Attachment C – Public Comments Pertaining to BRMEMC Received During the Mountain Reservoirs Land Management Plan Comment Period (August 15-September 29, 2008)

Page intentionally blank

In Support of Proposal

Please let BRMEMC Build a substation on Tract 52. (**Comment by:** *Chris Kelley*)

I wish to retract my e-mail to you folks based upon some information that I have been able to attain. It seems that our community is not well informed and based upon the information I have attained I have realized that the TVA and Blue Ridge Mtn EMC have the best interest of our community at heart and our commissioner is telling folks around Towns County only what they want to hear to benefit him. Blue Ridge Mtn EMC needs a new substation and they should have one where it most benefits them and the community and not where we necessarily want it to go. They know their need better than I do. I cant put into words exactly how I feel but I just feel now after obtaining some knowledge that TVA & EMC are doing for the better of everyone and I support you. There are many ignorant and misinformed people whose voices many times get heard because they scream the loudest. We don't consider ourselves as ignorant but we have seen our county get further behind because of petty political differences. I have lived in Towns County all my life and as a parent I would love to see our county provide nice recreational facilities for our kids in the form of baseball fields, etc. I know in the past TVA has played a major role in this and could again if ignorant people would put aside petty political differences but its probably not going to happen. The recreational facilities for our kids are no better than they were 30 years ago, I know because I came thru them. It always seems though because of a few idiots, everyones kids and mine have to be penalized. I know I have been all over the place in my conversation and for that I am sorry. I hope I have made my point. I'm not anybody in this world but I really would love to see the kids be able to have nice facilities to respect and enjoy because all we had is the same thing we got now. I also once again believe that you folks have the knowledge and best interest for the things that have to be done and people should make themselves more informed as I should have before I e-mailed the first time. (**Comment by:** *Randy McConnell*)

I would support the change from Zone 4 to Zone 6 IF it were developed in a quality manner similar to the camping areas and ballfields of the Georgia Mountain Fairgrounds. (**Comment by:** *Richard Storck*)

Opposed to the Proposal

One very important argument against Alternative C is that the socioeconomic conditions will change drastically. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

Specifically, we are opposed to shifting Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current designation to Alternative C, or any designation that would allow degradation of their natural state. I am strongly against any commercial use of the properties. (**Comment by:** *Stephen M. Morris*)

Specifically, we are opposed to shifting Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current designation to Alternative C, or any designation that would allow degradation of their natural state. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

I am opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. (**Comment by:** *Margaret M. knight, Tucker Demuth, Jim Duke, Donnalee DeMuth, Ophelia Dickey, Brenda Arnett, Ross DeMuth*)

I am opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. (**Comment by:** *Janet Duke*)

I am opposed to rezoning Parcel 10, 52, and 77. I would like for it to be designated as "Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Laura Benitez*)

I am opposed to rezoning Parcel 10, 52, and 77. I would like for it to be designated as "Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Lynne Bever*)

We are opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify parcels 10, 52, and 77 from their current state which is Natural Resource Conservation to one of developed recreation or industrial use. We support TVA adopting the "Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Thomas Bickes, Bill Bindewald, Clint Calvert*)

We are very much opposed to an electric substation or any industrial use on this prime lakeside location at the entrance to a beautiful mountain town. The land is partially below the 1,933 msl and would have to be filled in order to accommodate industrial usage and at the same time be an eyesore at the pristine shoreline entrance to Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *Ben Lilly*)

I am particularly opposed to implementing any lands around the lake to Alternate C which would modify Parcels 10, 52, and 77 from their current sate to one of developed recreation or commercial and industrial use. (**Comment by:** *Richard Ludwig*)

As a land owner in the Lake Chatuge area, I oppose the proposed change on Parcel 52 that would allow for an EMC power substation. Also, I oppose any change on Parcel 72 from Zone 4 (Conservation) to Zone 6 (Developed Recreation). That's just plain FOOLISH!! Lastly, I oppose any change on Parcel 10 from Zone 4 to Zone 5 (Industrial). This is GORGEOUS property! PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE don't destroy the integrity and beauty of Lake Chatuge through GREEDY OVER-DEVELOPMENT. Take a look at Wall Street today. There's what you WANT TO AVOID THROUGH GREED and OVER-DEVELOPMENT!! Please act responsibly. You have public trust. DON'T BLOW IT OVER MONEY!! (**Comment by:** *Craig Evans*)

I am OPPOSSED to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. (**Comment by:** *Gary M. Kopacka*)

Regarding Land Parcels #10, #52, #77 Actually any and all green space land. Please be a good steward of these parcels and lands, and maintain the natural green space to preserve it as is! Developers can seek out privately held land and purchase it to develop--not the natural land belonging to everyone! (Wildlife protected for the next generation to enjoy.) (**Comment by:** *Gene and Fairy Jackson*)

It is with regard for the future generations that I urge you to exercise Alternative A and do not grant requests for use of Parcels #52, #77 and #10 on Chatuge Reservoir. Once given up for development, these green spaces can never be returned to their natural state. This land is a precious resource, we have an obligation to future generations to protect it. (**Comment by:** *William R. Coffman*)

Sir, you can use big words and a long letter, but it all it can say is "Please Look for other sites before you choose Parcel 52 in Hiawassee, GA. This Parcel has great future for County citizens. My home is very near this site. (**Comment by:** *Mary Ann Walden*)

We are getting ready to receive a 20% increase in our power bills. Part of this is most likely for 90 million dollar over run by your contractors at the Browns Ferry Nuclear power plant. We don't need any mismanagement of the use of our greenspace land around Lake Chatuge by TVA. (**Comment by:** *Carl S. Shultz*)

We live at 1297 Laurel Lane, Hiawassee, GA. Our view is directly across Lake Chatuge and looks directly at Parcel 52. We understand that this parcel is being considered for a sub station for BREMC. While we recognize the need for additional capacity, we believe this is the wrong location. (**Comment by:** *Jack and Mary Miller*)

TVA has been a superb manager and steward of Lake Chatuge and I have witnessed excellent co-operation between TVA and the citizens of the Hiawassee River Valley of which Chatuge is the centerpiece! This is one of the major visitor attractions in the State of Georgia, the State of North Carolina and is in a very sensitive environmental area of the GA & NC western & northern mountains. Please protect this shoreline from any kind of development and continue to manage the reservoir as in the past with the help of your superb staff at the management team at Murphy, N.C. (**Comment by:** *Bill Herold*)

Parcel 52 is located along US Hwy 76 at the eastern entrance to downtown Hiawassee, GA. It is understood in public comments that this parcel of approximately 9.4 acres is being considered for a change from Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation) to Zone 6 (Developed Recreation) and from Alternative A (No Action) to Alternative C (Modified Plan). It is also our understanding, due to publicity in the local Hiawassee media, that a portion of this parcel is being considered for sale or lease to Blue Ridge Mountain EMC (BRMEMC) for use of an industrial type electric substation. We are very much opposed to an electric substation or any industrial use on this prime lakeside location at the entrance to a beautiful mountain town. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. Lilly and Peggy I. Lilly*)

No - See my e-mail DJArtmeier@yahoo.com to the Woods Creek. (**Comment by:** *Richard Artmeier*)

NO! out of sight land can be used. (**Comment by:** *Jeff Stamey*)

I am opposed to this proposed sale and easement for substation on parcel 52. These are my reason why - Water quality; Noise quality - Noise is amplified on the water; Visual - will take away from the beauty Hiwassee offers; Environmental It threatening to the ecological balance. I do understand that there are other proposed sites - that this substation could be built on. I am a registered voter and a home owner. Thank you. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

I am opposed to the sale of the TVA property on parcel 52 to BREMC for the following reasons: Degradation of water quality and aquatic ecology; Degradation of Visual resources; Degradation Air quality and noise; Degradation of Socioeconomics; Environmental Consequences; Betrayal of TVA commitment to wise custodianship; There are alternative sites that would not pose these issues. Further, I am in support of TVA designating all Chatuge land areas as Alternative B, Zone 4 "Natural Resource Conservation." I am a registered voter and a homeowner/business owner in Towns County, GA. (**Comment by:** *Michael Bever*)

I am opposed to Parcel 52 being changed to industrial usage. This land should be kept as zone 4 as it is next to the lake where many visitors enjoy its scenic beauty. It would cause noise pollution, damage water quality, reduce the economic development of the area as I feel it would be unsightly, and not congruent with the tranquil setting. I would like this parcel preserved as it is today. (**Comment by:** *Tom Chapin*)

I am vehemently opposed to this substation. Why - there are other locations that would serve the same purpose and not permanently destroy the lake Chatuge ambiance. $1 million savings one time divided by 50,000 customers = $20.00. This fee of 20.00 per customer is a bargain to not trash the lake! (**Comment by:** *Mike Jones*)

Chatuge reservoir Parcel 52 is my major concern. In no way could I ever support an electric substation on this property. It makes absolutely no sense to use such beautiful property in this manner. (**Comment by:** *Don H. Berry*)

Re: Parcel 52 Very much against use for industrial use(i.e. sub-station EMC). This is on a main road that everyone uses to enter Hiawassee (**Comment by:** *Vicki Turner*)

Any ecological changes to TVA land is a loss to everyone not just to the community, but to all who visit this area. (**Comment by:** *Maria Duben*)

Chatuge Parcel 52: Highly against use for industrial commercial substation, etc. I have already commented in more detail in an email to Mr. Tom Kilgore. (**Comment by:** *Todd Turner*)

NO NO NO to re-zoning Parcel 10, 52 and 77. Lake Chatuge's resources are already stretched to their limits. Water quality has been affected, boat traffic is ridiculous. Please rise above the level of most government agencies and USE A LITTLE COMMON SENSE. Rezoning would be destroying the very things that make this lake special. (**Comment by:** *R. Bickley*)

Parcel 52 is located along US Hwy 76 at the eastern entrance to downtown Hiawassee, GA. It is understood in public comments that this parcel of approximately 9.4 acres is being considered for a change from Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation) to Zone 6 (Developed Recreation) and from Alternative A (No Action) to Alternative C (Modified Plan). It is also our understanding, due to publicity in the local Hiawassee media, that a portion of this parcel is being considered for sale or lease to Blue Ridge Mountain EMC (BRMEMC) for use of an industrial type electric substation. We are very much opposed to an electric substation or any industrial use on this prime lakeside location at the entrance to a beautiful mountain town. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. and Peggy I. Lilly*)

I am writing to express my opposition to reclassification of TVA parcels 10, 52 and 77. If these parcels are reclassified, development resulting in serious disruption of the natural environment and the quality of life for generations to come will occur. Lake Chatuge, including its surrounding undeveloped land is often acknowledged to be the jewel of Towns County. (**Comment by:** *Robert Moffit*)

I am sending this note as a concerned citizen in regards to the re-zoning of land on the Chatuge Reservoir. That is, I oppose Alternative C (rezoning of Parcels 10, 52 and 77) and support Alternative B (no specific rezoning of Lake Chatuge parcels). (**Comment by:** *Michael Derby*)

I am opposed to rezoning Parcel 10, 52, and 77. I would like for it to be designated as "Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Debra LeGere*)

I am writing to voice my opposition to rezoning parcels 10, 52 and 77 on Lake Chatuge. I believe that you should adopt Alternative B - zone 4 - natural resource conservation. (**Comment by:** *Kristin Preye*)

Please vote against developing parcels 10, 52 and 77 and leave them in their natural state. (**Comment by:** *Kristin Preye*)

I am writing to oppose the development of all 3 parcels, 10, 52 and 77 on the lake. As a lover of nature and an environmentalist, I totally disagree with developing this land. We need to PROTECT this land for the future. If this land next to the lake were not available, the power company, the industry and the commissioner would simply purchase land for their projects. Please vote against these rezonings. (**Comment by:** *Matt & Hava Preye*)

I oppose Alternative C in its entirety. I believe Alternative B - zone 4 should be adopted for parcels 52, 10 and 77. I think adopting Alternative C, particularly on parcel 77 would be a huge mistake. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

I am writing to request that TVA maintain and/or designate *all* Chatuge area land in Alternative B/Zone 4 "Natural Resource Conservation" . Specifically, we are opposed to shifting Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current designation to Alternative C, or any designation that would allow degradation of their natural state. (**Comment by:** *Stephen M. Morris*)

I am opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52, and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. Think of the environmental hazards to the lake. (**Comment by:** *Steve Pulley*)

I am opposed to Alternative C in its entirety. Parcels 10, 52, and 77 should be allocated to Zone 4, Natural Resource Conservation or Zone 3, Sensitive Resource Management. (**Comment by:** *Michaell Bever*)

We are opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify parcels 10, 52, and 77 from their current state which is Natural Resource Conservation to one of developed recreation or industrial use. We support TVA adopting the "Proposed Land Use Plan

Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Helen Neiner*)

I am opposed to rezoning Parcel 10, 52, and 77. I would like for it to be designated as "Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Michael Crowe*)

We are opposed to implementing. Alternative C which would modify parcels 10, 52, and 77 from their current state which is Natural Resource Conservation to one of developed recreation or industrial use. We support TVA adopting the "Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)" into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). (**Comment by:** *Sara Calvert*)

I am opposed to Alternative C in its entirety. Parcels 10, 52, and 77 should be allocated to Zone 4, Natural Resource Conservation. (**Comment by:** *May May Bickes*)

We are opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52, and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. (**Comment by:** *Larry & Janice Rutledge)*

I am opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. These changes would change our existing views from the pristine setting we now enjoy ,continue to lower our water quality, increase noise and air pollution, and impact our wildlife. I am a native TOWNS COUNTIAN and have seen enough change to our lake over the years and would like to see it preserved for my children and grandchildren who love the lake so much. (**Comment by:** *Golda Sanders*)

Therefore, we entirely oppose Alternative C! We feel strongly that parcels 10, 52 and 77 should be allocated to Natural Resource Conservation. Hiawassee is one of our favorite towns to visit in the North Georgia Mountains, primarily because of Lake Chatuge. We ask that you limit development that would put this beautiful lake in jeopardy! (**Comment by:** *Dee Dee Jacobs & Carolyne Miller*)

I am very much opposed to Alternative C in its entirety. I believe that Parcels 10, 52, and 77 should be allocated to Zone 4, Natural Resource Conservation. For these parcels and land within their view, scenic value would be greatly reduced. I am also concerned with the impact on water quality, air quality and noise that would result from a recreation complex. Development of these parcels would make this area no longer desirable to me to visit or as a site for a retirement home. (**Comment by:** *Lynne Reid*)

I am opposed to Alternative C in its entirety. Parcels 10, 52, and 77 should be allocated to Zone 4, Natural Resource Conservation. • Visual Resources – Development on Chatuge Reservoir would result in impacts on the visual landscape character. For these parcels and land within their view, scenic value would be greatly reduced. (**Comment by:** *Jennifer Myers & Shamina Henkel*)

Lake Chatuge Parcels 10,52,77. Hop to it say "No" to Any TVA changes because No 1 - Destruction of trees and plants No 2 - Noise, traffic and pollution No 3 - Absolutely No -

since there are other options more suitable No 4 - Many more----. (**Comment by:** *Mary Miller*)

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the sports complex proposed at the end of Mull Road and on the TVA parcel 52 on Hwy 76 east of Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *Elizabeth Bates*)

I want to express my strong opposition to reclassification of any TVA controlled properties, and specifically parcels 10 and 52 currently under consideration. The issue is not, and should not become the TVA vs., a playground for the youth of Towns County, or of the TVA vs. job creation. If the Taxpayers of Towns County feel the need for additional recreational facilities or an industrial park, there is ample private property available for purchase by the county. The burning issue is keeping every square foot of TVA and Forest Service undeveloped mountain land in as pristine a state as possible for future generations. I urge you to deny the request to reclassify any undeveloped TVA property for any reason. Future generations of Americans deserve a chance to enjoy at least a small portion of the once vast and spectacular unspoiled beauty of the Hiawassee River Valley and Lake Chatuge. (**Comment by:** *Rebecca B. Beal*)

We want to go on record that I strongly oppose the substation that is being proposed on Lake Chatuge. I am a home owner of two homes in Beech Cove and we are very concerned about the value of our lake front properties. We purchased one of the homes for investment purposes before I knew this was being proposed and this substation will severely affect the price of this property. (**Comment by:** *Barry and Tricia White*)

We are OPPOSED to Alternative C in its entirety. Within Alternative B, we are also OPPOSED to declaring Chatuge parcels 10, 52, and 77 to Zones 5 or 6 which would allow Industrial and Developed Recreation uses. We believe that Industrial and recreational sites can and should be located away from our reservoirs and forested lands. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition by 65 people*)

I am opposed to implementing Alternative C which would modify Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current state to one of developed recreation or industrial use. (**Comment by:** *James Hendry*)

As homeowners residing on Lake Chatuge we are deeply concerned and opposed to ANY rezoning of property bordering the lake. (**Comment by:** *Gene and Lous Hewatt*)

Floodplains

Parcel #52 is below the 1933 foot elevation line, an elevation line that TVA has aggressively prohibited any construction in the past, below this elevation. -TVA must consider that allowing Blue Ridge Mtn EMC to violate their own procedure, will create inequitable situations for all those property owners that have been denied this opportunity by TVA. (**Comment by:** *Tony E. Branan*)

TVA would be violating its own rule by allowing Permanent Structures below the 1933 parallel. (**Comment by:** *Jack and Mary Miller*)

To allow a substation to exist on that property which is below the 1933 elevation, even if fill isn't brought in, violates TVA policy of no fill dirt allowed below the 1933 foot level. (**Comment by:** *Robert A. Keys*)

The land is partially below the 1,933 msl and would have to be filled in order to accommodate industrial usage and at the same time be an eyesore at the pristine shoreline entrance to Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. Lilly and Peggy I. Lilly*)

The proposal to allow parcel 52 to be used for a power substation should be withdrawn for several reasons: 1) all of Parcel 52 is below the 1933 line. (**Comment by:** *Mark Fitzgerald*)

Also, I understand that portions of this land are below the 33' line that TVA does not allow construction on, yet would make an allowance for a substation?? (**Comment by:** *Don H. Berry*)

Property is below the 1933 foot elevation line, that TVA has very aggressively enforced "no construction" except boat docks and ramps. Property owners adjacent to the lake have been denied, many times, requests for construction of various buildings. To allow an electrical substation below the 1933 foot elevation line is very unfair to those property owners whose requests have been denied. (**Comment by:** *Tony R. Branan*)

This site is somewhat below the 1,933 msl and would have to be filled in order to accommodate industrial usage and would be unsightly at the pristine shoreline entrance to Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *C. Thomas and Shirla Petersen*)

The TVA wants to designate part of Lake Chatuge Parcel 52 (lakefront property) as Industrial and sell it to the Blue Ridge EMC, even though part of that land is below the 1933 line. (**Comment by:** *Brendan and Joan Neville*)

TVA does not allow property owners to build beneath the 1933 line...it should not allow commercial structures to do so. If it is not safe and proper for individuals to do this, it should not be done by anyone. (**Comment by:** *Mary Lynn Miller*)

The land is partially below the 1,933 msl and would have to be filled in order to accommodate industrial usage and at the same time be an eyesore at the pristine shoreline entrance to Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. and Peggy I. Lilly*)

I feel this is not the best use of this property as it seems to be located below the 1933 level and the visual impact would be terrible. (**Comment by:** *Michael Brock*)

I would NOT support a electric substation or anything else that would detract from the scenic beauty of the entrance of Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *Richard Storck*)

Land Use

I reside at 287 Omega Way in Hiawassee. I am writing to request that TVA designate Parcels 52, 10 and 77 as Alternative B, Zone 3 or 4. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

TVA should consider suitable alternatives in order to preserve the natural beauty of the lake. Also, I am concerned about the lack of environmental stewardship on the part of local

governments. If you consider Chatuge Woods Campground you would question why TVA is considering granting easements of additional sensitive shoreline land to local governments. The Proposed Alternative B would maintain a compatible recreational use for parcel 77. The Hiawassee River Watershed Coalition urges the TVA to adopt Alternative B. Anything short of TVA adopting the “Proposed Land Use Plan Alternative (Alternative B)” into either zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) or zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation) will lead to the destruction of this sensitive resource and kill the economic “engine” that drives the local! economy. I urge you to protect the Lake Chatuge area from further environmentally destructive development and degradation of its natural state. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

I am writing to request that TVA maintain and/or designate *all* Chatuge area land in Alternative B/Zone 4 ”Natural Resource Conservation” (**Comment by:** *Stephen M. Morris*)

We are writing to request that TVA maintain and/or designate *all* Chatuge area land in Alternative B/Zone 4 "Natural Resource Conservation". Wise Custodianship: Regarding the current proposals for the Chatuge Reservoir, better alternatives than Plan C can be found beyond its boundaries, alternatives that suit the needs of people and industry far more effectively. Topography, environmental consequences both intended and unintended, infrastructure requirements, transportation, location, and suitability all support the position that reservoir property is inappropriate for high capacity and/or industrial uses. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

As stewards of the reservoir lakes under the TVA guardianship, how is it conceivable that the TVA could entertain the idea of further development on Lake Chatuge when the water quality is so poor already? From your own Land Management Plan, page S-3, where you state that it should be a recreational NEED FOR THE LAKE, parcel 77 being developed into a sports complex, is simply NOT that. A need - maybe. A need for the lake - absolutely NOT! One parcel off the lake would be a better alternative for this sports development rather than using 2 (parcels 52 and 77) on the lake which would only be a further detriment to the overall environmental impact of the lake area. One parcel off the lake would minimize said impact for the overall Towns County area, environmentally and economically, since anything that negatively impacts the lake impacts the economics of our county and town. As for zoning Parcel 10 or 52 as industrial, has someone completely lost their minds (with all due respect)??? You have already received many letters with all the arguments I could give here, regarding the noise, pollution, wildlife, poor land management record by Towns County, roads widened, runoff, septic impact, etc, etc. . I simply charge the TVA, as guardians of our beautiful lake (which we all want to keep beautiful) to act in the best interest of the lake and that is to keep Parcels 77, 52, and 10 as Zone 4. Be what you are - the guardians and act accordingly. (**Comment by:** *Jeanne Minichiello*)

I am a homeowner living near Lake Chatuge and am writing to request that TVA designate all land surrounding the lake to Alternative B – Zone 4 – “Natural Resource Conservation”. (**Comment by:** *Margaret M. knight, Tucker Demuth, Jim Duke, Donnalee DeMuth, Ophelia Dickey, Brenda Arnett, Ross DeMuth*)

I am a homeowner living near Lake Chatuge and am writing to request that TVA designate all land surrounding the lake to Alternative B – Zone 4 – “Natural Resource Conservation”. (**Comment by:** *Janet Duke*)

It is our understanding that there are several other more appropriate alternative sites for the electric substation. The better and much more logical choice would be to support the change of Parcel 52 to the Zone 6 (Developed Recreation) usage. This would allow the use of public recreation lands for lighted athletic fields, which should satisfy the needs of the people of the county. We are very much in favor of this usage change. We are also very much opposed to any change in usage of Parcel 77, a 66.4 acre tract in the middle of Lake Chatuge. This land is currently in the Zone 4 usage and is currently meeting the needs of the people that currently use it for camping, fishing, hiking, biking, hunting, etc. Any change to this Parcel 77 would be incompatible with the surrounding areas of Hidden Valley Estates, Cedar Cliff, Amber Lane Estates, Heather's Cove Hedden Cove, Tranquill Pointe, Ramey Mountain, Young Harris Mountain, and others. Noise levels, scenic view, endangered Georgia wildlife (bald eagle sighted several times in this area by us and other family), plant life and vegetation could all be negatively impaired on this Parcel 77, if the usage were changed from Zone 4 to Zone 6. As stated in the Resource Overview of the DEIS on page 83, "…the reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in the area (Chatuge Reservoir), and high-intensity developed recreational use on Parcel 77 could be incompatible with the overall enjoyment of the reservoir and scenic quality. This could lower property values and interest in residential development of available nearby property." We agree with this assessment of Parcel 77 by TVA and are therefore opposed to any change in the current Zone 4, Alternative A usage. Parcel 10 on Lake Chatuge is proposed to change from Zone 4 to Zone 5 (Industrial). This is the most obnoxious proposal imaginable. Lake Chatuge already has a problem with poor water quality and a change to industrial use would have a very negative impact on water quality, the high amount of water usage by industry and the likely heating up of water. It would also negatively affect the nearby residential view, the recreation nature of the lake, the wildlife, vegetation life, and fishing that is most important to the residents and users of Lake Chatuge. We oppose any change of Parcel 10. (**Comment by:** *Ben Lilly*)

I'm a lakefront landowner on Lake Chatuge and am writing to request that TVA designate all its land surrounding the lake to Alternative B- Zone 4- Natural Resource Conservation. TVA is the steward of these mountain reservoirs and wants to preserve the attributes that they offer, I strongly request that you consider any such rezoning deliberately and with comprehensive input from all impacted parties. (**Comment by:** *Richard Ludwig*)

I am a homeowner on Lake Chatuge and am writing to request that TVA designate all land surrounding the lake to Alternative B-Zone 4-"Natural Resource Conservation". The TVA has been good stewards of its resources, help the Lake Chatuge community be good stewards of theirs, DENY ALT C. (**Comment by:** *Gary M. Kopaka*)

I want again make comments against any change in TVA policy on Chatuge Reservoir to let Parcel 10, Parcel 52, & Parcel 77 and to allow these parcels to remain in their native vegetative state at this time. (**Comment by:** *Cathy Barton*)

Please re-consider any change of present policy and keep these lands in the current state without any further development by agencies other than the Tennessee Valley Authority which has been a superb steward of these lands and the Chatuge Reservoir. (**Comment by:** *Bill Herold*)

Putting a substation on part of Parcel 52, with additional use of the remaining land, is a risk to the community. There is talk of ball fields or a park on Parcel 52. Many parents at the meeting had grave concerns about letting their children go there if the substation were built.

Everyone has seen or heard of transformers exploding, with pieces and chemicals flying over a large area. This area would include parts of the remaining land. Children coming to that area could be exposed to those transformer pieces and chemicals. (**Comment by:** *Gus and Joan Neville*)

One TVA rep said that the steps would be: 1. The TVA would re-categorize this land as only usable for an electric substation 2. The TVA would create a low price, of $100,000 3. The TVA would have an auction only for companies capable of building electric substations. No one else would be allowed to attend, making sure that the Blue Ridge Mountain EMC was the only bidder. 4. Blue Ridge Mountain EMC would bid $100,000 and the TVA would accept the bid. This "deal" should be considered in violation of the TVA charter. The TVA has a mandate to conduct business in the open, solicit and seriously consider public input, and make the best land decision for the public and the government. Sweetheart Deals that circumvent the TVA process, ignore any opposing views, and provide land at far less than market price should not be allowed. There is no point in having a land management plan, if it can be ignored when the TVA wants to do so. (**Comment by:** *Gus and Joan Neville*)

Why should Blue Ridge Mtn. EMC be given a discounted property cost for this site. (**Comment by:** *Tony E. Branan*)

TVA should require all their city and EMC customers to construct electrical substations at least 200 feet off the road with all distribution feeder circuits existing the substation underground so that adequate landscaping can conceal these unsightly structures. (The private investor owned electrical utilities do this). (**Comment by:** *Tony E. Branan*)

Blue Ridge Mtn EMC should construct this electrical substation east of the intersection of highways 75, 76 & 17, off Highway # 76 with serious landscaping. + (**Comment by:** *Tony E. Branan*)

I support leaving this land as is w/ a possible use as a soccer field for Towns County youth, not a commercial - substation which has no merit for this location except lower cost for BRMEC. (**Comment by:** *Carl S. Shultz*)

I am familiar with the areas in question regarding both turning an area on the Lake Chatuge Reservoir into a site for a TVA substation and a site for recreation use for Towns County, GA. The last management plan as I recall determined that TVA would continue to manage the lands fronting Chatuge Reservoir in the same manner as in the past with no lands released for private development. I was under the impression that lands would also not be released for more recreation facilities and a power substation which could be located away from the lake and not impact visitor use of the reservoir. (**Comment by:** *Bill Herold*)

It is our understanding that there are several other more appropriate alternative sites for the electric substation. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. Lilly and Peggy I. Lilly*)

I am asking you to communicate with the appropriate powers in TVA to eliminate the possibility that this property can become the eyesore we fear it will become. Lake front property is our economic engine and TVA and the EMC should not be allowed to jeopardize our lake. (**Comment by:** *Elizabeth H. Ruf*)

I am extremely disappointed to see the TVA and Blue Ridge EMC consider placing a substation in one of the most prominent locations entering into Hiawassee. As a power user (2351 Ridge Crest Circle), I would hope that the power company would be a better citizen of the community by spending a little more money to affect far fewer people. Tourism drives the economy - please do not degrade the beauty even more. And yes I realize my power bill might go up a little to get the substation away from the lake. (**Comment by:** *John McKenney*)

For TVA to knowingly allow a power substation here on lakefront property is not a way to protect and preserve our mountains and lakes! (**Comment by:** *Mark Fitzgerald*)

We are strongly opposed to an electrical substation on Parcel 52. We have submitted numerous comments on this topic to Evan Crews, Dan Fisher, Angela Sims, Tom Kilgore. EMC has other choices that are off the lake; TVA should not place a substation on lakefront land. (**Comment by:** *Lindey and Mark Fitzgerald*)

I am opposed to putting industrial use zoning on parcel 52. I feel that the following issue would be detrimental to the peaceful environment. (**Comment by:** *Sandra Chapin*)

Environmental consequences - the environment would be better served if this facility is not directly on the lake. The ecological balance could be disturbed. A Custodian of the lake I would like TVA to preserve it for the future. (**Comment by:** *Sandra Chapin*)

This is a mistake. There is plenty of land OFF the lake to build an additional substation. (**Comment by:** *Steve Massell*)

Industrial interests already have an area that is developed and has rooms and space for their present and future needs. (**Comment by:** *Maria Duben*)

Please do not allow this property (Parcel # 52) to be used for an electrical substation. There are alternative sites on the east side of Hiawassee, GA available for Blue Ridge Mtn EMC to purchase. (**Comment by:** *Tony R. Branan*)

Lake Chatuge - Parcels 10, 52 and 77. Any zoning change to lands on or near the lake that allows commercial/industrial will result in visual and chemical pollution of the lake and reduction in quality of life for those living on/near the lake as well as recreational and casual users. Maintain the parcels in a zone 4 status. (**Comment by:** *Will Hearce*)

Dear Mr. Parr: It is our understanding that Parcel 52, which is located along US Hwy 76 at the eastern entrance to downtown Hiawassee, Georgia and is approximately 9.4 acres, is being considered to a change from Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation) to Zone 6 (Developed Recreation) and from Alternative A (No Action) to Alternative C (Modified Plan). (**Comment by:** *C. Thomas and Shirla Petersen*)

We have heard that there are several more appropriate sites that would be considered for the electrical substation. (**Comment by:** *C. Thomas and Shirla Petersen*)

The TVA proposed price is far below market level, yet the TVA needs to raise electric prices to generate more income. (**Comment by:** *Brendan and Joan Neville*)

Towns County has many other properties that can be used for Industrial purposes. They do not lie below the 1933 line, and they are not highly visible to Lake Chatuge homeowners and visitors. (**Comment by:** *Brendan and Joan Neville*)

It is our understanding that there are several other more appropriate alternative sites for the electric substation. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. and Peggy I. Lilly*)

It is morally, economically and environmentally most appropriate to avoid actions which threaten the beauty, purity, and ecological health of this lake - which the TVA created and has protected all these years. I and my family trust the TVA's record of stewardship. Without meaning to disparage any particular official, that trust does not extend to ever-changing local government. A look at our county's history of poorly regulated development, weak or non-existent building codes, and inadequate policing of activities which increase the pollution of Lake Chatuge, should suffice to confirm this sentiment. This lack of trust underlies my opposition to reclassification of the Chatuge Reservoir parcels currently under consideration. Why, after all these years of maintaining the undeveloped status of these parcels and protecting the health of the reservoir, would the TVA now see fit to enable further development of one of the most highly developed reservoirs in the system? The TVA's stewardship role is the single most influential element in preventing further degradation of water quality. Rather than agreeing to further development based on the promises of local government to do in the future what they have not done in the past, the TVA should stand firm and fulfill its role as guardian of these valuable land and water resources. (**Comment by:** *Robert Moffit*)

Towns County has demonstrated its very poor stewardship of the property that has already been leased to the County for "recreational use". This includes the development of trailer parks that have no "buffer zone" between the trailers and the water and see significant runoff issues that also contribute to poor water quality. (**Comment by:** *Michael Derby*)

Please, I urge you not to re-zone this property. We live in a area of the state where land development is simply out of control, and there is such precious few areas left where people can view scenery and enjoy the beauty that Georgia has to offer from an environmental perspective. Please do not contribute to the development of even more of Georgia's beauty, especially on lake front property that not only detracts from the scenery but contributes to destroying and degrading an entire ecosystem. (**Comment by:** *Michael Derby*)

I believe that TVA has a responsibility to consider available non-TVA land. My aunt who lives in Georgia spoke with a realtor and found several large tracts of land away from the lake that would be appropriate for development. As custodian of the lake TVA must oppose this rezoning. (**Comment by:** *Matt & Hava Preye*)

With this huge problem, how can we even be considering more development on Lake Chatuge? I believe there is land better suited for ball fields and substations rather than land next to the lake. I'm not an expert, but I know that water runoff is helped by trees and vegetation. I urge you to adopt Alternative B and to reject Alternative C in its entirety. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

As stewards of the reservoir lakes under the TVA guardianship, how is it conceivable that the TVA could entertain the idea of further development on Lake Chatuge when the water quality is so poor already? I simply charge the TVA, as guardians of our beautiful lake

(which we all want to keep beautiful) to act in the best interest of the lake and that is to keep Parcels 77, 52, and 10 as Zone 4. Be what you are - the guardians and act accordingly. (**Comment by:** *Jeanne Minichiello*)

I urge TVA to adopt the Proposed Land Use Alternative - Alternative B. I believe that parcels 10, 52, and 77 should remain in the natural resource conservation zone. (**Comment by:** *Mattie Chapin*)

I believe that TVA should continue to be the good steward that they are and protect this land. (**Comment by:** *Mattie Chapin*)

I am a homeowner living on Lake Chatuge and would like to request that TVA designate all land surrounding the lake to Alternative B-Zone 4 Natural Resource Conservation. (**Comment by:** *Golda Sanders*)

I urge TVA to keep parcels 77,52 and 10 for ALL the people and not special interests. Re:77.Towns Co. has adequate recreation facilities for it's limited youth population, but if more is needed they can buy it. Re: 52. BRMEMC can find and obtain land for a sub-station without taking over public land. Re:10. Towns Co. has not utilized the industrial park that they have. (**Comment by:** *J. D. Heer*)

Parcel 52 We strongly recommend that TVA remove any portion of Parcel 52 from consideration as a proposed site for BRMEMC to build a power substation. Parcel 52 is currently considered Resource Conservation land. It sits on Lake Chatuge as well as on Hwy 76, the main road into and out of Hiawassee. It sits next to property that is home to approximately 15 camper sites and a marina with approximately 35 boat slips. Across the lake from Parcel 52, are several residential neighborhoods – Beech Cove Vista, Lake Chatuge Shores and Sunnyside. These neighborhoods were originally developed in the early 1970s. (**Comment by:** *Lindey and Mark Fitzgerald*)

Parcel 52 is almost entirely below the 1933 flood line. As a lakefront resident, we have dealt with TVA on dock permits. As everyone, whether commercial, retail or residential, knows, TVA does not allow fill or permanent structures below the 1933 line. We have heard stories from residents who were forced to remove retaining walls, decks and in one case, their home's foundation because it was below the 1933 line. This rule is in place to protect the shoreline and the future integrity of the lake. We all comply with this rule because the lake's best interest is also our best interest. TVA would be violating its own rule by allowing the BRMEMC to fill and build a permanent structure on land below the 1933 line. BRMEMC EVP Joe Satterfield has stated that there are alternative sites off the lake for the power substation. He has said that there would be increased line costs to move the substation further down Hwy 76; however he has not calculated the costs that may be saved by the shorter distribution distances. He also said that the additional costs that may be incurred by moving the station would be amortized over thirty years and would be spread over the 48,000+ meters meaning TVA members would see an increase of only pennies per year. TVA should not allow the EMC to contaminate the lake with a power substation. TVA should not allow the EMC to do it the easy way; instead TVA should encourage EMC to do it the RIGHT way. Parcel 10 We strongly recommend TVA not change the designation of Parcel 10 from Resource Conservation to Industrial. Parcel 10 sits amongst all residential properties. There is no reason to utilize this property as industrial. It is our understanding that TVA would be changing the designation to Industrial with no regard to what type of industrial buyer may purchase the land. This is absurd.

Again, TVA has a responsibility to protect the integrity of the lake and as such should not recommend a significant change in use without a clear understating of the impact to the lake and the environment. Parcel 77 We have mixed feelings about the proposed change in designation from Resource Conservation to Developed Recreation. We understand and support the need for county parks and sports fields. However, we have reservations as to the development plans and management. We would ask TVA to perhaps work with Towns County and require detailed plans on how the land will be developed, where lights will be located, how the lake will be protected from runoff or other possible problems, buffer zones, tree removal, etc. Closing Much of the TVA website discusses TVA's responsibility to the land, the public and the environment. Yet, with TVA's proposed changes to Parcel 52 and Parcel 10 on Lake Chatuge, TVA would be negatively impacting the land, the public, the environment and the lake itself. Lake Chatuge is the cultural center of the city of Hiawassee and Towns County. Economic development, residential growth and tourism are all directly tied to the lake. TVA has a responsibility to support the continued smart growth of this region. Therefore, we strongly urge TVA to maintain the current designation of both Parcel 52 (the entire 9.4 acres) and Parcel 10 as Resource Conservation and to re-classify Parcel 77 as Developed Recreation with certain conditions in place. We sincerely hope that TVA will continue its strong tradition of stewardship by making the right and responsible decision. (**Comment by:** *Lindey and Mark Fitzgerald*)

I would ask you to please reconsider developing these parcels of land, keeping them as Zone 4, and, developing other land in the area, not on the lake, not in everybody's view. (**Comment by:** *Elizabeth Bates*)

The TVA has always evidenced exceptional stewardship of the lakefront and forest acreage under its control. This cannot be said of the private developers rapidly and permanently destroying much of the natural beauty of Towns and Clay Counties. (**Comment by:** *Rebecca B. Beal*)

There are many other options that could be considered but to use a prime piece of real estate on the lake for this type of use is not wise. We have a beautiful lake and a quaint little town. Why not make the property available for solely recreation? This decision is huge for the long term well being for the city of Hiawassee, the home owners in the area, the businesses in the area and the overall look and feel of our community. It could be argued I guess it is in the short term best interest of the community but someone will need to convince me that this is the best long term solution for all that are involved. Please don't make this short term decision. I truly believe this is a mistake for the long term best interest of our community. How would you like to have your life earnings tied up in real estate on the lake and lose the value of your homes because of a project like this? There are other options that must be considered. Please do not designate this piece of property for this horrible use. (**Comment by:** *Barry and Tricia White*)

This is a request to please keep the Lake Chatuge TVA land parcels zone 4. (**Comment by:** *Steve and Kathy Stamey*)

There is plenty of land available near the Towns County School that would be ideal for the sports complex. It would also be such a disgrace to this beautiful lake to rezone any TVA property for a power station or as industrial. PLEASE do what you can to see that none of the beautiful TVA land is lost. (**Comment by:** *Steve and Kathy Stamey*)

Therefore, we are requesting that the TVA select Alternative B as a management plan. Furthermore, we are requesting that within the Chatuge Reservoir, parcels 10, 52, and 77 be allocated to Zone 4, Natural Resource Conservation. Therefore, we request that TVA maintain and/or designate *all* Chatuge area land in Alternative B/Zone 4 "Natural Resource Conservation". Specifically, we oppose shifting Parcels 10, 52 and 77 from their current designation to Alternative C, or any designation that would allow degradation of their natural state. For the Chatuge Reservoir, much better alternatives than Plan C or Plan B Industry and Developed Recreation can be found beyond its boundaries. Topography, environmental consequences both intended and unintended, infrastructure requirements, transportation, location, and suitability all support the position that reservoir property is inappropriate for high capacity and/or industrial uses. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition signed by 65 people*)

Therefore, we beg you to designate all land surrounding the lake to "Alternate B-Zone 4, "Natural resource Conservation". (**Comment by:** *Gene and Lou Hewatt*)

NEPA Review and Public Participation

Since we have only known about the rezoning proposal for about a month though it's been in the works for about a year, I ask for an extension of the comment period for as long as is feasibly possible, perhaps 6 months. We need to reach as many people as possible and have had inadequate preparation time. (**Comment by:** *Jeanne Minichiello*)

The following issues contained in the Draft EIS of the Mountain RLM Plan would be seriously degraded by any development on these parcels. 1. Visual Resources, 2. Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology, 3. Air Quality, Noise and Light Pollution, 4. Socioeconomics, and 5. Wildlife Management/Communities. Intensive development of these parcels especially parcel 77 will have irreversible long term impacts on Lake Chatuge and the surrounding communities. Only additional information ,public outreach, a sufficient comment period, and a community engaged with the TVA will save Lake Chatuge. (**Comment by:** *Gary M. Kopacka*)

The justification for withdrawing two acres from Parcel 52 from the TVA Plan is flawed. The justification given for taking this land from the DEIS was that it was critical that Blue Ridge Mountain EMC build this substation by June, 2009 to meet rapidly increasing demands for electricity. Towns and Clay Counties, which surround Lake Chatuge, are primarily residential with tourist businesses such as restaurants and shops. These would have to be the entities that are generating the rapidly increasing demand. Perhaps no one at the TVA is aware that the tourist business is down, and there are serious real estate problems in Towns and Clay Counties, and across the entire USA. New houses are not being built, existing houses are not selling, foreclosures are increasing, and there are empty spaces where some restaurants and stores used to be. The TVA must ask Blue Ridge Mountain EMC to provide current and realistic demand forecasts for the future. These forecasts could show that electric demand is flat or decreasing, but certainly not rapidly increasing at this time. The urgency that Blue Ridge Mountain EMC would have the TVA act upon is no longer there. The EMC has time to seriously consider other sites. The TVA can put the two acres into a standard TVA Plan with a longer timeline. (**Comment by:** *Gus and Joan Neville*)

We attended the TVA Open House Public Meeting on August 27, 2008, for a review of the Mountain Reservoirs Land Management Plan. We wanted more information on the three

alternatives in the DEIS, and in particular, the plan and the evaluation process for Parcel 52 on Lake Chatuge. Per the TVA, two acres of the 9.4 acres in Parcel 52 "is being considered for use as a substation site and is being evaluated independently from the current land planning effort." From page 10 in 1.5.3 of the DEIS. As a result of the Public Meeting, we have the following concerns: 1. Lack of a defined process to create and evaluate a plan for two acres in Parcel 52. We asked 5 different TVA people to explain the new process. None could explain it. It became obvious from their responses that there was no defined process, and that the TVA wanted to avoid an evaluation and skip public input, in order to sell this land, at a minimum price, and as secretly as possible to the Blue Ridge Mountain EMC. Many would call this a "Sweetheart Deal", done "in the dark." (**Comment by:** *Gus and Joan Neville*)

I am writing you as a voter of both Towns County and BRMEC concerning Parcel # 52 of TVA property to be used as a substation by BRMEC. I strongly object to this use of parcel # 52 for a substation. Towns County homeowners (TCHA) has already submitted their comments of which I do not have to enumerate about. I'm also a member of TCHA. There are two (2) issues of which I would like to discuss and ask for answers from TVA. 1. How was this proposal for Parcel # 52 to become a "Done Deal" w/o input from our commissioner William Kendall or the people of Towns County? (**Comment by:** *Carl S. Shultz*)

The environmental impact could be significant due to the proximity of Lake Chatuge. (**Comment by:** *Jack and Mary Miller*)

The TVA has not sufficiently involved the public and local governments to assist in creating a good plan. Those parties vehemently disagree with the TVA proposed actions for Lake Chatuge in Alternative 3, and the "independent process" (TVA 1.5.3 Land Use Proposals) being used by the TVA in secret to evaluate Lake Chatuge Parcel 52. (**Comment by:** *Brendan and Joan Neville*)

Public notification has been insufficient, and input that has been received has been ignored. A majority of the June, 2007 input preferred NO changes in existing land use. A planned meeting between Towns County and the TVA was agreed to, and then cancelled by the TVA. A land use plan should adhere to the TVA's own rules and policies. Alternative C does not. (**Comment by:** *Brendan and Joan Neville*)

Added to the above problem - neither local government or the local newspapers have circulated anything of substance about certain of the parcels in question - although parcel 52 has received some attention due to the involvement of the BRMEMC organization and the implications of a possible added power substation. People are desperately seeking information and advice, and there is so little time remaining to spread the word. I appreciated talking with you and other TVA staff at the TVA Open House, and urge you to support an extension of the comments period. (**Comment by:** *Robert Moffit*)

For your information, following are our comments to TVA following our attendance at the Aug 27th Forum. Angela – we are sorry we did not get to meet you at the event. I would like to have a face to go with your voice! Please continue to keep us up to date on any progress or news on Parcel 52. Also, please forward our comments to Mr. Kilgore. Evan – It was nice to meet you – we ask that you also continue to keep us informed of any news on Parcel 52. (**Comment by:** *Lindey and Mark Fitzgerald*)

We attended the TVA Mountain Reservoirs Land Management Public Forum on August 27th. Following are our comments for the record: General Comments: TVA needs to do a better job of actually notifying the public of its public meetings. We have owned our property since 1998. In that time, we have made two separate applications for dock permits. We have never received notice of a TVA public meeting. Our next door neighbor has owned his property for more than five years; he changed the name on the dock permit from the previous owner to his shortly after moving in. He has received TVA materials – but in the previous owner's name! TVA should update its mailing lists so that the public is informed in a timely manner on issues of interest. TVA staff was courteous, helpful and for the most part, very knowledgeable. We enjoyed meeting some of the people we had communicated with by phone or email. However, I think the open house format is limiting in that, you often received different information depending on who you spoke to at the event. I believe the public would be better served by a true public forum, where TVA presents the facts and the consumer asks questions and is able to comment. Everyone in attendance would then hear the same facts at the same time. In addition, there would be an official record of comments and opinions. Prior to the open house we went online and looked at the DEIS posted on the TVA website. As you know, it is a very lengthy document and is not written for the general public, rather it is written for the use of staff at the TVA. I would assume that very few people read it cover to cover. Instead, most consumers relied on the charts that serve as a summary of the findings as an easy way to get an overview of those reservoirs where they have an interest. We found some of these charts to be misleading:
- Appendix E includes charts for the various reservoirs noting the use of the land and the various Alternatives. First, there is no "key" so that the consumer can immediately read the chart and decipher exactly what the numbers and letters represent. For example, no where in Appendix E is there a chart showing the various Zone numbers and what they represent. I am sure the TVA staff knows the Zone numbers and definitions since they use this language on a regular basis; but the consumer does not. Parcel 52 is shown on page 342. On the line for Parcel 52, it shows 9.4 acres - the total acreage for Parcel 52. Its Forecast Designation is "Public Recreation". Under Alternative A, it shows Zone 4 (Resource Conservation); under Alternative B, it also shows Zone 4. Under Alternative C, it shows Zone 6 (Developed Recreation). According to this chart, Parcel 52 – in its entirety – has been requested/recommended to be changed from its current status of Resource Conservation to Developed Recreation. However, if one flips back to the front of the study, to page 24, there is another chart showing "Allocation Differences Between Alternative B and Alternative C". In this chart, Parcel 52 is shown as 7.4 acres (not the 9.4 acres shown on page 342). It also cites requests from Hiawassee and Towns County that this parcel of land be available for a recreation area to include boat ramps, fishing piers and trails. Neither of these charts includes an asterisk or any kind of footnote alerting the public to the fact that the Blue Ridge Mountain EMC has requested that 2 acres of Parcel 52 be used for a power substation. I believe this is extremely misleading. It gives the appearance that TVA is hiding this fact from the general public. It also does not provide the full picture nor all the facts so that the general public can respond accordingly. How many people looked at the chart and determined that changing Parcel 52 from Resource Conservation to Developed Recreation was alright with them and thus felt no need to attend the open house or make any comment? They had no idea that a power substation was part of the plan. (**Comment by:** *Lindey and Mark Fitzgerald*)

We have read and studied information available on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement addressing alternative ways of management of TVA lands and reservoirs. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition signed by 65 people*)

Recreation

I understand the need for a developed recreation and industry; however it should not be located in environmentally critical areas like parcels 10, 52, or 77. Impervious surfaces such as ball fields cause 16 times more runoff than forested lands (as they are now). There are parcels of land more environmentally suitable for ball fields in other areas of the county. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

Recreational use could be positive-except for bright lighting at night. (**Comment by:** *Stephen M. Morris*)

Intensive development of the parcel for the proposed multiple field sports complex would be incompatible with adjacent low-density residential use due to impacts of noise, traffic, and nighttime lighting. A multiple field sports complex at this location would be incompatible with enjoyment of the reservoir and scenic quality. (**Comment by:** *Margaret M. Knight, Tucker Demuth, Jim Duke, DonnaLee DeMuth, Ophelia Dickey, Brenda Arnett, Ross Demuth*)

Parcel 77 currently supports dispersed recreation such as hiking, bank fishing, and informal camping. Modifying the zoning to a developed recreation would require increased infrastructure such as roads, parking lots, and lights. • Intensive development of the parcel for the proposed multiple field sports complex would be incompatible with adjacent low-density residential use due to impacts of noise, traffic, and nighttime lighting. A multiple field sports complex at this location would be incompatible with enjoyment of the reservoir and scenic quality. (**Comment by:** *Janet Duke*)

My 2 children in sports activities at the Towns Co. Rec. Dept in Hiawassee, GA. I request that you allow Towns Co. to use the Parcel #52 for recreational purposes. Thank you for your consideration. (**Comment by:** *Scott Davis*)

Please take this letter into consideration to use TVA Parcel 52 for recreational use for much needed athletic fields for the youth of our area. Please advice the EMC to look at different properties for the substation. I would really appreciate your consideration of this important matter. (**Comment by:** *Becky Landress*)

This letter is being sent to you in reference of the land that is being proposed for lease by Towns County; tract 52 and tract 77. We, the staff of the Towns Co. Recreation Dept., would love the opportunity to acquire this property, because we have greatly outgrown the facilities that we are currently located at. With more space we feel that we could give a greater opportunity to the citizens of the county. We have had to forfeit adult leagues such as softball, flag football, and so on for the lack space. The growth that we have experienced in the last ten years is astounding. We just don't have the space to accommodate participants. Our youth leagues, which consist of ages 4 through 16, are struggling to find time and space to practice. If you would please consider letting us use the property for these uses, we don't think that you will be disappointed with the use of the property. Thank you for your time and consideration, if you have any questions about any of our ideas please contact us at 706-896-2600. (**Comment by:** *Towns County Recreation Staff*)

As parents of a student at Towns County High School and as residents of Towns County, Georgia, we are writing to ask for any help you can give regarding Tract 52 and/or Tract 77. We are fortunate that many of our children are involved in recreational sports and we are in

need of more land so that much needed expansion can be done in this area. This land would make a tremendous difference in what we are able to offer the children of Towns County. We will appreciate any assistance you might be able to give in regard to this matter. (**Comment by:** *Leonard and Millie Poole*)

I am writing to request that Parcel 52 & Parcel 77 located on Lake Chatuge be used as recreational facilities by our county. I am opposed to Parcel 52 being used for a sub station by BRMEMC. (**Comment by:** *Johnny Rogers*)

It is with up most concern, I am voicing my opinion of the use of Parcels 52 & 77. Our children are our future. It is a proven fact that children participating in sports are better prepared for school, jobs, etc. We are obligated as a county to advise you that we wish for these parcels to remain recreational. This is our county, sir, and we like it the way it is. Please have our children in your best interest. This is their land and it is our obligation to keep it for their use. Thank you for your attention to this matter. (**Comment by:** *Sherry D. Canterbury*)

As a parent of three young children, I am pleading that Town's County has the opportunity to use the Parcel 52 for recreational facilities. All of our children would greatly benefit from this convenient and beautiful location. Six years ago, my husband and I drove through Hiawassee and saw a large group of children at the Fairgrounds playing ball. It was a major part of us moving here months later. Now, Towns County needs more space for our children's ball and to host other counties. It is quite difficult to always have to be the small town group to do all the traveling to other bigger facilities. Please allow us to use either Parcel 52 of Parcel 77 for recreational purposes. (**Comment by:** *Nancy Church*)

I am writing to express my opinion and desires regarding the above referenced tracts of TVA land (52 and 77). I appreciate the opportunity to be heard. I support designation of Tract 52 as a green space with the availability for Towns County to use certain areas for soccer, T-ball or other practice fields. (**Comment by:** *Marian Summer*)

I am writing to request that you consider allowing the Towns County Recreation Department to use Parcel 52 and Parcel 77 on Lake Chatuge for much needed recreation facilities. Thank you. (**Comment by:** *Mikey Rogers*)

I am writing regarding the property owned by the TVA located off Hwy 76 known as Parcel 52. Considering the growth of our county & the demands placed on the BRMEMC I understand the need for an additional sub station however, I am opposed to it being placed on TVA Parcel 52. This area would be better suited for much needed additional recreation facilities for our community. (**Comment by:** *Michael Rogers*)

The installation of soccer fields for our youth as well as possible walking trails & an access for boating would be ideal. Before moving forward I would ask that the TVA meet with the community and make careful consideration of alternatives uses for this property. (**Comment by:** *Michael Rogers*)

I am writing in reference to TVA parcel 52 in Towns County. My husband and I have 3 children who all participate in the youth athletic programs of Towns County, these young athletic programs have long-since outgrown the facilities available to them. One of the fastest growing sports, soccer, has no facilities whatsoever. Any land available which would be suitable for fields for the athletic programs (such as Parcel 52) should be set

aside for that purpose. Our youth is our future, and sports is a large part of their growing experience. I thank you for considering the feelings and input of Towns County citizens in this matter. (**Comment by:** *Andrea Anderson*)

I am writing to express my opinion and desires regarding the above referenced tracts (52 and 77) of TVA land. I appreciate the opportunity to be heard. I support designation of Tract 52 as a green space with the availability for Towns County to use certain areas for soccer, T-ball or other practice fields. (**Comment by:** *Barbara Shoak*)

As a citizen of the United States and a resident of Towns County GA. If you have any authority in helping our children's future. I am asking for your help. Please make all attempts in getting tracts 52 and or tract 77 for much needed recreational fields for our children here in Towns County. As a father I see the important of our kids. Education and sport activities. If I could be of any help please let me know. (**Comment by:** *Chad Hooper*)

Please consider Parcel # 52 to be used by Towns County for recreational purposes. I have 4 grandchildren, all of whom participate in athletic activities at the Towns C. Rec. Dept., and good level land is hard to find and Parcel #52 would be a good piece of property for a soccer field, as a park on the lake. Such a beautiful piece of property should be used for something good for the children and families in our area. Thank you for your consideration. (**Comment by:** *Edward Heddin*)

I have 4 grandchildren, ages 7, 10, 11, and 13 who participate in sports with the Towns Co. Recreation Dept. Level property is very hard to find in Towns County and I believe Parcel #52 would be a great piece of property for a soccer field, or any other recreational purpose. Thank you for your consideration in offering this parcel to Towns C. for recreational uses. (**Comment by:** *Linda Heddin*)

Please consider our concern for parcel #52. We want very much to have that property benefit our young people of Towns County instead of being an eyesore for eternity at that particular site - so near town and US Hwy 76. (**Comment by:** *Dudley and Peggy Castile*)

I am a resident of Towns County, GA and also a mother of two children. I am a soccer mom who would love to have a nice place to practice. We are always having to cancel practices and cautioning to much confusion and also making it hard on the coaches who have to track down his players to reschedule. This (52) track in discussion is located to our school for easement to all parents/children. (**Comment by:** *Deanna Ledford*)

There is a huge demand for recreational areas, and this land should be kept for recreational purposes. (**Comment by:** *Jack and Mary Miller*)

As a resident of Towns County, Georgia I am very interested in maintaining the aesthetic value of our lake and mountains. Therefore, I would like to see Parcel 52, Lake Chatuge totally designated as recreational forever and use no part of this parcel for a BRMEMC substation. Parcel 52 is a beautiful property which can be utilized as a recreation/sports field for Towns County young people with no negative impact on the existing topography. (**Comment by:** *Robert A. Keys*)

The better and much more logical choice would be to support the change of Parcel 52 to the Zone 6 (developed Recreation) usage. This would allow the use of public recreation lands for lighted athletic fields, which would satisfy the needs of the people of the county.

We are very much in favor of this usage change. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. Lilly and Peggy I. Lilly*)

If you look at all the communities that surround Towns County we pale in comparison with regards to recreational facilities. How is it we constantly struggle to accommodate our ever increasing population of young people? Show me all the TVA owned land where a substation could be situated and then show me all the flat, open, safe conveniently located land to accommodate a park facility for our community. This is not a hard choice to make. (**Comment by:** *Kristina Albach*)

The idea of building up our parks and recreation facilities is a task long overdue by our local government. As each opportunity arises for our county to grow how could we stand back and let opposition stand in our way. There is absolutely NO choice in the matter we must allow the actions of Commissioner Kendall to be accepted in his attempt to secure Parcel 52 for the benefit of the entire county. I say to Commissioner Kendall if Parcel 52 ultimately does not work out due to the size of the parcel based on what is needed for soccer fields, than let it Parcel 77. The bottom line is it must be something; it is time to move forward and bring to the county a recreational complex that will benefit everyone. This is not just about providing soccer fields for our children, this is much bigger. The idea of creating green space for the benefit of the community outweighs beyond measurement the idea of building a substation. We are blessed to live in a regional community where we are succumbed to the beauty of our surroundings. Let's continue securing places for our youth to grow, they are in fact the backbone of our community and our future. (**Comment by:** *Kristina Albach*)

As a parent of 2 school aged children who each year for the past 6 years have both been involved in the local area soccer and rec programs, I simply cannot stand idly by and watch the opportunity to create an environment in which my children can grow, learn and prosper safely. I say to you…how dare you consider giving up green space for my children. I ask you to count my opinion as you consider your decision, but then I'm sure you will agree this is an easy decision to make. Green Space, The Environment, Our Children…how can you go wrong with that investment. (**Comment by:** *Kristina Albach*)

I am a resident of Towns County and recently attended a local meeting to discuss the impact of TVA changing the classification on three parcels of land in Towns County. It is very concerning to me that Parcel 52 which is immediately on the lake front is being changed to allow Blue Ridge Mountain Electric Membership Cooperative to build a power sub-station. I understand the need for a sub-station on that end of the county, but don't understand how Blue Ridge EMC could be allowed to build such an unsightly project on such beautiful property. We in Towns County would like that property to become soccer fields for the use of our recreation department. (**Comment by:** *Elizabeth H. Ruf*)

We are strongly opposed to having a substation at this site. The county needs more recreation land and placing a substation next to youth activities is not acceptable. (**Comment by:** *Richard and Madeline Botting*)

This parcel would be ideal for recreational purposes as it is still zoned/designated. (**Comment by:** *Don H. Berry*)

Recreation needs flat land for a complex, off the lake to preserve the natural habits. TVA has been a steward of land and forest for many years. Please reject any changes to this steward ship. (**Comment by:** *Maria Duben*)

This would be a great location for the High School to put a soccer field in as some other use. We are on the lake - love being in Hiawassee and do appreciate the Blue Ridge Mt EMC, but please find another location for this substation. (**Comment by:** *Mary Mullin*)

The better choice would be to support the change of Parcel 52 to zone 6 (Developed Recreation) usage, allowing the use of public recreation lands for lighted athletic fields. This would satisfy the needs of the county's people. (**Comment by:** *C. Thomas and Shirla Petersen*)

As a soccer coach and resident of Towns County, I am sending this message supporting Commissioner Bill Kendall for use of Parcel 52 on Lake Chatuge to be used for recreation/park usage only. Not for use as a substation by Blue Ridge Mountain EMC or for industrial use. Towns county's children are in desperate need of places to go to play & practice their sports. (**Comment by:** *Kim Patterson*)

These places give our children & families a place to go, keeping them physically active & out from behind a TV or computer screen. Childhood obesity is an American epidemic and more recreational parks are needed to reduce this problem. My 12 year old son is a type 1 Diabetic & his physical fitness is extremely important for his health. I can honestly say we would be one of the first in line to use the new recreational park for our personal use and to use for practicing soccer with the children on my team. (**Comment by:** *Kim Patterson*)

We coaches are constantly searching for good open spaces for our children to practice on. They are incredibly hard to find. It gets very inconvenient sharing one patch of grass with other teams and trying not to overlap practice times with them. I'm sure other teams in other sports experience similar problems. (**Comment by:** *Kim Patterson*)

Blue Ridge Mountain EMC can find a better suited location for their substation & we already have an industrial park in place, that currently only a small fraction of it is being used. We do not need to use precious TVA land for that. If recreational park use cannot be retained, then the TVA should leave it to the wildlife untouched. (**Comment by:** *Kim Patterson*)

This property should either remain owned by TVA and undeveloped, or be used by Towns County for public park / recreation. (**Comment by:** *Mary Lynn Miller*)

The better and much more logical choice would be to support the change of Parcel 52 to the Zone 6 (Developed Recreation) usage. This would allow the use of public recreation lands for lighted athletic fields, which should satisfy the needs of the people of the county. We are very much in favor of this usage change. (**Comment by:** *Ben E. and Peggy I. Lilly*)

Parcel 52 is being considered for a Substation for Blue Ridge Mountain EMC this is a lake front lot. It should not be considered for this use. The county has proposed it be used for green space and for several soccer fields. If the EMC was to use it. It would endanger our young people due to the high tension power lines over head. (**Comment by:** *Gerald P. Gutenstein*)

Dear Mr. Kilgore, As a resident of Towns County I am very concerned about the future of Parcel 52. I believe it is the best interest of the county that the property be sold/leased for recreational use only. (**Comment by:** *Joe Spellman*)

Dear Mr. Kilgore, On behalf of my entire family I would like to go on record requesting that TVA Land Tracts 52 and 77 in Towns County Georgia be designated recreation. As a long time resident of Towns County I have enjoyed watching as my sons and now my grandsons and granddaughter participate in sports activities and see a definite need for more sports fields. At the time my sons was playing recreational sports Towns County was a less populated program it is obvious that this is no longer the case. As Towns has grown, so has the number of children and recreational sports are an important part of keeping them healthy and active. So again let me ask that you designate TVA Tracts 52 and 77 in Towns County Georgia for recreational and public use. Thank you for your consideration. (**Comment by:** *Robert N. Brewer, Jr.*)

Dear Mr. Kilgore, I am writing in regard to TVA's consideration on changing parcel 52 on Lake Chatuge in Towns Co., GA from recreation use to a possible site for the construction of a substation, built by BRMEMC. (**Comment by:** *Michael Brock*)

Towns County already has "baseball fields" that it proposes are needed and the rationale for taking prime shore land property and stripping it down to add fertilized grass etc. The current ball fields that are connected to the campgrounds/ fairgrounds on the lake are seldom utilized, and in fact a Tractor Trailer left over from the summer fair sat in the middle of the baseball field for over 8 weeks. (**Comment by:** *Michael Derby*)

My wife and I are avid outdoorsmen. I work for a store which sells outdoor merchandise and I teach canoeing, scuba, white water kayaking and I take groups of children (the OWLS) on weekend camping trips into the woods. Every year I visit family for 1 month on Lake Chatuge. We rent a large house on the lake and enjoy the lake and the town of Hiawassee. (**Comment by:** *Matt & Hava Preye*)

If this land is developed with ball fields, camping, etc. it will drastically change the environment. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

Recreational use could be positive-except for bright lighting an night. (**Comment by:** *Stephen M. Morris*)

Parcel 52 would make an ideal location for additional recreational facilities for our community. (**Comment by:** *Angela Kendall*)

As a citizen in this community it is something that is sorely needed. This property would be a great use to the citizens of Towns County. Over the past ten years we have outgrown on present Recreation complex. (**Comment by:** Tom Kilgore)

We could use this property for a soccer field that we are lacking in Towns County and would give testimony to everyone, that we care about our children and our Town. (**Comment by:** *Elisabeth and Oskar Letrotsky***)**

Socioeconomics

The loss of these unique natural resources will inevitably have a negative effect on the local economy. Economic prosperity and natural resources are inseparably linked in the NE Georgia Mountains. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

Socioeconomics: The irreplaceable beauty and majesty of the Lake Chatuge area has become the area's major economic engine. New and renovated housing, private and public resorts, campgrounds, fishing, hotels, B&B's, bicycling, mountaineering, and all the related support business including groceries, fuel, vehicles, marinas, equipment, maintenance and storage depend on the area continuing to attract those who appreciate our mountains and waterways. Degrading any of these Lake Chatuge parcels would reduce the environment that drives the economy. Lake Chatuge and Hiawassee have enjoyed increased real estate values and robust economies because of the natural beauty of the area and reducing that would reduce that economic momentum. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

Socioeconomics – The reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in the area, therefore high-intensity developed recreational use on Parcel 77 would be incompatible with overall enjoyment of the reservoir and scenic quality. Degrading any of these parcels would reduce the environment that drives the economy. Destroying natural habitat will reduce scenic beauty and tourism that generate significant income to surrounding businesses. (**Comment by:** *Margaret M. Knight, Tucker Demuth, Jim Duke, DonnaLee DeMuth, Ophelia Dickey, Brenda Arnett, Ross Demuth*)

Socioeconomics – The reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in the area, therefore high-intensity developed recreational use on Parcel 77 would be incompatible with overall enjoyment of the reservoir and scenic quality. Degrading any of these parcels would reduce the environment that drives the economy. Destroying natural habitat will reduce scenic beauty and tourism that generate significant income to surrounding businesses. (**Comment by:** *Janet Duke*)

This would cause an economic strain on the local economy because I believe that tourism brings in lots of revenues for business and government. (**Comment by:** *Laura Benitez*)

This would cause an economic strain on the local economy because I believe that tourism brings in lots of revenues for business and government. (**Comment by:** *Lynne Bever*)

It will lower home values and impact the tourist business on that portion of the lake. (**Comment by:** *Gus and Joan Neville*)

As a adjacent owner I also feel that the placement of a sub station would de-value my property as well as other surrounding properties. (**Comment by:** *Michael Rogers*)

These businesses will be adversely impacted by the suggested location and their owners are expressing their concern. (**Comment by:** *Towns County Homeowners Association*)

We own property in Hiawassee, GA. Please do not sell lakefront recreational land (Parcel 52) owned by TVA. Selling this property to become an electric substation would be horrible. It would ruin the lakefront, impact Hiawassee's businesses and tourism, adversely affect the adjacent properties and the properties directly across the cove which would have to look at the substation. (**Comment by:** *Mary Lynn Miller*)

Putting another, equally unattractive power station on the east entrance to Hiawassee would be a callused disregard for the economic future of a county that is blessed with the opportunity to excel in recreation and tourism. TVA should be helping us to increase the value of the lake for the economic well being of the local population not diminishing it for

decades to come. Please consider another alternate site for the much needed additional power station. (**Comment by:** *Joseph Ruf*)

The main economic drivers of the reservoir are tourists and visitors that are attracted by the beauty of the lake and the surrounding lands. The development of more shoreland will only negatively affect the area and the beauty that drives people such as myself to the area. (**Comment by:** *Michael Derby*)

It is my understanding that several Parcels are up for rezoning. I visit, spend time shopping and staying in local hotels, restaurants, and enjoy all of it. I would hate to see such beauty be damaged by declining water quality. This would cause an economic strain on the local economy because I believe that tourism brings in lots of revenues for business and government. (**Comment by:** *Debra LeGere*)

What about the declining property values which will result in a lower tax base and less money for Towns County? Why not find land off the lake (foreclosed properties for example) and leave the lake to be enjoyed for years to come. (**Comment by:** *Kristin Preye*)

The county will then lose valuable dollars that would have been spent in their restaurants, shops, hotels, etc. (**Comment by:** *Matt & Hava Preye*)

Property values will decrease and there will be less money from taxes for Towns County. There will be a large ripple effect. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

The reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in the area, therefore any developed recreational use of these parcels would be incompatible with overall enjoyment of the reservoir. Degrading any of these parcels would reduce the environment that drives the economy. Destroying natural habitat will reduce scenic beauty and tourism that generate significant income to surrounding businesses. (**Comment by:** *Michael Bever*)

I visit, spend time shopping and staying in local hotels, restaurants, and enjoy all of it. This would cause an economic strain on the local economy because I believe that tourism brings in lots of revenues for business and government. (**Comment by:** *Michael Crowe*)

My concerns are the reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in the area, therefore high-intensity developed recreational use of these parcels would be incompatible with overall enjoyment of the reservoir. Degrading any of these parcels would reduce the environment that drives the economy. Destroying natural habitat will reduce scenic beauty and tourism that generate significant income to surrounding businesses. (Comment by: Frances Callen)

Socioeconomics: The reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in that area, therefore high-intensity developed recreational use on Parcel 77 would be incompatible with overall enjoyment of the reservoir. (**Comment by:** *Larry & Janice Rutledge*)

Lake Chatuge is a valuable asset to our county and it would be a detriment to see this property used to erect an unsightly & possibly harmful sub station on well traveled Hwy 76. (**Comment by:** *Angelea Kendall*)

A power substation on Parcel 52 would diminish property values of the residential property owners across the lake and on the mountain looking down on the lake as well as the small business owner directly adjacent and small business owners across the road. Decreased property values means decreased tax revenue for Towns County. It also discourages newcomers from purchasing property on the lake because of the uncertainty of future land use. (**Comment by:** *Lindey and Mark Fitzgerald*)

Socioeconomics - The reservoir and scenery are the main economic drivers in the area, therefore high-intensity developed recreational use of these parcels would be incompatible with overall enjoyment of the reservoir. Degrading any of these parcels would reduce the environment that drives the economy. Destroying natural habitat will reduce scenic beauty and tourism that generate significant income to surrounding businesses. (**Comment by:** *Jennifer Myers & Shamina Henkel*)

Because of this, such a complex would also greatly devalue our real estate investment. (Comment by: Elizabeth Bates)

The irreplaceable beauty and majesty of the Lake Chatuge area has become the area's major economic engine. New and renovated housing, private and public resorts, campgrounds, fishing, hotels, B&B's, bicycling, mountaineering, and all the related support business including groceries, fuel, vehicles, marina, equipment, maintenance and storage depend on the area continuing to attract those who appreciate our mountains and waterways. Degrading any of these Lake Chatuge parcels would degrade the environment that drives the economy. The Lake Chatuge/Hiwassee/Towns County area has enjoyed increased real estate values and robust economy directly because of its beauty and environment attractiveness. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition signed by 65 people*)

Visual Impacts

People are drawn to the beautiful mountain scenery and to the lake for fishing, swimming and boating. Degrading these parcels for increased population and/or industry would reduce or remove some of the most precious and fragile aesthetic qualities the public now enjoys. To replace existing shoreline forest with a cityscape, including mowed or paved fields, parking lots, buildings, sidewalks, security lighting and all the related construction, would eliminate aesthetic value in the area for every person that visits the lake. People visit and move here because of the lake's beauty and serenity-the economic "engine" could be destroyed by additional shoreline development, and many local businesses (employers) could fail. The unmatched beauty and majesty of the Lake Chatuge area has become the area's major economic "engine". (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

I chose this area because of the nature of the community and magnificent views. Please do not harm these qualities. (**Comment by:** *Stephen M. Morris*)

We are a group of concerned homeowners who live in Dan Knob subdivision overlooking beautiful Lake Chatuge. We cherish this beautiful natural resource and would like to see it preserved for many generations to enjoy in the future. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

Visual Resources: Lake Chatuge and the surrounding mountains currently provide a wide range of trees, creeks, rocks, and vegetation. Wildlife, particularly the Bald Eagle, add to its aesthetic value and variety. Degrading these parcels for increased population and/or industry, would reduce or remove some of the most precious and fragile aesthetic qualities

we now enjoy. Visual Resources: To replace existing forest with a cityscape, including mowed or paved fields, parking lots, buildings, sidewalks, security lighting and all the related construction, would eliminate aesthetic value in the area for every person within sight of the parcels so designated. People visit and move here because it is NOT permanently paved and lighted. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

Visual Resources – development on Chatuge Reservoir would result in impacts on the visual landscape character. For these parcels and land within their view, scenic value would be greatly reduced." Parcel 77 is highly visible; located near the center of the reservoir. The change of Parcel 77 from Zone 4 to Zone 6 would result in a loss of forested open space, thus changing the character of the views from existing residential neighborhoods in the area and across the reservoir. I believe Parcel 77 should remain a pristine forested setting. (**Comment by:** *Margaret M. Knight, Tucker Demuth, Jim Duke, DonnaLee DeMuth, Ophelia Dickey, Brenda Arnett, Ross Demuth*)

Visual Resources – development on Chatuge Reservoir would result in impacts on the visual landscape character. For these parcels and land within their view, scenic value would be greatly reduced." Parcel 77 is highly visible; located near the center of the reservoir. The change of Parcel 77 from Zone 4 to Zone 6 would result in a loss of forested open space, thus changing the character of the views from existing residential neighborhoods in the area and across the reservoir. I believe Parcel 77 should remain a pristine forested setting. Lake Chatuge has always been different from the other lakes in Georgia. The natural beauty has been treasured and protected. (**Comment by:** *Janet Duke*)

We come to enjoy the peaceful, tranquil setting. We would not come knowing that more shoreline had been developed, detracting from the beauty and tranquility of the lake (Isn't it developed enough?). (**Comment by:** *Thomas Bicke, Bill Bindewald, Clint Calvert*)

What an eyesore in an otherwise beautiful setting. (**Comment by:** *Craig Evans*)

The community does not want an electric substation on Parcel 52. Parcel 52 contains 9.4 acres of lake front property, which is very visible from the main street running through Hiawassee, and from the lake and houses across the lake. A substation on this land will be ugly to both visitors and homeowners. (**Comment by:** *Gus and Joan Neville*)

Parcel #52 Towns County, Georgia. Please consider the following points concerning Parcel #52 in Towns County, GA and the land use of this beautiful site: -This is one of the most beautiful pieces of property in Towns County. A69,000 volts/25,000 volt electrical substation is not the best use for this site. -An electrical Substation is unsightly and should not be constructed on this site for all visitors and guest entering Towns County to see when approaching Hiawassee from the east. (**Comment by:** *Tony E. Branan*)

Blue Ridge Mtn. EMC has ruined the beautiful young Harris, GA (Towns County) with a similar electrical substation. (**Comment by:** *Tony E. Branan*)

This letter is to document my strong opposition to the plan to build a power substation on TVA parcel 52 in Hiawassee Georgia. I am a volunteer business counselor for the small business owners of Towns County. Almost all the business in Towns County is either in the tourist sector, dependent on the tourist sector or indirectly affected by the tourist sector. We presently have a necessary but extremely unattractive power station welcoming tourists

entering Hiawassee from the west. This station is right on the highway and unbelievably right on the lake!! Tourists have unfavorably commented on it to me many times. One comment was particularly insightful "Whoever did this doesn't understand the value of the lake"!! For a county that makes it's living on tourism it is a bad welcoming sight. (**Comment by:** *Joseph Ruf*)

It would be an eyesore and a possible health hazard for neighboring properties especially being located across the street from a gas station & oil distribution company. A more secluded location should be sought by the EMC. Our community values Lake Chatuge for it's beauty and economic effect on our county. (**Comment by:** *Michael Rogers*)

I also am not very happy with the fact that anything not appealing to our lake and it's view. We live in such a beautiful place. When I go on vacation and come back home to his area I am in awe. Let's not mess up a good thing. (**Comment by:** *Deanna Ledford*)

A substation is an unsightly structure which does not add to the beautiful ambiance of our community. It can be located in a less visible area. (**Comment by:** *Robert A. Keys*)

A power substation to say the least a high profile ugly and huge structure which will be a eyesore from the lake and the roads. Please withdraw parcel 52 from consideration and have it designated as it now stands. (**Comment by:** *Mark Fitzgerald*)

Visual Resources - the scenic beauty of the lake would be degraded and these fewer visitors would come to shop, dine, visit, fish, etc. (**Comment by:** *Sandra Chapin*)

Substation would present a poor visual impact as one approaches the city of Hiawassee. This would negatively impact tourism. Surely other tracts of land present viable alternatives. In general Hiawassee has a negative downtown due to uncontrolled signage and abandoned buildings. The substation would add to this. (**Comment by:** *Terence Radford*)

The lake beauty is the area's single greatest asset. Quality improvements on the lake will eventually filter into economic gain and population gain. This site #52 is a pastoral setting at the entrance to our town. Most communities consider building a grand gateway to their town. Hardly a substation fits that bill! I recommend Alternative "A" for this. (**Comment by:** *Steve Massell*)

I am very concerned that selling this parcel to Blue Ridge EMC for a substation would materially impair the scenery for visitors and tourists who are driving into Hiawassee. The lake is the bid draw and an unattractive substation between a main entrance into town and the lake is a significant negative. The sub-station should be placed out of sight, especially Hwy 76, and away from the lake. (**Comment by:** *Todd Shutley*)

Parcel 52. We do not want the substation at this location. There are so many homes that will be looking at this. I am not opposed to the substation coming in but not in this location. (**Comment by:** *Mary Mullin*)

Parcel # 52 - No 69KV/25/KV electrical substation on this parcel # 52. One of the most beautiful sites in Towns County. (**Comment by:** *Tony R. Branan*)

We have also heard all the publicity in the local Hiawassee media that a portion of this parcel is being considered for sale or lease to Blue Ridge Mountain EMC (BRMEMC) for the use of an industrial type electrical substation. We are opposed to an electrical substation or any industrial use on this prime lakeside site which is at the entrance to a beautiful mountain town. (**Comment by:** *C. Thomas and Shirla Petersen*)

As for eye appeal, Towns County needs to preserve the beauty along the Lake Chatuge shoreline at all costs. Especially, since the main roads travel so closely to the lake. Residents and visitors to Towns County should not be cursed to look at substations or industrial building/equipment destroying the beauty of the lake for the rest of our lives and future generations. (**Comment by:** *Kim Patterson*)

Tourism centered around Lake Chatuge is the core industry for Towns County. The TVA needs to remember that in its use plan. A beautiful lake increases land values and attracts visitors. Putting huge electric substations, or sand and gravel businesses, on lakefront property for all to see detracts from the beauty of Lake Chatuge, decreases land values, and reduces visitors. (**Comment by:** *Brendan and Joan Neville*)

We can't believe that EMC wants to build a substation on beautiful Lake Chatuge! We bought our lot there to build a home and retire soon because of the natural beauty of the lake and surrounding mountains and landscape. To have a sub-station planted near our subdivision is outrageous and totally unacceptable. Please reconsider these plans. Lake Chatuge is one of the most beautiful areas in the North Georgia Mountains. Please let's keep it that way. (**Comment by:** *Paul and Kathy Yellina*)

Understanding the need for additional electrical production, I believed there are better alternatives away from public view. The beauty and serenity of Hiawassee is unique and should be preserved at all cost. Thank you and please give strong consideration to my request. (**Comment by:** *Joe Spellman*)

As a concerned citizen and resident of Towns County, it is with great urgency I declare my opposition to the BRMEMC Substation as the use of parcel 52. In a town where growth is relevant and acknowledged by its leaders, I can understand the need for a substation, however not at the expense of its youth and not in a location that demeans the beauty of our lake and mountains. (**Comment by:** *Kristina Albach*)

What about the loss of tranquility and beauty? (**Comment by:** *Kristin Preye*)

The beauty of the lake and mountains is what attracts us to this area. If there is a power station, a ballfield and industry ON THE LAKE, people will go elsewhere. (**Comment by:** *Matt & Hava Preye*)

The reason I visit Lake Chatuge every year is to experience the beauty of your gorgeous lake and mountains. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

I live on and care about the Chatuge Reservoir, the city of Hiawassee, and Towns County, GA. I value the natural beauty and want to preserve it for the future of this beautiful and precious area. Development on Chatuge Reservoir would result in impacts on the visual landscape character. For these parcels and land within their view, scenic value would be greatly reduced. (**Comment by:** *Michael Bever*)

We come to enjoy the peaceful, tranquil setting. We would not come knowing that more shoreline had been developed, detracting from the beauty and tranquility of the lake (Isn't it developed enough?). (**Comment by:** *Helen Neiner*)

We would not come knowing that more shoreline had been developed, detracting from the beauty and tranquility of the lake (Isn't it developed enough?). (**Comment by:** *Sara Calvert*)

The natural beauty is one of the reasons i love it in the mountains and i want to preserve it for current and future use. (**Comment by:** *Frances Callen*)

I value the natural beauty and want to preserve it for the future of this beautiful and precious area. Visual Resources – Development on Chatuge Reservoir would result in impacts on the visual landscape character. For these parcels and land within their view, scenic value would be greatly reduced. (**Comment by:** *May May Bickes*)

Visual Resources: This is in an area in the center of the lake that is highly visible either way you go. This would result in the loss of forested open space and totally change the character of the shoreline in that area. (**Comment by:** *Larry & Janice Rutledg*)

I greatly value this beautiful natural setting and want to preserve it. (**Comment by:** *Lynne Reid*)

I value the natural beauty and want to preserve it for the future of this beautiful and precious area. (**Comment by:** *Jennifer Myers & Shamina Henkel*)

My husband and I retired and moved to this area because of its serene, natural beauty. The land you are considering developing is directly in front of our house and would therefore ruin our beautiful rural lake view, not to mention peace and quiet. (**Comment by:** *Elizabeth Bates*)

We were drawn to this area over 20 yrs ago by the beauty of these mountains and Lake Chatuge. It is of great concern to us to preserve the beauty. The Substation on this beautiful spot on the lake, at the east entrance of Hiawassee would be an awful distraction from the beauty of this area. (**Comment by:** *Elisabeth and Oskar Letrotsky*)

We value the natural beauty, the unique environment, the history, our neighbors, and all the citizens of the Chatuge Reservoir area. Most importantly, we want to be responsible for the future of this beautiful and precious area. Lake Chatuge and the surrounding mountains currently provide a wide range of trees, creeks, rocks, and vegetation. Wildlife, particularly the Bald Eagle, add to its aesthetic value and variety. Degrading these parcels for increased population, sports activities and/or industry, would reduce or remove come of the most precious and fragile aesthetic qualities we now enjoy. To replace existing forest with a cityscape, including mowed or paved fields, parking lots, buildings, sidewalks, security lighting and all the related construction, would eliminate aesthetic value in the area for every person within sight of the parcels so designated. People visit and move here because it is NOT permanently paved and lighted. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition by 65 people*)

The County has just taken a stand on limiting the height of buildings in this beautiful area of the mountains and we feel TVA should take a stand to help keep the lake and lake property in a clean and environmentally sound condition. (**Comment by:** *Gene and Lou Hewatt*)

Water Quality

Additionally, instead of maintaining the buffer along the lake, local government cut down trees at the Community Center and put in picnic tables. This will add to runoff and degrade water quality. One of their most pressing concerns is the ecological health of Lake Chatuge due to storm water runoff from impervious surfaces. Ball fields in particular add many nitrates and phosphates to the water from fertilizer. According to HRWC's 2007 report, Lake Chatuge's water quality has been poor 9 out of the last 10 years. It will take another 10 years to improve the water quality from where it is today. More development next to the lake will have a cumulative effect and may reach the tipping point where the lake cannot be saved. (**Comment by:** *Katherine Bever*)

Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology: These shoreline parcels impact the health of Lake Chatuge directly and irrefutably, a lake already listed in "poor" ecological condition. Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology: Increased use, both people and industrial, would reduce the current forest cover with its natural ecological recovery system, and replace that forest with new roads for access and usage, while burdening the lake and shoreline with required plumbing, sewerage, drinking water, run-off, compacting and litter. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology – For the past nine years, Chatuge Reservoir has rate "poor" every year with the exception of 2001. I feel that clearing the land and removing the trees would only cause this condition to deteriorate further by accelerating runoff of sediment, fertilizers and motor oils from developed land. Development and intensive land uses often increase the amount of impervious surface (i.e., roofs, roads, and paved area), remove vegetation, and increase storm water runoff, thereby reducing the natural buffering/filtering effect of vegetated lands and increasing the potential for soil erosion and other nonpoint sources of pollution. We should attempt to make the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *Margaret M. Knight, Tucker Demuth, Jim Duke, DonnaLee DeMuth, Ophelia Dickey, Brenda Arnett, Ross Demuth*)

Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology – For the past nine years, Chatuge Reservoir has rate "poor" every year with the exception of 2001. I feel that clearing the land and removing the trees would only cause this condition to deteriorate further by accelerating runoff of sediment, fertilizers and motor oils from developed land. Development and intensive land uses often increase the amount of impervious surface (i.e., roofs, roads, and paved area), remove vegetation, and increase storm water runoff, thereby reducing the natural buffering/filtering effect of vegetated lands and increasing the potential for soil erosion and other nonpoint sources of pollution. We should attempt to make the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *Janet Duke*)

I would hate to see such beauty be damaged by declining water quality. I think shoreline development with its sediment runoff would cause further damage to the water quality. (**Comment by:** *Laura Benitez*)

We are also concern with the light pollution and the impact on wildlife. The most important concern I have is the water quality-what will this do to the lakes water quality where all the children swim. The run off of sediment from the shoreline development would have a very negative impact on the water from fertilizers, runoff, and sediment from newly developed land. We believe we should keep the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *Thomas Bickes, Bill Bindewald, Clint Calvert*)

I believe that the issue that needs to be emphasized is the water and aquatic ecology as compared to other impacts. As a member of the Hiawassee River Watershed Coalition(HRWC), I realize that the Chatuge Reservoir has rated poor every year except one in the last nine years. (**Comment by:** *Richard Ludwig*)

Changing the use to anything but undisturbed vegetation will cause run-off & pollution into the waters of the reservoir. The use of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers will cause further deterioration of the water quality of the reservoir. (**Comment by:** *Cathy Barton*)

Water Quality - Possible runoff. The lake is already suffering from poor ratings for 10 years. (**Comment by:** *Sandra Chapin*)

Why would TVA desire to support converting pristine land bordering lake Chatuge? Particularly when Lake Chatuge's ecological condition is in poor condition. Putting any land into an industrial - commercial status will just contribute and masterbate Lake Chatuge's problem. (**Comment by:** *Carl S. Shultz*)

I am aware of the poor and declining condition of this reservoir's water over the last few years. (**Comment by:** *Robert Moffit*)

Water quality has continued to degrade within the Chatuge reservoir. Re-zoning additional lands for "recreational use" will over time allow for the development of lands that will see runoff of pollutants such as nitrates from fertilizers etc. enter the lake at a higher rate. Only furthering to the demise of the water quality. That poor water quality affects surrounding wildlife as well as the human visitors to the lake that use the water for swimming, fishing. (**Comment by:** *Michael Derby*)

I think shoreline development with its sediment runoff would cause further damage to the water quality. (**Comment by:** *Debra LeGere*)

What about water quality? (**Comment by:** *Kristin Preye*)

I am also concerned about degrading the water quality. Since it is already poor any additional development on the lake would be unwise. (**Comment by:** *Matt & Hava Preye*)

I also read in your report that the water quality has been poor the last 9 out of 10 years. This is very disturbing to me. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

For the past nine years, Chatuge Reservoir has rated "poor" every year with the exception of 2001. I feel that clearing of any of the land and removing the trees would only cause this condition to deteriorate further by accelerating runoff of sediment, fertilizers and motor oils from developed land. We should attempt to make the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. Chatuge is already the most developed reservoir in the system with approx. 75% of the shoreline developed-we do not need any additional

development, especially considering the threat it brings to further degrade the water quality. If we destroy the water, the community will decay and few will be around to benefit from even the existing development. (**Comment by:** *Michael Bever*)

The most important concern I have is the water quality-what will this do to the lakes water quality where all the children swim. The run off of sediment from the shoreline development would have a very negative impact on the water from fertilizers, runoff, and sediment from newly developed land. We believe we should keep the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *Helen Neiner*)

The most important concern I have is the water quality-what will this do to the lakes water quality where all the children swim. The run off of sediment from the shoreline development would have a very negative impact on the water from fertilizers, runoff, and sediment from newly developed land. We believe we should keep the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *Sara Calvert*)

Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology – For the past nine years, Chatuge Reservoir has rated "poor" every year with the exception of 2001. I feel that clearing the land and removing the trees would only cause this condition to deteriorate further by accelerating runoff of sediment, fertilizers and motor oils from developed land. We should attempt to make the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *May May Bickes*)

Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology: This would be to the determent of the water quality of the lake. There are already campgrounds across from that area and would accelerate runoff of sediment, fertilizers and motor oils from developed land. We believe that a lot of work is still to be done to try to clean up the lake because of its low water quality rating. (**Comment by:** *Larry & Janice Rutledg*)

I am very concerned about the water quality on Lake Chatuge. I know that nitrates and phosphates are a big problem in the deteriorating quality of the water. Adding ballfields near the lake is not a good idea. With the fertilizers required to maintain ballfields, the runoff will harm the lake to the point of no return. The HRWC states that one of the most pressing concerns for the ecological health of Lake Chatuge is stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces. Chatuge is already compromised. Lake Chatuge needs wooded shoreline areas where water can filter through vegetation and soil into the ground. Adequate buffers must be maintained. (**Comment by:** *Mattie Chapin*)

Water Quality and Aquatic Ecology – For the past nine years, Chatuge Reservoir has rated "poor" every year with the exception of 2001. I feel that clearing the land and removing the trees would only cause this condition to deteriorate further by accelerating runoff of sediment, fertilizers and motor oils from developed land. We should attempt to make the lake as clean as possible for current and future generations to enjoy. (**Comment by:** *Jennifer Myers & Shamina Henkel*)

It is very apparent that any new development, recreational or industrial, will further add to the deterioration and "poorer" quality of the lake. This includes, but not limited to, water quality and wildlife habitats that surround the lake. Everyone, including the Hiwassee Watershed Coalition, know that it is very difficult now to keep the lake quality clean without adding unnecessary development The salvation of every resident, including wildlife, in this

area of Lake Chatuge depends on the quality of this lake water and the beautiful views it affords. (**Comment by:** *Gene and Lou Hewatt*)

These shoreline parcels impact the health of Lake Chatuge directly and irrefutably, a lake already listed in "poor" ecological conditions. Increased use, both people and industrial, would reduce the current forest cover with its natural ecological recovery system, and replace that forest with new roads for access and usage, while burdening the lake and shoreline with required plumbing, sewerage, drinking water, run-off, compacting and litter. Because Lake Chatuge forms the bottom of its basin, noise is amplified across the lake and up into the mountains. Road noise from GA Hwy 76 crossing over Lake Chatuge is an existing problem now. Degrading these parcels for increased population, activities and/or industry would increase noise to all nearby homes, businesses, retirement homes, medical facilities and parks, destroying the peace and calm that makes this location unique. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition signed by 65 people*)

Noise

Air quality and noise = industry is not congruent with the goal of conservation and preservation of the land. (**Comment by:** *Sandra Chapin*)

There will be noise, lights at night, pollution in the water. (**Comment by:** *Susan Rothblum*)

I believe additional development would increase the noise level and, on a lake, this noise would travel throughout the valley. We are also concern with the light pollution and the impact on wildlife. (**Comment by:** *Helen Neiner*)

I believe additional development would increase the noise level and, on a lake, this noise would travel throughout the valley. We are also concern with the light pollution and the impact on wildlife. (**Comment by:** *Sara Calvert*)

I believe additional development would increase the noise level and, on a lake, this noise would travel throughout the valley. We are also concern with the light pollution and the impact on wildlife. (**Comment by:** *Thomas Bickes, Bill Bindewald, Clint Calvert*)

There will be extensive noise & visual pollution. (**Comment by:** *Cathy Barton*)

The installation of any kind of power substation on Parcel 52 will also create visual pollution for visitors to Towns County. (**Comment by:** *Bill Herold*)

Terrestrial/Ecology

Environmental Consequences: With development on the Chatuge Reservoir already nearing 75% of the available shoreline, further development is unwarranted and threatening to the fragile ecological balance. (**Comment by:** *Robert E. Garbe*)

Wildlife Communities: Because these areas are in areas that are already heavily developed we believe that the development of these parcels would seriously harm the wildlife in this area. Animals need green corridors and this would be taking away from them a major area they have that is not already developed. We request that consideration be given to all these matters and that we think not of just the present but the future of the environment of this reservoir. (**Comment by:** *Larry & Janice Rutledge*)

Wildlife Communities - Development of recreation facilities that require land clearing, such as the ball field proposal on parcel 77 or the industrial use on Parcel 10 would have negative local impacts to wildlife habitat. Animals need green corridors. (**Comment by:** *Jennifer Myers & Shamina Henkel*)

We are all for sports for our children, but the fields should not destroy this beautiful land and the wildlife that lives there. We have personally seen deer and bears that live on this property! We also hear owls most nights. (**Comment by:** *Steve and Kathy Stamey*)

With development on the Chatuge Reservoir already nearing 75% of the available shoreline, further development is unwarranted and threatening to the fragile ecological balance. Increasing acreage for development and/or usage is unwise and unnecessary. (**Comment by:** *Letter/Petition signed by 65 people*)