

**APPENDIX K**  
Meeting Workshop Minutes

Minutes for the SMP PDT Meeting with representatives from local municipalities  
7 April 2004

1. The meeting began at 1 pm with brief introductions by attendees and a Power Point presentation by Don Wiese on the background of shoreline management at the Elm Fork Project Office. A list of attendees is available.
2. The floor was then opened up for questions and comments.
  - a. Questions were raised regarding permits issued on leased land. Should permits be based on type of use, or would they be the same no matter where they are issued? Could a city contract with adjacent landowners to keep an area mowed in a leased area, including high density recreational areas?
  - b. Will the EA be considering the different recreational areas? Some representatives asked how the PDT would make a single policy which addressed the different types of use areas at the Elm Fork lakes.
  - c. Don stated that this meeting was part of a “scoping” process- a chance for the SMP PDT to determine what issues would need to be addressed in the EA. The cities should begin submitting recommendations, if they have any, starting now so that their concerns can be incorporated into the EA process.
  - d. A question was raised as to how strict the COE would be on violations, and a discussion followed on the current “soft shoe approach” the COE takes with violations.
  - e. Some of the municipalities expressed interest in being able to issue citations for violations taking place within their leased areas- issues raised included legal authority to issue citations and training of personnel. If this is a recommendation, it would be optional due to the small size of some of the municipalities around the lakes.
  - f. Another issue raised was that of public meetings- how many would there be, who would be included, and how would we contact them. There was some concern that adjacent landowners not included in HOA’s would be left out of the process, especially in cities that do not have HOA’s (ie, Lewisville). Some of the municipalities offered assistance in contacting adjacent landowners and arranging for meetings.
  - g. The possibility of a “checklist” for adjacent landowners within city boundaries was brought up, as well as possible requirements for setbacks and set-asides for public access along boundaries to consolidate paths for public access to the shoreline and reduce the need for private access paths.
3. The meeting then ended at approximately 2:15.

**Notes from SMP PDT meeting with citizens at Crossroads Town Hall, June 3, 2004:**

Number	Comments from the public	Team Response at Meeting
Note: The team tried to capture every public comment, but did not document all of the COE responses to the comments.		
Concerns relating to mowing, vegetation, children, snakes, predators:		
1.	Behind my house I have several trees, vines, poison ivy, it is a haven for snakes, I have young children. I don't want people coming up to my house from the lakeside but I do want to clear out some of the vegetation. The vines are overtaking the trees and killing them. (1)	
2.	I have grandchildren and had a snake infestation until I started mowing; I noticed a conspicuous contrast in the number of snakes after I started mowing. I also have issues with the trash that lands on the property behind my house. If we were not doing maintenance the land would not be accessible. I feel that the minimum distance that should be allowed to be mowed is 50 ft but more should be allowed on a case-by-case basis. There should be liberalization on mowing to make land usable. (14)	
3.	I have also had problems with snakes-cottonmouth, water moccasins, especially south of 380. (15)	
4.	I did clear out the underbrush; that would prevent cougars, etc. coming through to my property. Suggests that the team consider allowing mowing to 100 ft. onto government property. (16)	
5.	There are a ton of copper head snakes on my property and the government property adjacent to mine. I had also heard that mowing will diminish the mosquito problem. (17)	
6.	Regarding the question, how far would I like to mow- I would like to mow to the point where I can easily see the water from my residence. This would of course vary depending on terrain. (4)	
7.	Vary the rules depending on the ecology of the area. (18)	
8	How do you currently address tree removal? I	Snags do have habitat value.

	had a tree on government property that I felt was a danger and the project office said it could not be removed. (10)	COE policy at the Elm Fork is to leave dead trees unless they are a threat to property. IF they are a threat to property, then they may be removed, in most cases by the adjacent landowner after a ranger has paid a site visit.
9	Whatever the mowing distance is set at weather it is 25, 50, or 100 feet, There should be no mowing allowed within 50 feet of the water line except for a fishing path (23)	
Concerns relating to fire:		
1.	The grass and bushes that grow up by the lakefront and then die are a fire hazard. If struck by dry lightning they could catch fire. (2)	In regards to fire hazards, the team will be looking at -Texas Forest Service requirements for appropriate fire breaks behind residences. Currently the standards call for 30 feet behind a structure, which most landowners have in their back yards.
2.	Individual commented that rules should vary depending on terrain; mentioned the south part of Lewisville Lake, by the dam, as having fewer trees; concerned about fire hazard and what happened in the western states happening at Lewisville Lake. (19)	
Boat docks, fishing docks, policy on private docks		
1.	The policy on boat docks is not consistent nationwide. There are lakes in North Carolina where dredging, boat docks, mowing are all allowed. I am having difficulty understanding the differences in policy. If the community decided that docks were a good thing, would the SMP be reopened? (5)	ER 1130-2-406 governs the entire dock program. If the COE were to re-examine allowing new boat docks, this would have potential conflicts with commercial marinas, the carrying capacity, the National Environmental Policy. It is very possible that an EIS would be required. Similar actions in other Corps Districts (such as Little Rock District) have resulted in litigation). Preparing an EIS is quite expensive and would almost certainly require a special appropriation from Congress. Discussed that this EA is related to the Mowing and Underbrushing Guidelines and Access Path Activities only and is not covering all activities associated with the Shoreline Management Plan
2.	I would like to be allowed to have a fishing dock for my son to use to fish from without stepping on a cottonmouth snake. (6)	

Questions relating to lake level, buoys, COE boundary delineation		
1.	Why are channels not marked? (7)	Liability issues, arguments over who should pay to place buoys and maintain them.
2.	Is the COE boundary determined by mean sea level elevation? (3)	The Government acquired in fee title most lands up to a 537 elevation. In those areas where the Government purchased to a lower elevation (such as 530 feet msl) a flowage easement was purchased on all areas up to 537.
3.	During the drought a few years back, why did the COE not dredge, or have a contractor dredge, some of the soil to deepen the reservoir? (21)	A good thought, something to keep in mind for future drought periods.
4.	Lake level- what is the criteria for release of water? The lake seems to be consistently low- are they releasing water to provide water for the Trinity area recreational facilities? (22)	The State of Texas has jurisdiction over water use- doubtful that the City of Dallas would be able to release water solely for recreational use
5.	Lake level fluctuations seem to be drastic at this lake. (9)	
Comments relating to the PDT team, current permits, process		
1.	What happens after August 1? How will individuals be able to access the EA findings, comment on them? (24)	Through the district/project website; also, participants of the meeting will be notified in writing of the findings and given the opportunity to request documents and comment on content.
2.	Are permits currently being issued? I called the COE office last year and was told no permits were being given out. (12)	Permits are currently being granted. A year ago we were not issuing permits because we were allowing landowners to mow 15 ft. w/o a permit.
3.	Issuing citations- everyone should be treated equally. I had heard there were to be exceptions. If there are to be exceptions, will they be public record? I just want to be treated fairly. (11)	The SMP PDT has not stated that there would be exceptions to any guidelines issued. We are going through the EA process so that guidelines can be established and everyone is treated fairly.
Miscellaneous comments		
1.	Can I get a map of my residence and the adjacent Government property showing where the boundary line is? Are there any plans to make the COE lands smaller? (20)	A map like this can be obtained at the Elm Fork Project Office; there are currently no plans to surplus Government land at Lewisville/Grapevine.
2.	Chemicals vs. organics in the watershed? In the	There will be, in the prescription

	analysis, will there be some mention of this issue? Will there be recommendations on what people can use to manage areas? (25)	for land management.
3.	The gate width should be expanded to 72 inches so that I can get my tractor through the gate opening. (8)	
4.	If there is a noise problem with people mowing, why is the problem with the air boats not being enforced by the COE? (13)	This is a law enforced by the game warden (TPWD). There are restrictions on noise coming from boats under Texas law.

**Notes from SMP PDT meeting with Wynnewood Peninsula , June 29, 2004:**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Comments from the public</b>	<b>Team Response at Meeting</b>
Note: Team members tried to document every public comment, but did not necessarily document every team response to those comments.		
<b>Concerns relating to land issues, mowing, vegetation, children, snakes, predators:</b>		
1.	I am concerned about skunks and snakes, especially with children around. (13)	
2.	Boaters cannot pull up to shoreline when there is trash; why does a mowed area make any difference? (4)	
3.	How will wildlife use corridors when corridors are already broken up by development (Tribute golf course, high intensity park use areas) (9)	
4.	How much of the COE land is already being mowed? How much more of the riparian corridor is slated to be developed? Is anyone at the COE looking towards future development of the area? (16)	
5.	If the COE wants to restrict growth, they shouldn't allow it to turn into a jungle (17)	The SMP does allow for mowing
6.	Do you have any regulations with the City of the Colony as to how deep you can mow? (23)	
7.	(Referring to the slide titled "Woodlands" on the PP presentation and Don Wiese's comment about "Fish and Wildlife would love that slide")- What is the purpose behind that slide; I would much rather look at the lake (29) and how is the general public going to use the land in that slide (30)	
8	We are a very small area on the lake; we want to maintain the shoreline the way it is. We keep it clean, we pick up trash, fishermen use it- we don't want to have to fight to keep it the way it is. (45)	

9	I don't believe that the mowing restrictions are similar at other lakes. (56)	
10.	Possibility of using vegetation alteration plans (63)	
Concerns relating to fire:		
1.	Concerned about fire safety, especially if undergrowth is not mowed; this is a very small area on this peninsula and it will turn into a large fire trap. (18)	
2.	Growth of grass behind my house would become a fire hazard if not able to mow the perimeter, especially during a drought (26)	
Boat docks, fishing docks, policy on private docks		
1.	Ray Hubbard and boat dock restrictions- why do they have no problems and no restrictions and Lewisville has too many restrictions and too many problems? (67)	
2.		
Concerns/questions relating to lease areas, development, Tribute Golf Course		
1.	Why can't a neighborhood get a lease/agreement similar to what cities can get to allow for mowing and recreational use? (39)	
2.	What happens to the revenue from the Tribute golf course? Does the COE get any of that money? (42)	
3.	What kind of EA is done for marinas? (43)	The programmatic assessment in 1999 studied water-related recreational use; measured sustainable water recreational growth. Determined that there was room for growth in certain areas, but not in other areas.
4.	There is a contradiction besides allowing marinas and not allowing adjacent landowners to mow- marina areas are not clean (44)	
5.	What sort of agreements do the Tribute golf course and the indoor soccer complex have with the COE? (8)	
6.	If a city can lease land, why can't we? I was allowed to build a private dock in Florida under lease from the COE. (20)	
7.	Is the Colony planning on building a trail from Stewarts Creek Park? (25)	
8.	With the Tribute golf course, there is more mowing now than ever. (62)	
Comments relating to the PDT team, current permits, process, definitions		
1.	Why are we changing the rules; why fix something that isn't broken? Does the Fish and Wildlife service give you any reason as to why the COE	The Fish and Wildlife Dept. requested this review.

	should consider changing rules? There is so much land around the lake that is already natural. (2)	
2.	How is private use of public property defined?(3)	
3.	How do you define “erosion control”? We have seen an island disappear from the lake due to erosion in the last 10-15 years. (27)	
4.	What does it take to get the COE to go to an EIS? What process was done to approve the new marina (Cottonwood)? (37)	A programmatic assessment was done in 1999
5.	How do we go about getting this area rezoned from wildlife management to recreational? (38)	This would require a change to the master plan.
6.	Is this an economic issue- is the COE short of funds and they are using the EA to get out of paying for mowing in some areas? (41)	
7.	If the rules change, would it affect all areas on the lake? Would the areas leased by the Boy Scouts, Jesuits(Montserrat retreat center) and the YMCA be required to follow the same restrictions? If the HOA became a non-profit association could we also get a lease? (6)	The HOA would probably not be able to get a lease
8.	(In response to #7 above)- Why can we not get a lease; that runs counter to the ideal of public land. (7)	For a non-profit to get a lease it has to be shown need, must be open to the entire public for use, must serve the public in a capacity not already served.
9.	Who developed the use zones? (10)	
10.	Why is there so much concern about creating restrictions for this lake? Tawakoni and Cedar Creek have different rules (11)	
11.	Does the COE grandfather existing owners who follow regulations- grandfather existing developments and change the rules for new developments. (12)	
12.	How will this affect our property values in 10-15 years when we can't see the lake from our homes or use the lake? (15)	
13	This neighborhood has been established for quite some time- concerned about people who already live here. It is not fair to allow developments like the Tribute and have the be exempt from mowing restrictions but punish residential neighbors. We have certain expectations and we paid for those expectations (14) and comment (36)- different cities and developers are dedicating land for environmental restoration; if I had known that when I bought my property then I went into it with my eyes open but I had different expectations when I bought my property. This comment was	

	repeated again, (65)- consider grandfathering so that existing landowners can continue to mow, as they have been, to maintain property value- but enforce restrictions on new development.	
14.	When the EA comes out, does the COE have to hold private meetings? How will the public be notified of the start of the comment period? (21)	
15.	When did the assessment begin? How were individuals to perform EA chosen and who are they? (22)	
16.	The individuals doing the study have never contacted any of the individuals living in Wynnwood Haven- I want to know when they came out into the field (28)	
17.	Aren't there already designated wildlife areas on Lewisville Lake? (31)	
18.	We are zoned for wildlife- how did Wynnwood Haven receive that designation; we are in an urban setting, it seems contradictory to have a WMA in Wynnwood Peninsula. (32)	
19.	Where can we get information relating to the zoning of this area? (33)	
20.	Who do we send comments regarding the EA to? (46)	Rob Newman in PER
21.	Who makes the final decision? (47) and I have the feeling that the decision has already been made. If we wait and the decision is unfavorable to us, what is our recourse? (48) and again, what is the process of appeal (55)	
22.	What effect are the large causeways/highways having on this study? How could these things not have an impact? (48)	The highways are not included in the EA; most of these projects were covered in the programmatic assessment in 1999; 2499 could be significant.
23	The residents would like to meet with Dr. Sam Atkinson.	
24	How much money is being spent on this EA process- not just the cost of the EA itself but manpower, etc- can we get that information? (50)	
25.	Master plan information- which Master Plan are we working under now? (51)	
26.	There has got to be a way to partner with the residents to maintain the area (52)	
27.	There are no real public beaches in this area, no real public access- 4 marinas on Lewisville are owned by the same person- you can't go to the	

	lake unless you have money. (53)	
28.	This is a great opportunity to get people to work with you but you have a PR nightmare because someone at the COE decided to change the way things are (61) and We don't want negativity from the COE- little nitpicky things- we want consensus and consistency (64)	
<b>Comments and questions relating to enforcement</b>		
1.	How will these mowing restrictions be enforced? (5)	
2.	I see contradictions and lack of enforcement (54)	
3.	Does the COE have the ability to enforce? The manpower to enforce? (57)	
<b>Miscellaneous comments/questions</b>		
1.	What is a district; how does a lake fit into that hierarchy? Are regulations the same at each lake or do they differ? (1)	
2.	What is the status of the health of the dam/sedimentation of the lake? How many cities are dumping raw sewage into the lake? Are dams at Lewisville rated? (24)	Sedimentation is generally only measured if requested by the City of Dallas.
3.	The project office has not been timely in returning mowing permit requests- I requested a mowing permit 2 years ago and it was never returned.(19)	
4.	Erosion concerns- the COE spends money on beautification- what about erosion prone areas? (35)	
5.	It seems the park areas were taken care of in the past, and not now- leased out to the City of the Colony and the marina- is the COE remiss in taking care of some facilities? (40)	
6.	I have applied for and have not yet received my waterline permit (58)	
7.	What is the status of Joe Pool lake and hydrilla? (66)	
8	Dredging- can adjacent landowners dredge on their own? (59)	
9.	Why would an agency not allow private landowners to do beneficial items like dredging- I talked to Craig Kislingberry at the Lewisville office and he indicated that it was possible- why are people not on the same page at the office? (60)	

**Notes from SMP PDT meeting with Board of Directors of Homeowners Shoreline Alliance, July 29, 2004:**

Number	Comments from the Board	Team Response at Meeting
Note: The team tried to capture every public comment, but did not document all of the COE responses to the comments.		
General Discussion before comments were received:		
1.	Homeowner Shoreline Alliance President gave a quick overview of what the HAS is. It is a 170-member group comprised of members from various communities around Lake Lewisville.	
2.	Don Wiese introduced the members from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the University of North Texas (UNT) and asked the group to provide USACE with a list with names and addresses and we would add the Board Members to the project mailing list.	
3.	Don Wiese gave a brief power point presentation.	
Concerns relating to mowing, vegetation, children, snakes, predators:		
1.	<p>We agree with many things; but here is what we think the Corps should allow and what we want.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adjacent Landowners make decisions on what to do on federal property adjacent to them.</li> <li>2. We cannot picnic where the button bush is present</li> <li>3. What happens when you have a small band that is not very useful for wildlife habitat?</li> <li>4. Some type of native grasses is acceptable to the homeowners; it does not have to be Bermuda grass.</li> </ol>	
2.	There are concerns about safety with regards to other animals.	
3.	There is a lot of development with very large homes. Investments were made with the assumption that they could maintain the land. Are we taking this into consideration while preparing the EA?	
4.	We have been mowing 130 feet to the shoreline across from pier 121. We have been mowing all of it for 91/2 years.	
5.	Are we still considering the 15-foot no-mow	Sam Atkinson from UNT

	buffer by the shoreline and what is the purpose of that?	commented on the usefulness of Buffer zones. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protects water quality – 10 foot wide buffer filters 50-90% of pollutants from run-off.</li> <li>2. Provides wildlife habitat if at least 30 feet wide and provides corridors for wildlife migration if even less than that.</li> </ol>
6.	What about parklands? Would they have buffers along the shoreline?	No they would not. Parklands are managed differently than natural resource management areas.
7.	Statement was made that the Corps should consider human life and safety when studying mowing restrictions. Humans can't use areas that are thickly overgrown and there is a safety concern because of snakes and poison ivy.	
8.	Will the EA consider grand fathering current mowing levels? If you do, the grand fathering would have to go with the property	
9.	Will the EA consider that the prior use of most of this was agricultural land.	The EA will consider some aspects of prior use, but the fact is that constructing the lake changed the entire land use of the area.
10.	Will a 30' buffer mowed to 3" be as effective in filtering pollutants as a 15' undisturbed buffer?	Grass filters are better than bare ground and remove some pollutants, but not as effectively as undisturbed vegetation.
11.	Are we using previous studies that show that the natural vegetation allows more erosion than the mowed grass? These should be included in the EA.	If you are talking about Dr. Smith's vegetation management plans, then yes we are considering those. They are being modified and incorporated as Vegetation Management Plans.
12.	Question concerning individual permits for vegetation alteration or management plans.	We could implement our Vegetation Management Plans through organized groups, but we probably will not permit individual people to implement the vegetation management plans on government property.
13.	Can the government afford to implement the Vegetation Management Plans?	Not at this point, but there are funds from mitigation from

		other projects that can be used to implement the vegetation management plans at the lakes. There are also other programs that the Corps uses, such as the 1135 projects that can be used. Ultimately we hope to get project funds to do it.
14.	Mr. Stehlik stated that homeowners were willing to compromise with the Corps to allow them to maintain Corps property down to the shoreline, but not necessarily as a lawn condition, but in a condition that will allow them and the general public to use the shoreline. This would allow maintenance of narrow areas behind houses and the Corps can manage other areas not behind houses as wildlife management areas. Question brought up again about the usefulness of narrow strips of land as wildlife habitat.	The EA will address these concerns.
15.	Question concerning the source of concern with wildlife habitat?	USFWS is expressing concern for some time with loss of habitat through excessive mowing and loss of habitat in the region, not only at the lake, from development. The corps has a mission of providing wildlife habitat. These areas are designated as natural resource management areas.
16.	Didn't the Corps say that the Tribute Golf Course actually improved wildlife habitat?	Yes we did say that. Unlike a lot of these areas that are of pretty good habitat already, that area was not of very high quality and they replanted native species including tall and short grasses and constructed several ponds that created habitat.
Concerns relating to fire:		
Boat docks, fishing docks, policy on private docks		
1.	Are boat permits being considered under this EA.	Not in this EA, this EA is concentrating on Mowing, Underbrushing and Aces path Guidelines only.
2.	Why aren't owner's that have built million dollar houses allowed to build boat docks when there are so many around the lake that nobody is taking care of? Can we move a boat dock from one location to another? I always just get told no	Don Wiese explained the boathouse policies of the Fort Worth District.

	and never am given an explanation why.	
3.	Can the boathouse issue be raised after this EA is completed?	Yes, the issue can be raised, but we would have to consider impacts to commercial concessions, previous carrying capacity studies, and other considerations and we would more then likely have to prepare an EIS because of the possible opposition of other landowners in the areas not wanting to see boat docks at the lake. There would also have to be funding allocated for the EIS. This EA is being paid out of the lake budget, but the lake could not afford an EIS at that level unless funds were appropriated especially for that purpose.
Questions relating to lake level, buoys, COE boundary delineation		
1.	Are signs being posted to say that this is public land so that there is no perception of private property?	No they are not.
Comments relating to the PDT team, current permits, process		
1.	<p>USACE is lucky to have you (Don Wiese) in charge of this process. You are doing an excellent job at representing the Corps.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How was the decision made to write an EA instead of an EA as you know we believe it should be an EIS to capture public involvement?</li> <li>2. Will part of the EA study cumulative impacts including impact on private property values?</li> <li>3. Are you going to have a Public Hearing?</li> <li>4. Can you tell me what alternatives you are looking at?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corps explained that they believe that the mowing and underbrushing fall under a categorical exclusion of the Corps, but due to public controversy we decided to do an EA. The EA will determine whether to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact or to prepare an EIS. If the Corps was making an agency decision to establish a Shoreline Management Plan at all of its lakes, then that would be an EIS, but that has already been done. We are only potentially modifying existing guidelines at Lewisville and Grapevine Lakes. In addition, NEPA requires</li> </ol>

		<p>one public scoping meeting and one public hearing for an EIS. The scoping meeting can be in the form of workshops, public meetings, or open house format. Our process has allowed much more public involvement process with three public workshops, meetings with Cities and agencies, and letter correspondence to the entire mailing list and the Fort Worth District ENRAC list.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. There will be a brief cumulative impacts assessment in the EA since that is the nature of an EA, but we are uncertain if Property values will be assessed since that is not a Corps of Engineers mission.</li><li>3. We are not certain for sure if there will be a Public Hearing, but you are more than welcome to request one when the EA is released.</li><li>4. We originally had 26-alternatives, but had to reduce it down to 6 alternatives. 1) Fire Safety mow. Mow 25' on government property at both lakes. This along with the buffer on private property will allow the 30-feet required by Texas forest Service. 2) Status Quo or no action: mow 50' at Lewisville and 25' at Grapevine. 3) expanded mow: allow</li></ol>
--	--	---

		100' feet at Lewisville and 50' at Grapevine. 4) No Mow: mow nothing at either lake. 5) mow all the way to the shoreline at both lakes. 6) Minimum Habitat Buffer Mow: same as status quo, but have a 25-foot buffer that is not mowed regardless if it falls within the 50-foot mow zone.
2.	Addison asked that if we could check on his FOIA request and try to speed it up, he would be very appreciative. He explained that he had the request in for several months.	The request is over at the Southwest Division Office and we would see what we could do.
Miscellaneous comments		

**Notes from SMP PDT meeting with Texas Master Naturalists, 9 September 2004**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Comments from the public</b>
Concerns relating to land issues, mowing, pathways, wildlife, fire hazard:	
1.	(Referring to the PPT slide with 2 houses)- Could they each have paths down to the lake if the rest of the area was restored to a natural state? (4)
2.	How close can one build to the property line? Does it depend on city ordinances? (5)
3.	When the lake was built, there was much less impermeable surface; the flood storage capacity of the lake may be diminished (6)
4.	The people who are mowing are wiping out native grasses, plants (7)
5.	Boaters are attracted more to the mowed areas than to the natural areas (9)
6.	Property for sale is advertised as "lakefront" by developers and builders- developers use COE property as private property (12)- reference to the recent auction over near the Point Noble area where the auction house advertised property as "lakefront" when in reality it was not.
7.	Instead of a set 50 ft, recommend mowing distance be 25% of distance between property line and shoreline. (15)
8	Is the fragmentation of wildlife habitat a consideration? As long as they have their corridors, wildlife are perfectly content to avoid backyards. Also, the closer you cut the grass, the shorter the root system will be, which means less protection against erosion. Regulations should require at least a perimeter of natural-state shoreline around the lake. (18)
9	Comment on slide in PPT presentation: vegetation and trees on adjacent landowner property are as much or more of a fire hazard than vegetation on COE property, especially non-native plants which dry up in the summer. (29)

10.	Native shoreline grasses are lost when mowing; this is important because these grasses are used by fish as food and shelter. People should be encouraged to plant native grasses along the shoreline. (28)
Concerns relating to erosion/water quality:	
1.	If adjacent landowners are allowed to continue mowing, the taxpayers will end up paying for their retaining walls- adjacent landowners will not follow prescriptions, they will continue to mow and abuse government property. It is expecting too much of adjacent landowners to follow new regulations. (16)
2.	In the Crossroads area, there is a big erosion problem right off of 380- developers are bringing dirt into the area and building it up. (10)
3.	Fast motorboats are contributing to the erosion problem. Grasses with shallow root systems do not protect land against erosion- is the COE looking into a revegetation process? (13)
4.	What is the life span of the lake as a source of drinking water? How much does erosion contribute to siltation? Are there any plans to do a dredge study? Does building marinas contribute to siltation? (21)
5.	The quality of the water in the lakes is affected by the water shed- what control does the COE have over what happens in the watershed for the lakes? (24)
6.	Concern about use of fertilizers/pesticides by adjacent landowners- is there or will there be a list available of preferred products to use in the EA? (27)
7.	If erosion goes beyond property line- retaining wall should be built at adjacent landowner expense or native planting to prevent future erosion (written comment)
8.	Must leave wave back buffer of natural landscape (wave break determined by location) (written comment)
Boat docks, fishing docks, policy on private docks	
1.	
Concerns/questions relating to lease areas, development, Tribute Golf Course	
1.	There appear to be different standards for lease areas (marinas, Camp Copas, YMCA, Montserrat retreat house), recreational areas (parks and campgrounds) (14)
Comments relating to the PDT team, current permits, process, definitions	
1.	Although the word "balance" has been used in the presentation, it sounds like the COE is trying to appease the adjacent landowners. (17)
2.	This EA is an opportunity to take a stand; COE should not allow certain people to exceed minimum standards- does the COE have programs similar to the USDA, where money is provided to farmers to establish vegetation? (23)
3.	What about people who don't live on the lake? The adjacent landowners are making a lot of noise, but the COE should not give into the privileged at the cost of other users (Fishermen who will lose out on habitat) (25)
4.	What is different about the current regulations from the ones back in the 1970's? When I bought my house back then the COE mailed a copy of regulations (22)
5.	What are the precedents set by other lakes/states in regards to mowing/underbrushing on government property? (20)
Comments and questions relating to enforcement	
1.	What happens to the violators? What kind of enforcement is used against people who cut trees, mow, etc (8)
Miscellaneous comments/questions	

1.	What land do you (COE) have responsibility for- flood control, water supply, etc-how do you determine how much land you need for flowage easement? (2)
2.	What is the involvement from Fish and Wildlife? Are they charged with overall coordination of land management or is each agency going off and doing their own thing? (3)
3.	Does the COE ever sell property? (11)
4.	Possible hunting issue near the Old Alton Bridge (19)
5.	Would it be possible for the COE to buy up more land, especially untouched areas, to preserve them for habitat use? (26)

#### MEETING MINUTES: RED BUD POINT

On 13 August 2004, Park Ranger Jennifer Linde and Don Wiese met with Steve Noble and Thomas Webb, residents of Red Bud Point subdivision on Grapevine Lake. Steve Noble is the current president of the Red Bud Point Homeowners Association; Thomas Webb is the past president. The main concerns of the residents in this area were that they wanted to be able to maintain the Rocky Point Horse Trail which runs through the neighborhood; they were concerned about potential fire hazards from brush and vegetation, and they wanted to keep a "beach area" that the residents used clean of brush and debris. Red Bud Point is an older subdivision with many long-term residents who back up to Corps of Engineers Property on Grapevine Lake. Several residents are mowing onto federal property in excess of the 25 ft. allowance. Ranger Linde and Mr. Wiese talked to Mr. Noble and Mr. Webb about possible prescriptions for replanting mowed areas with native vegetation and toured the mowed area (approximately 2-3 acres). They seemed open to the idea of the prescriptions for natural vegetation.