

July 22, 2006

Mr. Dennis. L. Schornack, Chairman  
International Joint Commission  
U.S. Section  
1250 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 100  
Washington, D.C. 20440

RECEIVED  
IJC JOINT COMMISSION  
JUL 27 2006 10 33 35

International Joint Commission  
\*\*\*\*\*  
ACTION: BM  
INFORMATION: LB, JC, FB, RT, CMRS  
FILE:

Subject: Final Report issued by Study Board

Dear Commissioner Schornack,

We the undersigned are writing you to express our full support and faith in the comments made in a letter sent to you dated May 31, 2006 from Drs. Daniel Barletta and Frank Sciremammano.

Additionally, we have waited to comment separately on the recently completed International Lake Ontario- St. Lawrence River Study Report dealing with regulation plan options for managing Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River water levels. Our hope from the start was that the Study would look at upper Lake Ontario water level limits, with emphasis on the time of year, relative to those presently permitted without adversely affecting down stream flooding interests. Unfortunately, this has not occurred with the options being offered.

As members of PIAG, we spent much of our time during the five-year study educating Lake Ontario shoreline residents about the system and the types of problems and issues facing River interests. We, to this day, do not feel that some River interests fully understand or care what affect higher water levels have on the erosion prone shorelines of Lake Ontario or public accesses to the Lake itself.

The existing Criteria, implemented with Plan 1958D with deviations, has been the foundation for residents to establish appropriate fortification between the Lake and their properties. The same has held true for Municipal infrastructure, including public beaches, as well as private marinas and yacht clubs.

It is apparent that a primary driver of some recommended plans is the desire to extend the River boating season into the late fall. Common sense states that there is only a small proportion of recreational boaters on the system that would like their access to the Lake extended into late fall. This can be accepted by shoreline property owners as long as Lake levels naturally or mechanically are lowered during the late fall and winter months to levels that sufficiently reduce potential winter -spring flooding and accelerated bank erosion.

The Coastal Technical working group developed a water level curve that scientifically demonstrated accelerated erosion at levels above 246.7 feet. This is half a foot below the current upper water level target of 247.3 feet. Many properties have protected their

property at significant cost and pay high property taxes to their communities for their Lake view enjoyment.

While participating in Study Board Meetings, we have heard comments such as: "should flooding occur and properties sustain significant damage, these homes should be moved further back from the shoreline or eliminated in favor of nature." Comments such as these, from Study Board Members that do not live along the shoreline, are not considerate or appropriate.

Current wetlands along the Lake have prospered during periods of low and high water supply years within the current target range. This is the case even when additional water supplies were released to accommodate economic and non-economic interests downstream. Much of the environmental conclusions are based on assumptions. The National Research Council found some of the Environmental assumptions unsupported and the results, therefore, inconclusive.

It also appears a bit unfair that the Power Authority provides financial assistance to both St. Lawrence and Jefferson Counties and Municipalities. During years of low water supplies, we are sure boaters would appreciate dredging grants which would permit access to the Lake from the major tributaries that host marinas and feed into the Lake.

We can all get along and enjoy the system while protecting and growing the environment within the current target range. What we cannot accept is to let the lake level exceed 247.3 ft. without procedures in place that permits water levels to be rapidly reduced should a major weather event be eminent. This is plainly wrong and goes against common sense social and economic thinking as it affects local residents.

We respectfully urge you to not accept any plan that does not take the residents of the South shore into consideration during periods of high water supplies. Doing so, quite frankly will cause individual hardships that are unfair considering past history. These residents have had great expense protecting their property from bank erosion and flooding that can occur during periods of high water.

Sincerely,



Tony McKenna



Henry Stewart



Max Streibel