LL.35

It is a travesty that counties are allowed to dump sewage into the drinking water for so many people—even if they claim the extreme treatment and purity. There has never been a sewage treatment plant that hasn't had a spill and the super plants being allowed will spill millions of gallons of untreated water when the spill occurs. If the water is so treated and clean, let them put it back into their drinking water treatment plants and cut their allocation of water for drinking purposes.

LL.56

I am opposed to ANY dumping, pumping or discharge of ANY treated or untreated sewerage, industrial, commercial, private waste or water into Lake Lanier, currently or proposed for the future. The pollution levels in the lake are bad enough now and to turn this beautiful natural watershed and lake into Georgia's largest septic tank is an environmental CRIME! Politics, big business and big money be damned! If this type of thinking in the name of progress continues, we will have a "dead" lake that is unfit for swimming, recreation or fishing. Government should be focused on making sure that Lake Lanier is a showcase for the rest of the country of what can be done to preserve its water quality, water level and a logical and concerned balance of the needs as water source for Atlanta and recreation for all the users and homeowners. There are other technologies and options available for waste disposal but the lake is too easily seen as an easy and inexpensive solution—all to its detriment. It seems that Government usually has no problem "spending" money. Let's see that this spending is done to provide the proper options and technologies to keep the lake CLEAN and a beautiful Georgia resource!

LL.60

Prohibit development around the lake that would result in pollutant discharge into the lake. Do not allow sewage to be discharged into the lake. Police sewage discharge from boats.

LL.80

Not to dump treated sewage into the lake. If the water is harmless then recycle it for drinking water. If you can't use it for drinking water then don't dump it into the lakes. Build a pipeline to the Hoch below the Morgan Falls dam and run it into the nasty river water there.

LL.81

SEWAGE DISPOSAL was NOT one of the chartered purposes of this lake. So it should NOT be allowed, plain and simple. Municipalities should have to deal with their growing sewage issues as if the dam had NEVER been built. Just because the lake is "there" and "convenient," it is not intended to be a sewage dump.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Power Generation

LL.24

Power generation - quality of life and economic benefit to the lake itself as the means to ensure water quality protections far into the future. The best protection for the lake is a strong defense of its value - and that takes money.

Prohibit Chemical Use

LL.116

Prohibit the use of any chemical by any private party on Lake Lanier. Plant trees, shrubs, grasses, and forbs. Seek more restrictive state standards as they relate to water quality. Prohibit any sewage collection system or septic system on Corps property.

Public Involvement

LL.58

I love Lake Lanier. As a resident of Atlanta we all are fortunate to have this beautiful lake so close by. Hopefully, all of us who use it respect the lake knowing that it doesn't get used and stay clean without everyone's collective attention. I think I abide by that and make sure all who are with me abide by it too.

LL.72

Everyone needs to protect the quality of the water in Lake Lanier.

Publication of Water Quality Information

LL.118

Water quality is an issue with any lake. The availability of information on water quality of the lake by the Corps is wonderful.

LL.38

Lack of information in this area. Is the water safe to drink or not? Status of eating fish—are they safe or not? Quality of fishing available?

LL.58

I have read that the City of Gainesville dumps raw sewage into the upper waters of the lake. Hopefully, that is not or no longer true. I am concerned about polluted runoff into the lake from the area that produces the largest number of chicken broilers in the world. I know that white or light-colored clothes dunked in lake water do not wash clean. What does that mean? Too many particulates in the lake? I would like to know how clean the water is with respect to being clean enough to swim in. I think that ought to be a matter of public record and that there ought to be an understanding of how the measurements compare to acceptable standards. I would rather know than not know. So would everyone.

Seem ok to a layman like me. I have searched the Internet for all I could find about water quality of the lake. I can find the readings and measurements but they are meaningless without an acceptable standard to compare to. How hard would it be to publish the daily/weekly/monthly water quality readings around the lake and how they compare to acceptable human standards, just like actual lake levels compared to full pool are published every day? Wouldn't folks become more interested in keeping the lake clean if they could see how close to being unsafe for swimming it might be.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Septic Tank Runoff

LL.1

I have heard the lake used to rise so much that septic tanks overflowed into the lake. I used to be a home I.V. nurse and took care of three people who supposedly died from a bacterial infection in the lake. Friends tell us they won't swim in the water because it's unsanitary. Is there any validity? Is the water quality improving?

LL.108

Septic tank inspections.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many residents believe that water quality is a very important factor to be considered in the EIS. Among the concerns mentioned is septic tank leakage. Several focus group participants are concerned that infrequent septic tank inspections and the resulting lack of maintenance and repair have led to a large amount of septic tank leachate reaching the lake.

LL.16

I am concerned about runoff from lawns and septic tanks.

Storm Water Runoff

LL.120

With all the construction (residential and commercial) storm runoff into small creeks leading to the lake is increasing, especially around McEver Road/Stephens Road, which runs into Flat Creek, and some others.

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many residents feel that water quality is a very important factor to be considered in the EIS. Among the concerns mentioned is storm water runoff.

Support for Carefully Inspected Sewage Discharges

LL.20

I encourage the release of treated wastewater into the lake, provided treatment is the same (or higher) level as is currently done by Gwinnett County. I also wish to protect the cold water (hypolimnion) layer from an infusion of warm water.

I applaud the USACE actions that have boosted dissolved oxygen content of the tailrace.

LL.53

I have no problem with returning treated water to the lake as long as:

The return water is placed upstream of the water withdrawal points. This ensures self-interested quality control.

The water quality inspection process is independent and rigorous.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Support for Current Lake Management Activities

LL.61

Water quality is fine.

Toxic Chemicals and Bioaccumulation in Fish and Humans

LL.121 FG-LAR

Many residents believe that water quality is a very important factor to be considered in the EIS. Among the concerns mentioned is the bioaccumulation of toxic chemicals by fish and therefore the consumption of contaminated fish by humans.

In addition, the residents are concerned that what occurs in Lake Lanier negatively effects the quality of the water downstream. Changes in temperature, effects on habitat, and water quality degradation are all concerns.

Upstream Water Quality

LL.122 FG-RLU

The group requested the quality of the water upstream be discussed in the draft EIS available to the public in the summer of 2002.

Water Quality

LL.27

Water quality has to take priority over recreational needs. In fact, it has to be the top priority.

Water quality has to be the top priority over all other uses for the lake.

LL.95

Continued support is crucial, however, we would like to see more emphasis on keeping the lake cleaner, i.e., floating and land debris, etc.

Water Quality/Recreation

LL.37

I would like to see the recreational/commercial needs of the north Georgia area be the second highest priority just behind maintaining water quality down the Chattahoochee River. Maintaining barge traffic down river seems to be an overall economic mistake considering the negative impact those water releases have on the upstream economy and recreational needs.

Issue: Water Safety

License Boat Drivers

LL.4

Can we license all boat operators, and include environmental and conservation factors in their training and test?

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.97

License all boat owners and PWC owners that use Lake Lanier. If caught and not licensed, fine.

Promote Boater Safety

LL.121 FG-LAR

Residents are also very concerned about the safe operation of boats and other personal watercraft. Several would like to see an increase in no-wake areas, establishment of speed limits, a limit on the size of boats, and better signage to help boaters navigate in low-water conditions.

LL.123 FG-BO

Some participants mentioned that there should be greater promotion of boating safety, better technology, and environmentally safe jet skis. According to one person, technology for future 4-cycle jet skis negates environmental impacts.

The business owners and operators also believe that there is a need for more boat safety courses.

Too Many Boats

LL.54

How about only allowing the poker run contests in the spring/fall...when the lake is not as crowded with recreational users...it's downright dangerous!

LL.82

This lake is dangerous on weekends due to traffic, high-speed boats and idiots with no sense.

LL.87

It is endangering our lives when we go for a swim: some racing vehicle could come around the bend and not see us in time.

Underwater Hazards

LL.37

I would request that the COE evaluate the impact of putting in place a formal hazard removal procedure (tree stump and rock) at and near the shoreline when water levels are lower than normal as they have been for the past year. Many hazards near the shoreline could easily be removed at lower than normal water levels and make boating/swimming much safer when the lake is at a low level. Resident/recreational users could formally request specific hazard removal by use of a FORM or phone call to a COE office.

LL.38

Seems the lake lacks markers in areas where there are submerged items.

LL.41

Thumbs up to the rangers who mark the danger areas.

LL.78

Better marking of the shoals, trees, and rocks.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.96

We love to ski. We wrecked two props last summer due to unmarked dangers. The water level needs to be maintained. We cannot use our lift this summer. The 5 boat docks beyond us are dry!

Universal Signage

LL.70

I don't see signs advising the new rules so "recreators" are aware of them. Wouldn't it make the Corps's job easier if there were signs at all boat ramps with the top "rules," a reminder not to litter and then some safety tips (like who has the right of way, check your life vests, oars, horn, etc.). Since we do not have to have a license to drive a boat, many folks are not aware of the laws or safety tips.

LL.90

I feel that a disproportionately higher number of non-English-speaking individuals have been injured, died of drowning or other water safety-related accidents on Lake Lanier.

Part of the problem is that water safety signage is written only in English. As a result, non-English speakers are automatically at a safety disadvantage on the lake. In addition, English-speaking illiterate persons cannot understand the signs either because they cannot read.

According to a member of the US Army Corps of Engineers' Lake Lanier Water Safety Task Force, the Army's current rules and regulations leave absolutely no room for considering any type of alternative new signage or changes and modifications to existing signage. I have been frustrated by the US Army Corps of Engineers for their lack of willingness to consider innovative recommendations for educating the entire public about water safety. I have made a number of recommendations, such as the use of universal, illustration-based signage to show the rules of the lake and to advise of safety precautions. Such universal signage would not require any expensive translation into multiple languages because the sign would be universal. Everyone would understand the meaning, including persons who are illiterate. Unfortunately, each time I make such recommendations, my ideas fall to deaf ears.

LL.97

Put up signs in Spanish, Japanese, and Indian so they can be read by all.
Move all NO WAKE barges out further at all ramps and put bouys where there are none at ramps (Bolding Mill).

Issue: Watershed Management

Chicken/Dog Food Processing Plants

LL.120

Dumping into the lake as well as smelling really bad when the wind is in the right direction.

Commercial Pollution

LL.10

We need good water quality. Restrict commercial in North Lake from polluting to Smith Lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.113

Commercial enterprises pollute the lake.

LL.70

It is also why you have a growing problem. When you tell businesses you are serious and you shut them down, they will stop polluting. As long as they can get away with it, they will.

LL.84

Protect the quality of the water at all cost. Do not allow any feedlots, processing plants or large developments within the watershed. Develop an alternative to the silt fence; developers should have catch basins first. Hold all municipalities responsible for pollution.

Consistent Enforcement of Watershed Regulations

LL.70

Bending the rules because a business wants to do something, is not being responsible and will catch up with us. You cannot please everyone all the time but the agencies charged with enforcement should be empowered to actually enforce the laws without interference OR get rid of the rules and laws and the agencies.

Industrial Pollution

LL.120

Flat Creek has the best fishing I know of, and the most polluted water. It runs from an industrial area through a waste dump.

Monitoring

LL.66

You have an obligation to report to the state and take a stand on how well the bordering counties are doing in controlling nonpoint pollution.

LL.96

Of utmost importance! Can Alatoona supply water that Lanier currently provides? Stricter enforcement of water quality entering lake—monitor businesses (chicken farms) and subdivision septic systems.

Nonpoint Source Pollution

LL.124 FG-EO

The group expressed concern about nonpoint source pollution from fertilizers, pesticides, and other sources. One person believes that the EIS should also address the impacts of new reservoirs.

Sedimentation/Siltation

LL.18

Local governments should work harder to enforce sedimentation laws to permit siltation from entering the lake.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

LL.86

This is where we have serious problems. The rapid development in the Lanier watershed is causing erosion and sedimentation problems in the lake. The Corps needs to pressure local governments in the watershed to better protect the streams draining into the lake, since the sedimentation adversely affects the lake. It would be wise, in fact, to find funding somewhere to buy land which would increase the buffers on lands along these streams.

I am a homeowner on the lake myself, and I have a septic tank system. I and most people I know would not object if there were requirements, fairly administered, for septic tank inspection and pump-out, with documentation to prove it, on a consistent basis (every 2-3 years or whenever experts agreed it would be appropriate). Also, homeowners and businesses around and near the lake need to be educated about the harmful effects of pesticides and fertilizers that run off into the lake. Research needs to be done, if it has not already, and publicized about types of fertilizers and pesticides best suited for use in an environment near a lake like ours. Most important, the EPD needs to fully enforce the laws about dumping poorly or inadequately treated wastewater into the lake.

Storm Water Runoff

LL.123 FG-BO

Many of the business owners and operators believe that storm water runoff should be included in the EIS because there needs to be a study on the cumulative effects from this type of nonpoint source pollution.

Support for Current Lake Management Activities

LL.119

It usually looks great except after a rain.

Watershed Management Organizations

LL.3

The different watersheds that make up the lake and the many different tributaries—these regions should be split up. If possible, it would be effective if each watershed (HUC-12) had its own homeowners or business owners forum—like a watershed alliance... but for different lake tribs.

The individual watershed alliance could promote public education, implement shoreline cleanup (being more effective because watershed-dependent), invoke competition and empower the citizens living within the given watershed.

LL.4

Need to continue to try to get the counties in the upper watershed to participate in Governor's watershed management organization.

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Issue: Wildlife and Vegetation

Buffer Zone

LL.118

I like the Corps lines. I feel it helps give this man made lake a more natural appearance and helps with the cut down of pollutants contaminating the water. No construction below the Corps line is one of the reasons Lanier is such a attractive lake.

LL.3

The current buffer regulation is not suitable for maintaining a healthy lake—a lake that provides over 200 million gallons of drinking water per day. It should be buffered, and public education is the only way that this buffer increase will be supported—therefore, public education should be increased and directly tied to the fact that we receive our water from the lake.

LL.34

I am disappointed and concerned over the cutting of trees and vegetation between new expensive houses and the shoreline.

Concern About Decreased Wildlife Populations

LL.121 FG-LAR

Several residents noted that they have noticed a decrease in wildlife populations, especially geese, around the lake. They believe that a loss of habitat has contributed to this problem.

Hunting

LL.111

The lake is too crowded to allow any type of hunting. If you can't shoot anywhere near a boat dock, where are you supposed to hunt. Too dangerous!!

LL.117

I'm not in favor of hunting.

LL.119

I'm against goose hunting. Please don't do it!

LL.12

This is very important. The fishing, hunting, etc. needs to be closely controlled with continued limits on fish. Our water needs to be kept clean for the wildlife and birds' health.

LL.66

I would like to see a reduction in the geese population.

LL.95

Very important ... that is why we emphasize dock control!

Lake Sidney Lanier EIS

Comments

Nonnative Species

LL.124 FG-EO

Several individuals believe the number of nonnative vegetation and wildlife species, such as the rice eel and the zebra mollusk, is becoming a threat to the native species.