Paul 30th August 2013 17:10:12
NY, Penfield,
I strongly object to your plan 2014.

Nancy Schallmo 30th August 2013 17:08:36
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014!

Mark Schallmo 30th August 2013 17:04:14
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014!!! The attached picture shows what was left of my neighbor's cottage during Lake Ontario "High Water" in April of 1993 under the existing plan. The higher levels of the 2014 plan will wipe out many more of my neighbors.
Attachment

Rebecca M Skinner 30th August 2013 16:52:35
NY, Wolcott,
I object to the proposed changes because lake level variations for property owners on Sodus Bay and other bays in the area are extreme enough already. Increased water levels will cause property damage and loss as well as economic loss for thousands of landowners across the shoreline and bays. I anticipate the loss of the protective sandbar which stands as a barrier of the brunt of Lake Ontario's might on Sodus Bay. The last time this sandbar was lost was in the 1950's before the current controls were put in place. Now it is full of homes- I fear for their loss. I sat and watched the remnants of Hurricane Sandy cross these waters: NO AMOUNT OF QUICK DRAINING WILL PREPARE FOR THESE EVENTS.

Jeffrey Jerome 30th August 2013 16:16:41
VA, Winchester,
This is a most unworkable plan. For the IJC to suggest the level of 248 ft.proves that they are totally out of touch and should be barred from holding their positions. We own a 70 yr. old cottage that we have moved twice now to a postage sized lot that the IJC has left us. Higher wanted levels above their own flood stage is beyond belief. I cannot understand why we are forced to write and plead almost annually for what is ours..Retire the IJC board today and place competent folks in their place. SAVE THE LAKE !

NY, Greece,
We are opposed to the Lake 2014 Plan, and any plan that allows any significant rise in water levels above the current level. We bought 610 Edgemere Drive in December 2012 and understand that two flood insurance claims were made at this property during previous periods of high lake water level. Therefore, for us, the danger and damage that can be caused by high lake levels together with unpredictable storms is not imagined - it is real ! We urge the rejection of this Plan. Wayne H. Knox and Victoria Visiko

Thomas Folino 30th August 2013 15:05:23
N.Y., Alexandria Bay,
Implement Plan 2014 now........before it's too late and all is lost!!! It's been too long in the coming already!!!
Agnes Burlee 30th August 2013 14:45:19
NY, Wolcott,
I am opposed to this 2014 plan. We have lived on Sodus Bay on the southern side of the lake for over 40 years. High water causes huge erosion problems along with damage to personal property. There does not seem to be a way to reduce the lake level fast enough to keep this from happening when the level reaches the trigger point in the plan. Even one day with high winds and high water levels could cause a tremendous amount of damage.

Melissa Mance 30th August 2013 14:43:53
NY, Alden,
As a long time summer resident of the St. Lawrence River and a property owner on the river, I fully support PLAN 2014. I think it is critical in restoring the health of the river and surrounding eco-systems. Water levels also are so low in the late summer that boating becomes a challenge limiting the economy of the Alexandria Bay area.

Joseph A. Wellington 30th August 2013 14:25:16
Connecticut, Waterbury,
The 2014 proposal appears to be focused primarily on enhancing the profits of commercial interests on and along the Saint Lawrence River, the pleasures of motor boat enthusiasts on that river and the sensitivities of environmental protection enthusiasts all at the probable expense of property owners along the lake shore, the users of pubic beaches along that shore and the protection of sensitive natural resources such as the sand dunes at the eastern end of the lake. My family has owned and enjoyed property on the eastern shore of the lake for three generations. While the water levels have varied from season to season and year to year, we have managed to coexist with the aforesaid commercial interests, boating enthusiasts and those who consider themselves to be spokesmen and women for the environment for nearly sixty years. I respectfully submit that the lake and its associated environs are not broken and that they do not need fixing by your proposed 2014 plan or otherwise as a consequence thereof. I and my my family strongly oppose your plan to manipulate the level of the lake for what appears to be the benefit of commercial and boating interests on the Saint Lawrence River and those who believe that the interests of nature should automatically trump those of humans. The furtherance of those interests always seem to be at the expense of those who live on the shore of and enjoy the lake as it is. I make the foregoing submissions as a property owner and as an U.S. attorney with twenty-five years experience in the practice of environmental law. I also look forward to learning how the involvement of the U.S. federal agencies that are necessary to the implementation of your 2014 proposal have complied with the review requirements of the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, 42 United States Code Sections 4321 et seq.

Lois Steinfeldt 30th August 2013 14:21:31
MD, Lanham,
I strongly oppose Plan 2014. Using our tax money to destroy the economy of western new york state to save a muskrat is just plain wrong and affects all taxpayers in the United States. This is our money and you should have more respect for us and how hard we work for this money and not spend it on muskrats

Maxine Appleby 30th August 2013 14:14:26
New York, Sodus Point,
Dear IJC Commissioners, I want to first thank you for allowing many voices to be heard. You and the IJC staff did an outstanding job at the public and technical meetings and town hall conferences. I sincerely appreciate your visits to our Village. After siting through many of these meetings and participating in discussions over the last month, it has been troubling to me that so many have turned their backs on the environment. I don’t fault anyone. I believe the process of segregating stakeholders into different user groups is flawed. It drives individuals to take sides and perpetuates hostile expressions. Our environment should come first. This plan is about
wetland restoration, a critical component to the health of our water system and the wildlife that inhabits within. Plan 2014, although evolved from many plans, is still one solution. It is a plan with trade-offs many do not understand and most will not accept. And, although alternatives such as man-made wetlands may not work as well as natural wetlands, the fact is since the construction of the Moses Saunders dam, Lake Ontario is no longer a natural system. Until the removal of this encumbrance Lake Ontario will never be natural. So I support finding another solution that will work. I support Ducks Unlimited use of aquatic excavators to dig under the muck and uproot the invasive plants to help native plants win out. I support the Nature Conservancy’s continued monitoring of the St. Lawrence river ecosystem and help with Adaptive Management. I am glad to see $10 million from the GM and Alcoa/Reynolds in settlements to be spent on a variety of ecological restoration projects, including restoration and/or enhancement of wetlands, stream banks, native grasslands, bird nesting and roosting habitat, fisheries and fish habitat. I support the continuation of funding to USFWS and Great Lakes Fishery Commission for fisheries restoration work. I support all work toward finding a solution that helps our environment, even if it is man-made. But I do not support the one solution you have presented, I DO NOT support Plan2014.

Mary Griffith 30th August 2013 13:51:25
NY, Sodus,
Please do not implement Plan 2014. I am deeply concerned not only for lakefront properties but the entire community of Sodus Bay, and for Wayne County as a whole if lake and bay properties lose value in devastating storms. The removal of 50-year protections against damaging high water on the entire south shore of Lake Ontario and its bays seems unwise, unnecessary and irresponsible. I support further study to find more equitable solutions - with a more balanced representation of stakeholders.

Michael 30th August 2013 12:40:18
NY, Rochester,
Who will be performing assessments of the south shore property owners break walls that will have to contend with an even more extreme version of lake level management? I did not get a call from the DEC for an assessment. Why is there no information regarding the additional cost that will be incurred with these higher lake levels?. Letting Lake Ontario rise to new extremes is simply illogical and does not mitigate the need for dredging. My south shore "residential" property that has existed for well over 100 years has gone from beach front to a carved out drop off. The prior structure on my property from 1930 is now about 30 feet into the lake. How can anyone assume this is a good idea without considering the generations of riparians on the south shore? I strongly oppose plan 2014 regarding the water level of Lake Ontario.

Chase Miller 30th August 2013 12:30:29
NY, New York,
I support Plan2014. The IJC must act now, the time and resources have been spent to determine the best option available and this is it!

Sarah Miller 30th August 2013 12:23:07
NY, New York,
I support plan 2014

NY, Lyons,
Please see attached comments.
Attachment
John Boogaard 30th August 2013 11:40:42  
NY, Wolcott, 
I am a property owner on Sodus Bay and love the nature of the area. I am opposed to the newest plan because of the impact on local marinas, personal dock areas and the negative impact on erosion control structures already in place and designed for the current lake levels. I also heard at the Williamson NY session of the impact on local sewer districts and personal property. The remedy of cut points to lower the super high water would come too late to be of much help. Water is a powerful force and will do damage over night when the water is very high along with a strong wind. So, I hope the IJC considers not accepting this new plan because of all the logical negative impacts it will have on the Southern Shore of Lake Ontario. Thank you for the opportunity to voice concerns.

Sally Hirschey 30th August 2013 11:27:21  
New York, Cape Vincent, 
This plan is the result of years of study by qualified people not to mention the cost, and we should definitely take advantage of all this knowledge and work and adopt the plan.

David Kuter 30th August 2013 11:25:07  
WI, Madison, 
Please do not raise the lake level of Lake Ontario artificially without including the cost of compensation to landowners who will be damaged by this action.

Pat Costanzo 30th August 2013 11:18:10  
NY, Sodus Point,  
The IJC based its study results, relating to its proposed Plan 2014, on only 3,000 properties on the south Lake shore that they valued at $360 M purportedly resulting in an annual loss of about $300 per property. It should be made known that the actual numbers of affected properties are much, much greater and the cost is much more disturbing. The properties number about 10,025 and are valued at $3.8 Billion. Additionally, the IJC completely ignores shoreline and otherwise affected properties on the bays and give no value to public or undeveloped properties. Much damage to property owners has already occurred; the insurance companies obviously respect a high probability of flooding as it has been suggested that there be a 1000 times increase in the cost of flood insurance. This, alone, is leading long-time residents to consider selling their properties while they still have value. The IJC actions will have an affect on shorelines, so where is the Coastal Zone Management Review? Such environmental actions should require either or both a SEQR or an Environmental Impact Statement. The IJC is blatantly contradicting the Clean Water Act and ignoring the mandates of NEPA. Raising and lowering water levels are actions, actions that impact the environment including coastal areas - everyone else who considers such a action must study its effects on the entire environment and on economic impacts - where is such a study based on the proposed actions of the IJC?

Anthony Hollebrandt 30th August 2013 10:44:47  
New York, Sodus Point,  
I STRONGLY oppose the 2014 plan. Not only for the millions of coastal residence that it will affect but also you have to remember that there are nuclear power plants that would be affected and therefore affect millions more who aren’t coastal residence. Please don’t ruin our beautiful community!

Sally A Sessler 30th August 2013 10:41:27  
NY, Sandy Creek,  
I object to the high levels allowed under this plan. I am a property owner on the EASTERN shore of Lake Ontario. This property has been in my family for 65 years. There has been a lot of erosion by high waves during high water levels. Even in the current plan the level has been on the high
side most of the time. I have NO OBJECTION to low levels. The new water level plan for the Lake can result in substantial shoreline destruction which will create financial problems for property owners and subsequent loss of tax revenue for municipalities. There are 10,025 private or public parcels in the six county region of the southern and eastern shores of the Lake with a total assessed value of $3.7 billion. If the Plan goes through, shipping and hydropower should pay for mitigation costs for potential property destruction! The Plan supposedly includes “trigger points” which can initiate action to change the lake level if it become dangerously high or low. However, it has been noted that it takes a week to lower the Lake by one inch! How will that prevent destruction of property in the event of an incoming severe storm? When brought to the attention of the hearing Panels this summer, no one had a response/answer to this concern. I urge you to reconsider this plan and make it more equitable to landowner concerns. Thank you for listening.

Ville de Montréal 30th August 2013 10:41:25
Quebec, Montreal,
Veuillez trouver ci-joint les commentaires de la Ville de Montréal portant sur une nouvelle proposition de régulation des niveaux et débit du Lac Ontario et du fleuve Saint-Laurent (Plan 2014) de la Commission mixte internationale.
Attachment

Canadian Association of Port Authorities 30th August 2013 10:34:32
Ontario, Ottawa,
Attached please find the comments of the Association of Canadian Port Authorities (ACPA) regarding the proposed Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence water levels regulation plan.
Attachment

Tom McAuley 30th August 2013 10:29:51
Ontario, Orleans,
Statement attached
Attachment

NY, Buffalo,
As a longtime resident in three Great Lakes cities and on Wellesley Island on the St. Lawrence, I strongly support Plan 2014 for a healthy, robust ecology across the basin, as close to pre-Seaway conditions as possible, regardless of the impact it may have on private property my family and I own. We can engineer, relocate, and rebuild the cultural and the constructed but ecosystems, we repeatedly learn the hard way, are not so easy. Please do the right thing and implement Plan 2014 immediately.

Robert Lewis-Manning 30th August 2013 09:59:52
Ontario, Ottawa,
Please find attached the comments of the Canadian Shipowners Association (CSA). CSA recommends several amendments to the proposal in order to enhance its effectiveness. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Robert Lewis-Manning (President)
Attachment

Pamela D’Luhy 30th August 2013 09:55:59
New York, Clayton,
I strong support plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented immediately. Having spent almost 30 years on the St. Lawrence River, the water levels have made it more difficult each year
to reach our home. The only way to reach it is via boat and water levels get way too low. Marshes are taking over and we need 2014! Please implement it now!

Lauran Throop 30th August 2013 09:40:49
NY, Clayton,
I supported plan BV7 and I support plan 2014 and I believe it should be implemented without further delay.

Lauran Throop 30th August 2013 09:30:29
NY, Clayton,
I support Plan BV7 and I believe it should be implemented without further revisions and delays.

Lee Willbanks 30th August 2013 09:26:07
NY, Clayton,
Please see the attached comments of Save The River, the Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper.
Attachment

JACK STEINKAMP 30th August 2013 09:21:40
NY, Sodus Point,
I was a presenter at the technical hearings in Rochester and the IJC said they would contact me to get a copy of my presentation. Since no one did, I am sending it to be part of the public comment. BTW...It was nice to meet you all face to face and thanks to Dereth for visiting our area.
Attachment

Michael Fitzpatrick 30th August 2013 09:17:17
NY, Sodus Point,
I oppose plan 2014 regarding the water level of Lake Ontario

Jack Steinkamp 30th August 2013 09:17:06
NY, Sodus Point,
Over 19 NY State counties, hundreds of towns, villages and hamlets and hundreds of elected officials representing over 3,000,000 NY residents cannot support Plan 2014. These are facts and numbers that the IJC cannot ignore. There is no support for Plan 2014 from the south shore. We simply cannot support a plan that focuses the damages on one area and one or two interests while showing only minimal environmental gain and no investment from other areas. What the south shore CAN support is a plan that restores wetlands without damaging others. It may be a difficult job to come up with a plan the helps everyone and hurts no one but, that is what your all are hired to do! We need a wetlands plan....not a water level plan. I also ask that the IJC consider the quality of the public comment and understand that some groups have resorted to "zombie-ish," robo submissions that were canned automated submissions to drive numbers up. While we on the south shore certainly lobbied our friends and neighbors to submit comments, most from our area are individual and heart felt from people that have a lot to lose and who are starting to actually fear the IJC. The IJC also needs to understand that there is no emergency plan in place for "flash erosion" that is certain to happen when PLAN 2104 spring levels meet with a high wind and wave weather pattern. There will be some help for flooding but nothing for homes, land and public properties that wash away. Plan 2014 has the potential to cause far more damage than you estimate and if passed this IJC board and its current members, will be remembered for being part of that damage.
Ellen G. Detlefsen and her family of seven 30th August 2013 09:11:54
NY, Thousand Island Park,
We--a River-loving family of eight and a family which which has been affected by the St. Lawrence and its waters for seven generations (since 1875)--definitely support Plan 2014. We heartily believe it should be implemented now, please.

Janet Hoffmann 30th August 2013 09:08:07
California, Palm Springs,
During our family's 62 years on the River we have sadly watched the changes that have taken place with sorrow in our hearts, wishing for the old water levels to be restored, the fish to come back, the weeds to subside, the barn swallows and croaking frogs to return. I support Plan 2014. Thanks You

Susan Mazza 30th August 2013 09:06:11
NY, Rochester,
I do not support plan 2014 and feel that this will dramatically and unfavorably impact residents and the environment in our community on Lake Ontario.

Margo O'Brien 30th August 2013 09:01:07
New York, Cape Vincent,
Please pay close attention to maintaining the natural water levels on the St. Lawrence River. Not only is it vital to the whole Thousand Islands area, our little tourist community of Cape Vincent relies on the necessary water levels to support the activities of our tourists. Please consider the little details for our Small Business Owners.

Darden MacWade 30th August 2013 08:55:03
MS, Jackson,
After reading Plan 2014 I believe it is a plan that should be implemented immediately. The St. Lawrence River can be treated fairly as both a natural resource and a tourist attraction, and I believe Plan 2014 can achieve that goal. Thank you.

Lianne Snow 30th August 2013 08:20:35
Ontario, Colborne,
I have lived by the shore of this great Lake all my 50 years. I have loved it and felt a relationship to it. It has pained me from childhood to see the abuse it has suffered for shortsighted profit. Please support this 2014 plan to become responsible governors. You are my voice as I am steward.

Susan L. Kurland, Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs,
U.S.Deptartment of Transportation 30th August 2013 08:16:53
D.C., Washington,
Attached please find the U.S. Department of Transportation's comments regarding proposed Plan 2014.
Attachment

Damian Weidmann 30th August 2013 08:16:31
NY, Rochester,
I strongly oppose and respectfully submit the attached document detailing my concerns
Attachment
Sean Mahar 30th August 2013 08:13:51
NY, Albany,
Attached please find a comment letter in support of plan 2014 endorsed by 33 organizations from the US and Canada.
Attachment

Lyle B. Shughart 30th August 2013 08:10:05
NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014”.

Erin Crotty 30th August 2013 07:56:44
NY, Albany,
Attached please find comments in support or plan 2014 from Audubon New York.
Attachment

Caroline Gravel, Director of Environmental Affairs, Shipping Federation of Canada 30th August 2013 07:32:07
Quebec, Montreal,
Please find attached the Shipping Federation of Canada’s comments with respect to the IJC’s Plan 2014 for regulating Lake Ontario St. Lawrence River water levels.
Attachment

Charles Fowler 30th August 2013 07:27:58
NY, Sodus Point,
I was born and raised in Sodus Pt. I have seen what high waters can do to the southern shores of the lake. The devastation it causes would be far reaching throughout the state of NY. As a result I strongly oppose plan 2014. There must be a more reasonable resolution to this plan.

Chris 30th August 2013 07:23:50
NY, Sodus Point,
Economic slowdown has already started in the Village of Sodus Point, NY, even though Plan 2014 is not yet implemented. As mayor I have heard several residents tell me that they are putting their plans to renovate or to expand their homes on hold due to what Plan 2014 might bring. Slowdown in spending has started. I also have heard from a couple of “Environmentalists” that Sodus Point should raise their homes up on stilts. Evidently they do not understand engineering and or construction. Many homes were built on the ground making is impossible to get beams under the dwelling to raise them. Even if this could be done, we still have the problem of how to convey the wastewater to the treatment plant. We have fourteen lift stations that accomplish that task. They would also have to be raised as well as all the sewer pipes. Elevating them would expose them to the cold of the winter and freeze, making the Village uninhabitable even when we don’t have a flood. There is no easy or even hard way to protect the homes and infrastructure from the extremes of Plan 2014. I implore you not to recommend this plan; it definitely would place an undue burden on this community as well as others on the south shore.
Chris Tertinek, Mayor Sodus Point, NY

Stewart R Davey 30th August 2013 07:01:29
NY, Redwood,
For the past fifty-five years we have been willfully damaging the environment of the upper St Lawrence River with the current water management plan. This may have been forgivable at first, but now that we clearly see the results it is unconscionable to continue. You had it right last year with plan Bv7. Implement plan 2014 now. No more waiting. No more revisions.
Martha Collins 30th August 2013 06:56:32  
Ontario, Wasaga Beach,  
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Ben J. Mac An Tuile 30th August 2013 06:50:51  
New York, Rochester,  
People, their homes and their livelihood should come first; period! It’s unconscionable to think that a plan could be implemented with full knowledge that it would cause thousands of people’s homes and their properties to be destroyed, costing millions of dollars annually. A better plan would be to conserve, preserve and protect the wetlands and other natural shoreline environments from further development. The current lake plan already has high and low water levels throughout the year, which the plants and animals have adapted to. The focus should be shifted towards reducing invader species, controlling run-off from housing tracts and farmlands of fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals into the tributaries spilling into Lake Ontario. Stiff fines should be issued for people using such chemicals whose properties lie within the Lake Ontario watershed. Shipping vessels using the St. Lawrence Seaway who dump their ballast water into the lake should be monitored and fined if they do so. Nonpoint source pollutants, such as sediments, nutrients, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, animal wastes and other substances that enter our water supply as components of runoff and ground water, have increased in relative significance and account for > 50% percent of the pollution in U.S. waters. The Hudson River has tremendously improved over the past 40 years due to the Clean Water Act, by educating the public sector on the determents that upstream pollution has down-stream and by holding accountable, the industries that have polluted the river. Please, I respectfully request that you reject Plan 2014 as it will destroy hard-working, tax-paying people’s lives and follow the guidance put forth by the Clean Water Act. Thank you. Ben Mac An Tuile.

Janet Chaney 30th August 2013 06:49:01  
NY, Sodus Point,  
Although I am pro-environment, I strongly OPPOSE Plan 2014. This is a complex issue that demands balancing competing interests of shoreline communities, industry, and environmental stewardship. The water front property owners stand to incur major damage and loss of their homes and businesses, which will negatively impact the local economies. The environmental quality of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence Seaway must be addressed, but there must be a better way to do this without risking the homes and livelihoods of shoreline communities.

kenneth j. deedy 30th August 2013 06:42:23  
ny, bayport,  
I support the immediate implementation of Plan 2014.

William Couch 30th August 2013 06:23:09  
NY, Clayton,  
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. I appreciate the environmental advantages and the economic benefits of an extended boating season. The late summer draw down is dangerous and harmful.

Camille 30th August 2013 06:10:29  
Quebec, Sherbrooke,  
À la Commission mixte internationale, Je souhaite par la présente vous faire part de mon soutien au Plan 2014 et vous appeler à pleinement et entièrement adopter dès maintenant cette nouvelle approche de gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario. C’est grâce au Plan 2014 que nous pourrons assurer un avenir viable à ce bassin versant emblématique en lui permettant de retrouver des niveaux et débits plus naturels, et que nous permettrons la restauration d’un écosystème précieux pour la faune et toutes les communautés qui l’habitent. Le plan doit
permettre de réaliser le but ultime de la CMI, soit de redonner des flux et débits plus naturels à ces cours d’eau, au bénéfice de l’environnement et tout en tenant compte d’autres intérêts. La santé des écosystèmes d’eau douce est indissociable de celle des communautés, de la faune et de la flore, et de la viabilité de notre économie. Ainsi en implantant une meilleure gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario, nous offrirons une meilleure qualité de vie à tous les citoyens qui vivent, travaillent et vont se ressourcer le long des berges du fleuve et du lac. Ce nouveau plan contribuera également à la viabilité économique, environnementale et sociale de cet immense bassin hydrographique que constituent le lac et le fleuve. C’est donc avec enthousiasme que j’appuie cette nouvelle démarche en vue de la régularisation des niveaux d’eau dans le fleuve Saint-Laurent et le lac Ontario. Je vous remercie de tenir compte du témoignage de ma position dans ce dossier. Cordialement, Camille Bussières-Hamel

Chantal Forest 30th August 2013 06:07:38
Quebec, Sherbrooke,
Je demeure au Québec 2 des rivières de ma ville se jettent dans le Fleuve St-Laurent à la hauteur de Drummondville au Centre du Québec. L’eau et tous les écosystèmes qui en dépendent, dont l’Homme, nous obligent à restaurer ce que nous détruisons et abîmons depuis des décennies. On est à un point de non-retour.

PETER BLEAU 30th August 2013 06:06:56
NY, CHIPPEWA BAY,
I support Plan 2014 because of its environmental advantages and the economic benefits of an extended boating season. I would like to see the end of the late summer draw down which impacts boating during September and October.

Jeffrey Burt 30th August 2013 05:47:21
NY, Chippewa Bay,
I support Plan 2014 and strongly believe that it should be implemented.

Lisa Weber 30th August 2013 05:43:57
NY, Wellesley Island,
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Eric Mysak 30th August 2013 05:42:36
Ontario, Toronto,
I support Plan 2014.

Roberta Majka 30th August 2013 05:39:35
New York, Rochester,
We purchased our home on the south shore of Lake Ontario in Greece, NY, in September 2004. We have 2 concerns about the proposed 2014 Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence River regulation. The first is the proposed higher allowed lake levels. The 2nd concern is the multiple costs for property restructuring to homeowners and municipalities, due to high water, or high water-wind damage. We read your 2014 plan. None of your information or data addresses the impact of wind on high water levels. The impact of high wind and waves can be unbelievable. For example, a week after we moved into our home, there was a tremendous amount of wind out of the northwest and huge waves. Afterwards, we found hundreds of Zebra Mussels stuck to the north side of the house -- which is 175 feet from the lake. In March of this year, high waves and wind carried a large tree and rocks larger than my foot, over the 8-foot high breakwall and up the lawn. During that same storm, a smaller rock was propelled 175 feet, shattering a porch window. As I look at your Lake Ontario water level chart for September 2004, and March 2013, I see that the lake levels were 246+, and 244.8 feet, respectively, for the above examples of wind and wave force. There was very little cost for repairs. If the Joint Commission approves a plan to allow the Lake Ontario...
water level to be as high as 248 feet (Figure 1, 2014 Plan Overview), I can't even imagine what kind of damage and cost would be incurred during high waves and wind. My 2nd concern is who pays for restructuring to prevent property damage from potentially higher water levels and who pays for actual damages ? The out-of-pocket capital required to beef up an existing breakwall, or install a new one, is thousands of dollars. How many lake homeowners have that kind of money ? Your proposal suggests a restructuring figure of 1.94 million dollars. This amount seems naive and far below what actual costs would be, when you consider that thousands of lake homeowners will be affected. The only option might be to sell one's lake home. How many people would want to buy a lake home at that point ? The value of lake property would be strenuously depreciated. Those of us on the lake pay very high taxes. If lake houses don't sell, there goes the tax base, which would then logically shift to non-lake homeowners to share the tax burden. United States and Canadian citizens are slowly getting back on their feet after the recession. A plan to raise the Lake Ontario water level incurs a huge financial burden for individuals and municipalities. The 2014 Regulation Plan should not be allowed.

Joy Rhinebeck 30th August 2013 05:30:29
N.Y., Clayton,
I support PLAN 2014, and I hope you do too!!

Penny P Joel 30th August 2013 05:14:12
New York, Clayton,
Please pay careful attention to Plan 2014 to help preserve the natural water levels of the beautiful St. Lawrence River. The wildlife is an important aspect that needs your protection in the future.

Jeffrey Lee 30th August 2013 04:44:29
NY, Camillus,
As a sailboater who has spent the last 30 years sailing on on Little Sodus Bay on the south shore of Lake Ontario I am opposed to Plan 2014.

Gildo Tori (on behalf of Ducks Unlimited Inc. and Ducks Unlimited Canada) 30th August 2013 04:38:20
MI, Ann Arbor,
Please see attached document. Thank you.
Attachment

Samantha 30th August 2013 04:37:12
NY, Lima,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

NJ 30th August 2013 04:22:24
NY, Marcellus,
As a property owner on the eastern shore of Lake Ontario, I am against B14 and the possibility of lake levels rising another four feet. This proposal benefits the hydro power business (the Canadians could build those hydro plants they've wanted?), the shipping business (what's a few more invasive species?) along with more boats to foul up those wetlands created by increased water levels. With the approach of a storm that has 12' to 14' waves as in the Spring seasons of 2012 and 2013, can you really drain enough water from the lake to minimize lakefront erosion? Last weekend the beach at Southwick Park was closed due to high bacteria levels. The IJC should be looking into the health of the lake rather than exploiting it to further risk.
John Peter Ferraina 30th August 2013 04:21:37
NY, Honeoye Falls,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

Calie Jo Maxam 30th August 2013 04:20:29
NY, Honeoye Falls,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

L. Orr 30th August 2013 04:10:48
NY, Rochester,
Although I am pro-environment, the 2014 plan sees somewhat extreme. The high-water trigger levels are set so high that the proposed plan seems unfair to property owners who may suffer erosion, especially on the southern shore.

Save Our Sodus, Inc 30th August 2013 04:10:27
NY, Sodus Bay Area,
Attached the online petition with the signers of 2,200 opponents to Plan Bv7, and the modified Plan BV7 named Plan 2014.
Attachment

Barbara Vars 30th August 2013 04:08:21
New York, Wellesley Island,
I support plan 2014 and feel it should be implemented without further delay. The time to move forward is NOW.

Jane Carver 30th August 2013 04:06:36
NY, Clayton,
The fragile ecosystems of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River require that we be responsible stewards of their natural resources and beauty. We have the opportunity to rectify some of the damage done by the mistakes and abuses of the past decades. I support Plan 2014 as the best option available at this time, and am in favor of immediate implementation.

Catherine Ginies 30th August 2013 04:01:33
Ontario, Warsaw,
I grew up in Cornwall, Ontario which is located on the St. Lawrence River. My father and I fished for perch on the river and as a child I could look down 20 feet through clear water to see the schools of fish swim over the sandy bottom. As I grew older, I saw the river devolve to weeds and dirty water to what the river is today...a disgusting toxic waste. And, I would not eat another perch from it. A major food supply has been destroyed. How will we feed ourselves? Monsanto? Clean up the St. Lawrence River for our future.

Jeanne Snow 30th August 2013 03:55:17
New York, Alexandria Bay,
I totally support Plan 2014 which should help many problem areas on the St. Lawrence River in the 1000 Islands area. Goose Bay is suffering from current regulations.

Laura Stevens 30th August 2013 03:54:07
New York, Buffalo,
I am opposed to plan 2014
Kristen Taylor 30th August 2013 03:53:53
New York, Clayton,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Dale Corsa 30th August 2013 03:46:50
NY, Redwood,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Katy Keohane Glassberg 30th August 2013 03:42:00
NY, Wellesley Island,
I support Plan2014!

Lindsey R 30th August 2013 03:33:05
Ontario, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Lindsey R

Annie Cardinaux 30th August 2013 03:23:17
NY, Thousand Island Park,
I support plan 2014. Business, tourism, biodiversity, ecological sustainability, and human interests depend on one another. Thank you for considering this plan.

Samantha Dupre 30th August 2013 02:59:14
Ontario, Newmarket,
Comments are attached.
Attachment

Leigh Smith Charron 30th August 2013 02:58:51
NY, Dewitt,
As a member of Save the River, I support the proposal to return to "more natural seasonal water levels and flow" in the St. Lawrence river valley. I have summered on the St. Lawrence for my entire 64 years and have watched with concern the degradation of the river environment. The abundant wildlife that was observed in my youth is no longer apparent. Species of birds and fish that were found in great number are diminished or no longer seen. Any plan that will improve the wildlife habitat will be beneficial for all concerned.

Elizabeth Hendriks (on behalf of WWF-Canada) 30th August 2013 02:58:27
Ontario, Toronto,
Please consider the attached document WWF-Canada's statement on Plan 2014 (based on testimony given July, 15th, 2013).
Attachment
Jay M. Siegel 30th August 2013 02:56:51
Virginia, Nellysford,
I support Plan 3014

Vickie Morgado 30th August 2013 02:36:48
ON, Mississauga,
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Vickie Morgado

Alan R Buyck 30th August 2013 02:33:44
NY, Sodus Point,
I'm opposed to plan 2014. Who is going to pay for the damages to my dock and house?

Jane Heffron 30th August 2013 02:28:00
United Kingdom, London,
I support plan 2014 and suggest you implement this now.

Heather Scott 30th August 2013 02:14:58
Ontario, Kingsville,
Could we please make an effort to do the right thing for our ecosystem of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River by putting Plan 2014 into action, showing that humans CAN be GOOD stewards of the land and water. Thank You, Heather

Jane Arras 30th August 2013 02:01:51
NY, Wellesley Island,
I support plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented immediately.

Thomas S. Richards 30th August 2013 01:56:32
NY, Rochester,
See attached response
Attachment

Stephen Schultz 30th August 2013 01:52:16
NY, Rochester,
I support Plan 2014 and would like to see it implemented immediately. The ecosystem of the Lake and St. Lawrence River should be put in the forefront above all other interests. Thank you.

Robert Miron 30th August 2013 01:19:17
New York, Syracuse,
We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to restore the health of the St. Lawrence River. I support Plan 2014 and urge is full and speedy implementation. The plan will begin to reverse more than
50 years of damage to the River and ensure that future generations will inherit and enjoy a world class water body. I have had a second home on the St. Lawrence river for approximately 25 years and have been visiting for over 50. Please don't lose this opportunity. Thank you for your consideration.

Martin Jean 30th August 2013 00:04:55
Qc, Boucherville,
I would like to express my full support for the Plan 2014 and encourage its full and speedy adoption in order to achieve the ultimate goal of the Plan.

Dr. Daniel Barletta 29th August 2013 23:44:16
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 25
Attachment

Patrick Moynihan 29th August 2013 23:40:26
New York, Clayton,
I STRONGLY support plan 2014 for healthier waterway!!!

Kevin Heffron 29th August 2013 21:58:54
New York, Wellesley Island,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now

Ted Mascott 29th August 2013 20:27:36
New York, Clayton,
As a nearly 20 year resident of the Thousand Islands region and an active boater, I support Plan 2014.

Christopher Whipp 29th August 2013 19:25:28
Quebec, Montreal,
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the
coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

**Jacqueline Hamilton** 29th August 2013 18:29:54
Ontario, TORONTO,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Jacqueline

**Helen Elam** 29th August 2013 18:10:22
New York, Rochester,
The Town of Irondequoit’s letter references plan B7 however, plan 2014 is no better. I am appalled by the way plan 2014 was communicated to the public. The research and findings are not in laymen’s terms; rather they are in jargon only a statistician can understand - if that! The so-called “public meetings” were held at times/locations strategically chosen to prevent the majority of the stakeholders from attending. An attempt by the IJC to squelch stakeholder’s from commenting. I did not see any media coverage of the meeting held in downtown Rochester on 7/16/13. Did the IJC purposely pay the media to stay away that day? As a member of Nature Conservancy, what I find ironic is the fact that the IJC wants to increase the lake levels during the Spring, a time when it is already naturally high due to the winter melt and subsequent run-off from the land up-stream, as well as the natural flow from the other Great Lakes. The IJC that has been using the environmental groups such as the Sierra Club and TNC to gain political momentum, when in reality it is not about the environment or water quality at all. It’s all smoke & mirrors to get their agenda approved. The IJC let a professor from Ottawa, a former member of the IJC, speak beyond his 3 minutes. Why? Because he was behind the anti-democratic position to allow the “people” a voice (his stipend was probably funded by the hydro-electro company!). I understand that the funding has to come from somewhere, that we need alternative sources of energy and that wetlands are the sponge of the ecosystem, absorbing all of those bad chemicals…but the clinker is that the professor actually said that the IJC should not be concerned about the riparian’s problems on the south shore. Who needs all those riparian tax-paying people anyway? He also added that the IJC should neglect the law from 1999 mandating that the governments of the US and Canada be involved in this decision; just move on and approve plan 2014!!! That was his 6th point which he admitted he never previously expressed, but certainly made it his #1 priority on the 8/27/13 teleconference! Please stop insulting our intelligence and the our hard-earned money that went into funding these studies and just come out and say it; the lake level has to rise because the hydro-electric power company needs it to do so. If it is really a concern for water quality and diversity of species, then the focus should be on reducing shoreline development, upstream pollution, i.e. eliminating fertilization of suburban yards, farms and antiquated septic systems and stopping companies and municipalities from pumping (stealing) fresh water to make profits. If plan 2014 is truly about the environment and getting Lake Ontario to a more natural state (as it was prior to the 1950’s), then why not propose eliminating the Saunders-Moses dam and the St. Lawrence Seaway altogether?

Attachment
AL GROTH 29th August 2013 18:02:34
NEW YORK, CAPEVINCENT,

it’s not a good thing when your grand kids can’t fish off the dock. or you can’t put your boat in the water and you can’t pump water to your house. We NEED THE LEVEL TO STAY UP!

Terry L. Yonker 29th August 2013 17:21:26
New York, Youngstown,

I urge the IJC to adopt the Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence Plan 2014 along with the implementation of the Directive to the International Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence River Board on Operational Adjustments, Deviations and Extreme Conditions. The Plan is best for the health of the Lake Ontario ecosystem and fair to US and Canadian riparians. Opposition to this and previous proposed plans is overblown. The Castle at Old Fort Niagara at the mouth of the Niagara River will not be in danger of falling into Lake Ontario because of this plan. Erosion at Old Fort Niagara has been occurring for centuries and will not change because of this plan. Lake levels a few inches higher in the spring and a few inches lower in the fall will not change the actual erosion rate. It is the more frequent storms that threaten the fort. The erosion at Fort Niagara is an issue that the State of New York has neglected for years and needs to address quickly before additional storm damage occurs. Twenty-five years ago I was appointed to the Natural Resources Working Group of the IJC Water Levels Reference Study that looked at the possibility of regulating all five Great Lakes to maintain water levels so that levels did not vary more than one foot from the long term mean. The issue then was high water. The study board concluded that further regulation of Great Lakes water levels was not practical, nor economic, nor called for, except for some modest efforts to adjust water levels to better protect the health of Lake Ontario’s fragile ecosystem and downstream St. Lawrence River. My training is as a meteorologist. I was the first to introduce the prospect of climate change into the five lake study. I have studied global warming and subsequent climate change for 50 years. In the long term, water levels of the Great Lakes are expected to decline, in some models by several feet. As Gordon Lightfoot noted, Lake Ontario takes what ever flows into it from the upper lakes, be it more or be it less than historical flows. Over the next several decades we will be tackling an altogether new set of issues: maintaining flows over Niagara Falls, limiting hydro power production, limiting shipping through the St. Lawrence Seaway, limiting recreational activities that depend on higher water levels, and protecting emerging wetlands from development. Please adopt the Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence Plan 2014.

Michael J Sinnott 29th August 2013 17:13:27
New York, Sodus Point,

I am opposed to Plan 2014!

Catherine BoothSmith 29th August 2013 17:05:04
Ontario, Bowmanville,

I strongly support Plan 2014. The iconic Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River watershed needs and deserves our help to become and stay healthy for generations to come.

Karen McKergow 29th August 2013 17:01:54
NY, Alexandria Bay,

I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. I believe this to be the best plan for the health and sustainability for Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence River.

Jeremy T. Smith 29th August 2013 16:46:57
NY, New York,

I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.
Bruce Radicello 29th August 2013 16:39:41
NY, Baldwinsville,

I cannot support plan 2014 unless it is modified with provisions to make it more equitable. Power generating facilities and Shipping industries will benefit, while riparian landowners have been unfairly asked to take the full cost burden. The warnings are clear - if plan 2014 is put into place, there will be significantly more damage during periods of high water management. If IJC plan 2014 is approved anyway, it signifies is that the governing body believes that the public benefits outweigh the damages inflicted upon the landowners. The landowners will have loss of use of waterfront as erosion washes away land and property. Make no mistake; this is not natural erosion, but rather accelerated erosion, possibly with devastating results, through intentional flooding called upon by the water management plan 2014. By the IJC’s own estimation, Plan 2014 will cost landowners $3.5 M per year. Some will lose property, others may lose homes, but it amounts to land intentionally taken. Property rights routinely receive constitutional protection. (Water Rights). “The EMINENT DOMAIN CLAUSE of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution limits the power of state and federal governments to impinge on the riparian rights of landowners. It requires the government to pay the victims of takings an amount equal to the fair market value of the water rights.” Eminent domain has four elements as set forth in the Fifth Amendment: (1) private property (2) must be taken (3) for public use (4) and with just compensation Some will argue that plan 2014 will only manage the Lake Level at its “normal and more natural state”, but this is a false assumption. We don’t know what the natural state is anymore since the Moses-Saunders Power Dam has managed water levels for 55 years. In addition, the Great Lakes watershed and streams have been altered in those decades as well. Let us be fair and open on the options. There are three possible outcomes of this process: - Amend the plan to budget for payment for damages inflicted upon private landowners as a direct result of plan 2014; money that can be used for seawall construction, shoreline conservation and restoration, beach replenishment, structure relocation or protection, and other appropriate mitigations. - Or explain why the IJC Plan strips property owners of their Constitutional right - Or do not implement plan 2014 Take responsibility for your actions, and do not abandon those who are harmed by your actions, because that is not what we do to our citizens in the United States. Environmental needs must be weighed against the good or harm it does to others. Rethink this plan and win over the landowners with a modified plan that does not trounce their interests and rights. An environmental win at the expense and misery of others would be appalling. It diminishes its legitimacy, and would be a hollow win that could well backfire. And what does that kind of imperious action say about us as a people, and as a society?

June Summers 29th August 2013 16:21:03
NY, Rochester,
I support Plan 2014 because of the possibility of wetland and economic recovery under the plan.

Debra Ryan 29th August 2013 16:06:07
NJ, Westfield,
I own a cottage on 6th St in Sodus Point, NY and am opposed to plan 2014.

Carrie McNally 29th August 2013 16:05:54
NY, Fineview,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

George Textor 29th August 2013 15:50:39
n.y., wellesley island, ,
I support plan2014. The current plan is not adequate fr the 21st century and the more complex water needs and issues on the St Lawrence and Lake Ontario
Cheryl A. Gressani 29th August 2013 15:50:06
NY, Syracuse,
I am a property owner along the eastern shore of Lake Ontario in the Town of Ellisburg (Montario Point), where my family has been summering since the 1930s. I am writing to express my strongest OPPOSITION to the IJC’s Plan 2014 for the following reasons: • Plan 2014 would cause severe erosion of my property under its high water scenario • Plan 2014 does not provide for compensation for mitigation strategies or loss of land. • Plan 2014 violates a principal guideline of the IJC 2006 study, namely: “No plan should be implemented that results in a disproportionate loss to any one user group or geographic area.” • Plan 2014 was not recommended during the 2006 IJC study because it will cause far greater damage to Lake Ontario’s southern and eastern shore owners while offering little additional benefit to the environment. • Plan 2014 was crafted largely in secret, closed door negotiations, whereas the IJC conducted its 2006 in many public forums and study groups over the course of many years. • Plan 2014 is based on outdated and incorrect assumptions and speculative data (refer to the Study Board Minority Report of 2007 that pointed out these numerous errors). For these and many other reasons, I respectfully request that the IJC REJECT in its entirety Plan 2014. Furthermore, I suggest that the IJC immediately enact a moratorium on the development of any future proposals to modify the range of water levels on Lake Ontario until the completion of a thorough, objective analysis of the potential economic impact on the shoreline’s riparians, recreation, tourism and business. Sincerely,

Anthony Mollica 29th August 2013 15:46:50
New York, Alexandria Bay,
I totally support Plan 2014 and hope it will be implement now

Sara Gillespie 29th August 2013 15:37:56
Ontario, St.Catharines,
Lake Ontario needs a lot of help to keep it healthy and provide life we should take pride in Lake Ontario as well as the St.Lawrence River . Both give something for local people to do as well as tourists having them polluted is frankly embarrassing lets take care of the problem .

Ashley Barton 29th August 2013 15:27:50
Ontario, Cannington,
This beautiful, delicate habitat is home to many non-replaceable, beautiful, fragile, harmless creatures. Lets show them some compassion. It is their earth just as much as it is ours. Respect.

Marcia Fowler 29th August 2013 15:27:46
New York, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014. The Plan will result in man-made destruction on the southern shore of Lake Ontario. The economic loss will be felt by individuals, businesses, communities, counties and eventually New York State. Surely there must be a more equitable solution.

Craig S. Holt 29th August 2013 15:21:11
MA, Marlborough,
As a lifelong summer resident in the 1000 Islands region, I strongly support Plan 2014. I believe this plan provides the best balance of benefits for all interests.

Jane Hayslip 29th August 2013 15:20:03
N.Y., Williamson,
No -I do not want plan 2014 as I work and play on Lake Ontario.
Joseph Brogan 29th August 2013 15:18:54
NY, N. Rose,
I am opposed to plan 2014

Judy Keeler 29th August 2013 15:14:12
NY, Redwood, NY,
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Jessica Kohout 29th August 2013 15:13:24
NY, Williamson,
I am opposed to Plan 2014. The plan that has been in effect has worked well. This summer with normal water levels we have seen lots of damage to our sea wall.

Victoria B 29th August 2013 15:09:00
ON, Wiarton,
Fresh water is essential ... please do everything you can to preserve it.

Nathalie Rockhill 29th August 2013 14:45:34
ON, Toronto,
I strongly support Plan 2014. Regulating water levels in the great lakes and the St. Lawrence River will make a huge difference to the health and vitality of fish and wildlife, and help return us to a proper balance with nature. Thank you.

Sharon Rose 29th August 2013 14:30:55
NY, WATERPORT,
I am apposed to the raising the levels of Lake Ontario. My property would be destroyed and you would lose my taxes and local support. I am also part owner of 13043 Mitchell Dr. which is on the Lake.

Dalton P. Foster 29th August 2013 14:27:02
New York, Massena,
I would encourage the adaptation of Plan 2014. We have seen a long and tedious process since 2000 without any real changes. We need to bring ourselves into the 21st century. I believe the most critical part of the new plan has yet to be elucidated, i.e., the Adaptive Management Plan. We do not know enough about the dynamic characteristics of the basin. We need more involvement from academia and local communities in gathering and processing information of a wider spectrum. We need to develop a kinetic model of the St. Lawrence River through its various compartments. We need to set up an online data analysis of the wind vector effects (magnitude and duration) on the various locales within the basin. We need to have more active public involvement (e.g., a PIAG-like group) associated with the Adaptive Management Plan. Like any process, we need constant improvement. Best of luck with the politics, Dalton

Mr. Jean Aubry-Morin (St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation) 29th August 2013 14:20:26
Ontario, Cornwall,
Dear Commissioners It is my pleasure to enclose The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation’s comments on the Plan 2014 for the “Lake Ontario – St. Lawrence River Regulation” as presented on July 18, 2013 at the International Joint Commission Technical hearing in Montreal. On behalf of The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation (Seaway) and stakeholders, I would also like to extend our appreciations for the opportunity to share our perspective and expertise in water regulation on the Seaway system with the commission for the betterment of the proposed plan. We are providing our comments within the prescribed time of
August 30th 2013 using this electronic transmission and will also submit its content via normal courier to your Ottawa office. Best Regards Yours sincerely, Jean Aubry-Morin Vice-President External Relations, SLSMC

Attachment

Gaillard L Schmidt 29th August 2013 14:18:12
New York, Clayton,
In support of Plan 2014 My family has been a seasonal resident of the Thousand Islands region of the St. Lawrence River since approximately 1885. As with many long-standing residents, we have been concerned with the many challenges and ecological stresses that unregulated or poorly regulated usage have had on the lake/river ecosystem. Along with many others who are concerned with preserving this unique area, I support Plan 2014 as a firm step in the right direction. My concern rests not only with measures that will mediate and reverse damage that has been done, but that will move us closer to assuring the indefinite sustainability of the lake/river environment. The first inhabitants called this region "Manitouana", the Garden of the Great Spirit; that's what I want the generations that follow us to experience. Let's implement Plan 2014.

Wade Cook 29th August 2013 14:18:02
NY, Rochester,
I am strongly opposed to Plan 2014. This plan is likely to cause extensive property damage to homes and businesses along the south shore of Lake Ontario. In particular, our neighbors at Sodus Point, NY, will experience flooding at the high water level allowed under Plan 2014. To change the water level for homes and businesses that have been in place for 50 years or even more is terribly unfair and should be patently illegal.

Richard Menaldino 29th August 2013 14:16:49
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

Christine 29th August 2013 14:16:39
NY, Orchard Park,
I am not knowledgeable about Plan 2014, and am not an environmental scientist. However, the Nature Conservancy does seem to be a reliable source of accurate information. I learn from them that this plan is in the best interest of our ecosystem, clean energy & jobs. I support Plan 2014.

leemoore 29th August 2013 14:07:19
Ontario, Hamilton,
all our waterways need to be protected

Lynn Mehaffey 29th August 2013 13:41:45
Ontario, Wawa, Ontario,
Please protect Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence. This is part of our total ecosystem and is needed also as an environment for the wildlife living there I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to
Don O'Keefe 29th August 2013 13:14:48
NY, Lyndonville,
I am opposed to plan 2014. It seems the south shore always gets the brunt of water level changes. I’ve already had to invest in rocks for shoreline erosion and have lost stairs and decks due to high water levels. Being on the lake for 30 plus years I am hoping the commission can come up with a solution that is good for all. Thank You

Bob Paiement 29th August 2013 12:58:31
NY, PENFIELD,
For some time I have been watching the progress of the joint commission, never expecting that you would take such an extreme position. Have you honestly evaluated the significant negative impacts that your proposal would have on those of us who use Lake Ontario and the shoreline? And for what benefit, a minimal impact on wetlands, if that actually occurs? I urge you to reconsider your extreme action and NOT IMPLEMENT the proposal.

Karlene Parshall 29th August 2013 12:10:34
NY, Rochester,
I am in strong opposition to the IJC’s "new" plan 2014. Please see attached note.
Attachment

Sarah Miller 29th August 2013 11:54:55
NY, Lowville,
I am a property owner in the town of Alexandria (13607) . I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented as soon as Possible.

Marguerite Sanzone 29th August 2013 11:52:59
NY, Wellesley Island,
I strongly believe that you should implement the 2014 plan

Alison gruseke 29th August 2013 11:45:47
CT, new canaan,
I own two properties in Chippewa Bay, Hammond New York, both on the River, where my family has resided (and paid taxes) for more than 100 years. I writing to say that I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Amanda Swist 29th August 2013 11:40:28
NY, Rocky Point,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. These lakes and rivers are a crucial part to our local ecosystem, lifestyle, and economy. This plan benefits everyone and should be enacted immediately!

Bob Hamilton 29th August 2013 11:23:43
NY, North Rose,
I would like to submit my disapproval of Plan 2014 for the regulation of Lake Ontario water levels. I think the damage to our southern shore line will be irreparable and costly.
Alan O Austin 29th August 2013 10:59:58
NY, Rochester,
It is mind boggling to think that anyone would consider raising the lake level at all. There will be BILLIONS of dollars in damage and I can't even think of how many lawsuits and years and years of court cases and money spent. For the past 50 plus years people have learned to work with the already higher than "natural" lake level. I don't think you are letting a majority of the people know what you plan on doing. I live on the lake and I just learned a month ago what they were thinking of doing. I hope you have done your homework or I feel people will be looking for blood if they loose everything they work for all their lives. Sincerely, Alan Austin

Kathleen Cross 29th August 2013 10:59:53
TX, Houston,
Please support and implement Plan 2014. The Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River are much too important to the health and welfare of the Canadian and United States people and wildlife. A healthy river will benefit us all. Thank you.

Ron Treanor 29th August 2013 10:57:13
New York, Sackets Harbor,
I mostly approve of Plan 2014. The higher water levels will improve the boating situation and extend the boating season as well - especially in the upper portion of Henderson Bay. The waters around Sackets Harbor are protected by a number of outer islands and peninsulas and have limited wave action. That is not the case in all areas of the lake. As we all know, there is significant wave action in the unprotected areas of the lake and that coupled with a high-wind storm will produce significant flooding if the lake level happens to be at the 248 foot level. My concern is the insurance situation. Those living on the lake - in the flood plain area - can expect to pay special premiums and some could be quite high. Insurance Companies tend to make broad-stroke decisions on who to include in their high risk areas and those of us who normally have no storm related worries will also have to pay this extra premium.

Mary Lou Jeffery 29th August 2013 10:55:31
New York, Clayton,
I strongly support plan 2014 and encourage you to pass this plan and implement the plan now. The St. Lawrence River is a precious natural resource and it is imperative that we do everything in our power to protect the ecosystem before it is too late.

John Chisholm 29th August 2013 10:47:44
VA, McLean,
I would encourage the adoption of Plan 2014. I believe it is the option that comes closest to regulating water levels in a natural manner, short of returning the entire system to its natural state.

Rita Gefell 29th August 2013 10:46:51
NY, Thousand Island Park,
I support plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Oswego County NY 29th August 2013 10:46:16
New York, Oswego,
Please see the attached resolution adopted by the full Legislature in Opposition to Plan BV7 as amended to be known as Plan 2014.

Attachment
**Oswego County NY** 29th August 2013 10:44:29

New York, Oswego,

Please see the attached letter from the County's Legislative Committee on Economic Development and Planning in Opposition to Plan BV7 as amended to be known as Plan 2014. The Resolution referenced in the letter will be attached in a separate submission.

[Attachment]

**Andrew Raddant** 29th August 2013 10:41:02

MA, Boston,

Please see attached file for comments from the U.S. Department of the Interior.

[Attachment]

**Ronald Currie** 29th August 2013 10:33:12

N.Y., Henderson,

We have owned property on the south eastern shore of Lake Ontario in Henderson N.Y. for thirty-five years and are now in the process of making it our permanent home. I understand it will benefit some people and will also hurt a lot of property owners. Wouldn't it be better to raise the level in increments to see how it will effect the shoreline? Maybe there is a way to benefit everyone.

**David Fagner** 29th August 2013 10:32:42

NY, Sodus Point,

Good afternoon, I am writing to oppose Plan 2014. The current plan we have is working great and should not be abandoned in favor of 2014. As a full time resident in Sodus Point, the possible highs and lows from this plan could be catastrophic to our home and community. Thank you for consideration of my comments.

**Tom Piekunka** 29th August 2013 10:30:01

NY, Sodus Point,

I am opposed to plan 2014. Our family has been paying taxes on this property for the past 69 years and know you plan to flood our home and destroy our property and the NY state Chimney Bluff Park. The street to our home and break wall that protect our property is at an elevation of 248 feet. Many of our neighbors floor joice are at 248 feet. On a perfectly calm day we will be flooded when the water reaches 248. Sodus Bay can easily have 2 foot waves from the wind and boat traffic. Not only will our property be flooded by our gas meter will be flooded. How will the utility company, 1st responders such as fireman and EMS, service us if they are unable to get down a flooded road. Raising the breakwalls will not prevent flooding since we live on a sandbar. Raising the lake level above 247 feet will destroy our NYS park, Chimney Bluff, which is an International wonder. People come from all over the world to see the unique glacial formation. The fluctuation of the high and low water will not rebuild this NY state park, or beaches like I have heard at some of the IJC meetings. Once Chimney Bluffs are destroyed, they are gone forever. How will the IJC, environmentalist, hydro power company, shipping industry and government compensate us for the losses that can not be replaced. I ask the state of NY to do an environmental impact study on Chimney Bluffs and every state park along the lake. Why are we allowing the IJC to destroy our NYS parks and property? Will they start pulling the plugs on all the dams in NYS next? There must be laws protecting our NYS parks.

**Linda Kelly** 29th August 2013 10:24:44

NY, Sodus Point,

I oppose Plan 1024 and the consequences for the Sodus Bay Area.
Catrine Charron 29th August 2013 10:17:31
CA, Piedmont,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now

Karen Shughart 29th August 2013 10:15:39
New York, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

Tom Bradley 29th August 2013 10:08:49
NY, Watertown and Henderson Harbor,
Yes- I support Plan 2014. PLEASE. Now is not too soon but it's also not too late.

Christine Roets 29th August 2013 09:17:43
NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

Heather Nolan 29th August 2013 09:15:30
NY, Palmyra,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

Edward C. McNally 29th August 2013 09:03:02
NY, Wellesley Island,
I believe the time and $$ invested in studying the Lake Ontario/Saint Lawrence River Water Levels has been sufficient to produce an educated decision near term and for the IJC to recommend a new plan to Canada and the United States. While I liked some of your earlier plans, I encourage you to implement Plan 2014 as soon as practical. I understand all the issues, the varied interests, and the fact that some do not like the plan. Incidentally, they have not liked any plan. My feeling is that there is one major factor that is bigger than the power company, bigger than the Seaway, bigger than recreational boating and bigger than landowners---that simply is that a healthier Lake Ontario and Saint Lawrence River should be the overriding issue or none of the others will matter. Thank you,

John B.Hogg 29th August 2013 08:56:49
NEW YORK, RUSSELL ,
The whole country is either drying out or flooding depending on where you look. You need to watch the long range weather forecast and open or close dams in sequence, as necessary. In St. Lawrence County many of the power dams only have spillways and the water backs up and floods the low lands when it rains hard, sometimes the water is coming over the spillways over four feet in depth causing flooding in many upstream areas. The hydro-plant in Huevelton has the proper set up and lets the water out instead of backing it up as is done just about everywhere else. The hydro companies save money on the build and flood out the environment so their dams will have more water to make more electric and to hell with everyone else. This practice causes a lot of ups and downs(and wet feet) that wouldn't happen if things were done correctly. These ups and downs are magnified when they reach the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. The whole system would work better if the dams would let the water go before a storm hit and later cut the outflow when things are getting dry even if it meant losing a dollar from the loss of hydro generation by holding the lakes and rivers to a constant level. This whole thing is really a no brainer and if scientist/ biologist were to be in charge of it instead of politicians the problem wouldn't even exist.
Melanie 29th August 2013 08:36:45
NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to PLAN 2014! It would be devastating for our Village at both extremes- low water and high water!

David Klein 29th August 2013 08:18:17
NY, Rochester,
We have attached comments by Stuart Gruskin, Chief Conservation and External Affairs Officer, reaffirming support by The Nature Conservancy for Plan 2014.
Attachment

Eleanor Jeffries 29th August 2013 08:12:38
NY, Fishers Landing,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Patricia Lynch 29th August 2013 07:23:25
New York, Greece (Rochester ),
Dear Sir/Madam, as a lake onrario resident for over thirty years, I am I awe of the time and money spent on the issue of regulation of lake levels. I have witnessed how this lake can move in a very rapid manner with the right conditions and it is scary!! I DO NOT WANT TO LOSE MY HOME! PLEASE ABANDON PLAN 2014 and continue the current water level management plan. Thank you kindly .

SUSAN KNAP BROWNING 29th August 2013 07:20:07
NY, Clayton,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Marta O'Keefe 29th August 2013 07:19:34
NY, Lyndonville,
We've had a home on Lake Ontario for 32 years. We no longer have any beach. If lake levels are raised, we will lose the bottom portion of the stairs from our deck to the water; and, as a result of strong storms, could possibly lose the entire deck as well. We urgently request the lake levels be left alone which, in our opinion, is more than high enough as is.

John and Julie Odenbach 29th August 2013 06:53:32
New York, Webster,
We are totally opposed to the new Plan 2014. The propsal has totally underestimated the cost of damage to docks and structures along the Ontario shoreline. The estimates are ridiculously low. The cost to build adquate shoreline protection with large rock is currently about $1000 per linear ft. A minimum size lot would require over $100,000. Multiply that times the number of houses on the shore. Plan 2014 cost estimates are deceptive. We have an effective plan now and we should keep it. Do not approve the proposal.

Bret DeRoo 29th August 2013 06:50:46
New York, Lyons,
Please refer to the attached letter from the Great Sodus Bay Watershed Intermunicipal Committee.
Attachment
Robert and Barbara Wale 29th August 2013 06:42:33
New York, Fairport,
We oppose IJC Plan 2014 due to the devastation it will bring to the New York State Lake Ontario shoreline and the flawed process used to arrive at the final plan.

Fred Birchard 29th August 2013 06:39:26
Mi, Royal Oak,
We are opposed to Plan 2014. Please see the attached document for more commentary our stance regarding Plan 2014.
Attachment

LINDA MCCOUSLAND 29th August 2013 06:09:38
NY, CLAYTON,
Please implement Plan 2014 as soon as possible for the St. Lawrence River.

John Swenholt 29th August 2013 06:04:02
New York, Wellesley Island,
As a fishing guide and business owner here on Wellesley Island for almost 30 years, I've seen many negative changes to the St. Lawrence. I gave up guiding seven years ago due to the low waters levels which shortened the fishing season to the point that it wasn't worth it anymore. As for my business, it has suffered as well. I remember when folks came up in April to launch boats and fish and the boats remained in until late October and November. Now folks aren't launching until late May or early June and hauling their boats as early as late August because of lack of water. The current plan has been devastating to our economy and ecology of the fishery. We only have a few months each year to make a living. Extending the season would make a huge difference to our economy. I strongly support Plan 2014.

Mark Vande 29th August 2013 06:01:56
NY, Sodus Point,
As a Sodus Bay year around resident with my house on the bay and subject to the flooding at the level you propose, I am opposed to your new standard!

Rosemary A. Manes 29th August 2013 05:59:41
New York, Chippewa Bay,
I strongly support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now!!

Sandy Plumb 29th August 2013 05:54:06
New York, Wellesley Island,
I support the 2014 Plan to regulate water levels in the St Lawrence river and I think it should be implemented asap.

Paige L Stanton 29th August 2013 05:48:50
New York, Wolcott,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

Elizabeth Wolverton 29th August 2013 05:43:47
NY, Clayton,
I am writing to endorse Plan 2014 for St. Lawrence River water levels. It is by far the most fair and rational plan so far and better balances the complex issues involved. The beauty and wonder of this river can not be overrated and, after a point, can not be regained. It is critical that the water levels address ecological, the environmental, issues to maintain the diverse ecosystems present
here. At present, the levels benefit only economic factors involving Lake Ontario homes built on flood planes and the shipping interests in the Port of Montreal. Please listen to us and preserve this unique water system. thank you

**Greg Lellis** 29th August 2013 05:41:55  
New York, Greenlawn,  
I strongly support Plan 2014. It is a modern plan that achieves a good balance between all interests. It will benefit the environment and the economy while improving hydroelectric generation. This plan will make significant progress toward restoring the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario after more than half a century of environmentally damaging regulation.

**Michele Hickman** 29th August 2013 05:41:41  
NY, Sodus Point,  
I am opposed to Plan 2014.

**Ed Stein** 29th August 2013 05:23:53  
NY, Syracuse,  
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now."

**Erich** 29th August 2013 05:19:07  
NY, Sodus Point,  
I am opposed to Plan 2014

**Kelly Olcott** 29th August 2013 05:18:49  
New York, Huron,  
We are being asked to make upgrades to our septic system by Federal entities at the same time the raising of the lake will jeopardize the land housing these updated systems. Please do not raise the level and destroy our property.

**Silvia** 29th August 2013 05:17:34  
NY, Sodus Point,  
I am opposed to Plan 2014

**Rossman Giese** 29th August 2013 05:10:12  
NY, Sodus Point,  
The increase of the high water level and the increase of low water level proposed by Plan 2014 threatens the vast majority of property owners and businesses along Lake Ontario shorelines and its bays, particularly the south shore, and yet, although amazing, every IJC study has not included the disastrous effects on the bays that are discussed below. How can Plan 2014 and the people supporting the plan so blatantly ignore the devastating effects the new proposed lake levels will have on all low and many high-lying shore and near shore properties. Sodus Point present an excellent example. High water levels and storms will not only present danger of serious flooding of the near water level properties of the Village, they will also damage the sewage system that serves the entire village. This will require complete shut off of sewage facilities and water mandating evacuations for all homes and businesses on low and high lands. Low water levels will devastate marinas and all other docking areas. Sail boats will have to be moored in deeper water and it will be questionable as to how they can be accessed. Whether the implementation of the plan causes a lack of water or too much water all local land values will plummet. Tax income will also fall. Will tax rates then increase? How else can the villages pay their bills? Plan 2014 does not include compensation for damages for either municipalities, businesses, or private land owners. The expanded range of high and low water in Lake Ontario may improve the wetlands but by only 18%, yet will likely result in a much larger percentage of damage to human lives and habitat. In 1958 the IJC assured property owners of the lake levels
they would have to work with. The federal government loaned money to local municipalities to build sewer systems along the water front areas to allow people to live there. People relied on these promises and assurances and invested in building vacation and year round residences in the Village and now the IJC is saying, too bad, we changed our minds and the loss of your investments including money, time, and labor are of no concern to us. How can anyone be that callous? This amounts to an illegal “taking” of our land and our rights. We hired an architect to prepare our Sodus Point home for our retirement, but now we will reconsider investing any more in an area where liviability and property values are threatened by Plan 2014. 19 New York State Counties can't be wrong. The loss to the New York State economy is much greater than the 18% restoration of wetlands over 100 years, or the increased state revenue from Hydropower. Where in logic and common sense in this?

**Tracy Bernard** 29th August 2013 04:56:49
NY, Potsdam,
I support Plan 2014 and urge its full and speedy implementation.

**George Palmesano** 29th August 2013 04:38:21
NY, Dansville,
Who is going to look after the park systems. Higher water levels means an increase to the rate of erosion. Will my grand children be able to use the parks? Not if Plan 2014 is implemented. I am opposed to any water level management plan that has an adverse effect to the shoreline.

**Paul and Suzanne Parrott** 29th August 2013 04:36:02
New York, Syracuse,
We strongly support the Plan 2014. We have waited many years for a reasonable plan to be implemented. Many people knew that the water levels were still an on going issue and yet they chose to build in areas they knew could be effected. They claim they are for protecting the waterways when in fact it is mostly what they personally desire. Lets all say thank you to God for giving us such a beautiful area to live, and hope that the decision made will eventually be for the good of all.

**Frank C Wackerle USCG-Ret** 29th August 2013 04:35:21
N.Y., Sodus Point,
I AM OPPOSED TO THIS PLAN OPPOSED OPPOSED

**MARY ANN UDERITZ** 29th August 2013 04:34:02
NY, Brockport,
I AM OPPOSED TO PLAN 2014!!!

**Laurie Verbridge** 29th August 2013 04:33:05
New York, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014. There will be more lower water years then high. Sodus Bay has a great number of Harmful algal blooms during low water events. By Labor Day, when the water begins to go down, we already have to consider bringing our boat in because it is sitting on the bottom of the Bay. Additionally, I am concerned with the water levels and the affects they will have on our sewer systems and piping. We cannot afford further pollution from water levels that are affecting piping that was set up for the current programs.

**KIM PEASHEY** 29th August 2013 04:32:05
NY, Brockport,
I AM OPPOSED TO PLAN 2014!!! PLEASE DO NOT TAKE/FLOOD/WASH OUR PROPERTY AWAY!!!!
Anthony Menkel 29th August 2013 04:31:15
New York, Chippewa Bay,
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Cheryl Ferge 29th August 2013 04:21:48
NY, Williamson,
"I am opposed to Plan 2014".

Raj Gill 29th August 2013 04:13:03
ON, Orillia,
I support Plan 2014. A healthy freshwater ecosystem is vital for the long-term economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system.

Charles Daul 29th August 2013 04:09:33
NY, Webster,
No - South Lake shore property owner do not support this plan. The erosion on our shore is so bad already when a big storm hits in the Spring... Our houses will not handle more Lake level variation. Check here how U.S. Senator Charles E. Schumer came to see by himself:
http://www.schumer.senate.gov/new_website/record_print.cfm?id=323753

Stephen Nesspor 29th August 2013 03:58:40
New York, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014”

Mary Evans 29th August 2013 03:50:23
NY, Syracuse,
I strongly support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. I have enjoyed the beauty of the River for more that 50 years. Please let remain beautiful for the next 50 years and the next and the next ...

Judy Gordon 29th August 2013 03:39:20
New York, Rochester,
I am vehemently opposed to Plan 2014. It is not in the best interest in the health of Sodus Bay.

Maryanne Adams 29th August 2013 03:32:48
New York, Cato,
The Onondaga Audubon Society would like to go on record as supporting the Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence River Plan 2014 (Plan 2014). Although the potential for negative impact from high water levels on property along the southern lake shore is unfortunate, it would be hoped that the “Adaptive Management Strategy” built into Plan 2014 will be used to mitigate the situation if the plan needs revision. Future problems are speculative at this point. Cumulative and real damage to the environment, however, is not. For the past 50 years, under plan 1958D, water levels of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River have been kept unnaturally stable. This was beneficial for hydropower and shipping and enabled homeowners to build structures very close to the water. It also was the direct cause of serious degradation of coastal wetlands ecosystems along Lake Ontario and the upper St. Lawrence. The loss of functional meadow marsh ecosystems has caused a decrease in the Northern Pike and Black Tern populations, who need this habitat and a healthy muskrat population to maintain it. There are measurable data that indicate the negative effects of habitat degradation: the Northern Pike population has decreased by 70% and the Black Tern population has shown an 80% decline and is now a threatened species in New York. Plan 2014 will help to restore the coastal environment and thereby help the birds, fish, and mammals who live there. Restoring wetlands will improve water quality and help bring back sandy
shorelines in some areas. The Onondaga Audubon Society is a lakeshore property owner with a cottage sitting near an eroding bluff in Mexico, NY. Yet, we stand with Audubon New York in support of Plan 2014 which will begin to set things right for lakeshore ecosystems. It is time to begin to reverse the damage cause by 50 years of destructive regulation. Maryanne Adams Conservation Chair Onondaga Audubon Society

**Anne Connors** 29th August 2013 03:32:21  
NY, Niskayuna,  
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented NOW - "because we all have a place on the water".

**Gary M Baker** 29th August 2013 03:32:18  
New York, North Rose,  
"I am opposed to Plan 2014 ".

**Michael J. Foley, President Sodus Bay Junior Sailing, President Central NYSailing Assn.** 29th August 2013 03:31:03  
NY, Sodus Point,  
I am opposed to Plan 2014!

**Art Williams** 29th August 2013 03:25:48  
New York, Newark,  
If the IJC allows the new plan to be adopted, it is my opinion that they will have become beholden to one special interest group at the expense of many others including the Lake Ontario south shore property owners and businesses. As commissioners, you all took an oath to be fair and unbiased yet, the appearance is that you are on the verge of conceding to the concerns of only the environmental interest who are the only ones to benefit from the new plan. The best compromise is to stick with the plan that everyone has been able to live with for the last 50 years.

**James Gisleson** 29th August 2013 03:16:53  
New York, Sodus,  
I vehemently oppose Plan 2014 that has been proposed by the IJC. Who is going to pay the taxes when the homes on the south shore of the lake are under water? In my younger days, I was a lifeguard at Charlotte Beach in Rochester, NY. The year I started working on the beach (very early 60's), Lake Ontario was clean. I observed the pollution begin while being a lifeguard, and have watched the waters of Lake Ontario continue to deteriorate over the years. Instead of raising the lake level, the IJC should concern themselves with cleaning up the lake!

**Sara Orvis** 29th August 2013 03:08:05  
NY, Clayton ,  
We need a modern water level plan, a plan that will support a strong river and strong river communities. I support Plan 2014.

**Sandy Creek Town Supervisor Nancy Ridgeway** 29th August 2013 03:07:34  
NY, Sandy Creek,  
We do not support plan 2014.

**Joanne Ballard** 29th August 2013 03:01:20  
NY, Buffalo,  
Please consider this message in support of a healthy lake and river. • I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. • Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you, Joanne Ballard
Frank J. Leonardi 29th August 2013 03:01:03
New York, Cape Vincent,
We damage our environment enough. Take this opportunity to restore St. Lawrence River's natural processes regarding habitat, boating, and tourism.

Dennis Van Camp 29th August 2013 02:55:52
NY, Watertown,
I strongly support Plan 2014. Growing up, I spent a lot of fun days with friends fishing and swimming in the St. Lawrence River. Looking back, enjoyment came from knowing there was always a decent water level for boaters and recreation for ALL river communities. Enjoy what we can as long as there is a diverse River System with guidelines for all to follow.

Jon Spangenberg 29th August 2013 02:48:04
NY, Chippewa Bay,
I support plan 2014... I believe it’s a step towards halting and hopefully reversing the damage caused by the 50 years of managing with the old plan..

Kira Duke Clark 29th August 2013 02:44:04
NEW YORK, Alexandria Bay,
I endorse Plan 2014. As a fifth generation St Lawrence River island resident I feel this is the best plan to protect our beautiful river.

Emily Churchill 29th August 2013 02:43:32
NY, Clayton,
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. It is the only plan that balances everyone’s interests. Please protect this river; it is the most important thing in my life.

Dennis Grandjean 29th August 2013 02:28:02
New York, Ontario,
While I am not opposed to improvements to our environment and ecosystem, I am opposed to the changes proposed in IJC Plan 2014. I am retired and live on a fixed income and have just recently repaired the rock structure that separates my home and lawn from lake Ontario. The original structure and repairs are designed around the current regulations. Increases to the lake level as allowed by Plan 2014 will accelerate the rate and cost of repairs. Without provisions for adequate compensation by the state or federal governments, this is a very unfair penalty to the middle class homeowners like myself and many others. Maybe the environmental proponents of this plan would like to donate some of their own personal money for repairs to my property.

Thomas M. Voelkl 29th August 2013 02:10:09
New York, Hilton,
August 29, 2014 International Joint Commission: I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition to IJC Plan 2014. I live in the Town of Hamlin, Monroe County, NY. The vitality of our community depends on the preservation and safety of our homes, families, schools, public utilities, and infrastructure. We do not want to see these assets threatened by disproportionate consideration given to single-interest stakeholders under the auspices of commerce, energy, and the environment. We take exception to any inference that lakeshore homeowners are not environmentally conscientious. We enjoy the natural diversity of the shoreline and have a vested interest in its health and preservation. Indeed, most of the environmental damage resulting from pollution and the introduction of invasive, non-native species into Lake Ontario have resulted from the actions of commercial interests. Any action that would allow lake levels to exceed the range currently maintained under the existing Order of Approval 1958-D (243.3 feet – 247.3 feet), will have devastating consequences for lakeshore homeowners on the south shore of Lake Ontario.
The potential negative impact is not limited to loss of homeowners’ property on the lakeshore. Public utilities such as sewer and water, emergency response agencies, transportation, highways, and public property (parks) would be impacted as well. Commercial and private property owners on the south shore of Lake Ontario contribute millions of dollars annually in school, county and local municipal taxes. Loss of property and erosion resulting from high lake levels will result in lower real estate assessments and consequent reduction of property tax revenue to lakeshore communities. These negative fiscal impacts would be devastating. We strongly support adherence to the lake levels established by the International Joint Commission (IJC) as part of the Order of Approval 1958-D (243.3 feet – 247.3 feet) and urge the IJC to maintain lake levels at the low end of the range during the fall, winter, and spring to minimize seasonal storm-related damage. I urge the IJC to abandon Plan 2014. To increase lake levels now, without protection or indemnification of property owners, is an unconscionable abdication of government responsibility to its citizens.

Ken and Diane Elliott 29th August 2013 01:56:56
New York, Rochester,
We speak in strong opposition to IJC Plan 2014. We’ve lived on the south shore of Lake Ontario for 14 years. This is the home we dreamed of having for our retirement, and we did careful research before purchasing it to determine that we’re in a location that has never flooded. However, the lake levels allowed in Plan 2014 before any “trigger” actions are taken, virtually assure that we will have to try to survive springtime flooding on a too-frequent basis. Once during our time here, we lived through three frightening days when a lake level of 247 ft. coincided with a Nor’easter. Had the Nor’easter been a hurricane, and this surely will occur again as it did in 1973, the results would have been disastrous. Plan 2014 offers reassurance that an action plan exists to mitigate damage when “trigger levels” are reached. On careful reading of the plan, it is clear that “action” is not guaranteed; it depends on a Commissioner granting approval to initiate the action. IF approval is granted and "action" taken, the damage would already be done by the time the lake level decreases weeks later. The text of Plan 2014 indicates that it incorporates the 8 goals of Plan Bv7. These goals mention every interest BUT the protection of lake shore lives and property. Perhaps I should say “the protection of HUMAN lives and property.” Great care is given to mentioning the protection of wildlife and its habitat. For our entire lives, we have been outdoor enthusiasts, birdwatchers, and animal lovers. We find it ironic that WE are now endangered by environmental extremists who have the funding to drown out our concerns. Plan 2014 is flawed in process (developed behind closed doors and without public hearings in our area) and flawed in its recommendations. We do not want assurance that funds will be provided to help riparians address property damage. We want assurance that a plan will be developed that PREVENTS such damage to begin with!

Brenda petro 29th August 2013 01:51:02
Ny, Liberty,
We have a lake house on Sodus bay. last year the water levels were so low that we couldn’t get out boat out of the boat house in the middle of August because the water level was so low. please don’t allow the IJC lot regulate waterl levels. if the water level goes up it could damage the house and make the boathouse inaccessible. if this happens the value of the house would plummet and their would be a mass exidus from the area.

Diane Gottman 29th August 2013 01:44:05
Ny, Sodus point,
As a homeowner on Sodus bay who pays over $9000 a year in taxes for the privilege of living on the water it’s important for the water levels to remain consistent at a level that will not damage my property or ruin the value of this costly investment. Please do not allow the IJC to change the water level on Lake Ontario..
David S. Smith 29th August 2013 01:40:17
NY, Clayton,
Many years of work have gone into the considerations regarding desirable water level control of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Various proposals have been considered in depth, and this final proposal by the IJC reflects a reasonable balance of the needs of the users and the need to restore the ecological integrity of the lake and river ecosystems, after too many years of the balance favoring just shipping and shore owners interests. Stepping forward and implementing this Plan 2014 is the right thing to do for our magnificent lake and river.

Mary McCoy 29th August 2013 01:37:29
NY, Fayetteville,
I strongly support Plan 2014. It is a plan that benefits all interests and will help restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Eric Gorman 29th August 2013 01:19:29
PA, Landenberg,
"I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now."

Lucinda and Charles Lutwiller 29th August 2013 00:11:15
N.Y., Hilton,
I have lived on Lake Ontario for 36 years my husband for 54 years and we are appalled by the lack of consideration that is being given to all residents on Lake Ontario. The lake level needs to be lower in the fall so when the winter and spring storms come we don't get flooded. We have prepared for many springs, but with the winds mostly from the north Canada does not need to worry about those storms. In the summer the lake levels are higher to support shipping, leave it that way. We do not agree with raising the lake level to any extremes. IT MAKES NO SENSE

Max Gries 28th August 2013 19:21:57
MN, Minneapolis,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

WILLIAM BOSWELL 28th August 2013 18:12:50
NY, Canandaigua,
Please support Plan 2014

Jonathan Kaplan 28th August 2013 17:56:38
NY, Clayton,
I support Proposal 2014. It's time for government to take real action to reverse the harmful degradation we've seen on our river over the last several decades. Having swam, fished, sailed and viewed the river for more than 40 years, I can say from experience that this amazing natural resource has fallen on hard times and deserves far better stewardship. The proposed rule is the result of years of negotiation and offers a long-needed, balanced solution.

Robert S. Lamoureux 28th August 2013 16:21:38
New York, Redwood,
Please see file below
Attachment
Carol A Lamoureux 28th August 2013 16:16:58
NY, Redwood,
Dear Commissioners I am a concerned homeowner on the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, NY. We bought our home in 2000 and since that time I have seen a deterioration in the Bay that I live in (Goose Bay). I know when the St. Lawrence River was made accessible for shipping and hydro-power no one thought of what it would do to the eco-system along the River. You don't have a difficult decision to make. You must do what is best for the whole river. Protect the fishing, waterfowl and beautiful shore line. What is happening is destroying the natural habitat of the St. Lawrence River. If this continues, sad to say, you are destroying something that can be fixed. Consider the consequences if this isn't done, our children will not have the opportunity to enjoy the St. Lawrence. It will take years to recover the damage that has already been done. Don't let it continue. I know there are people who are concerned over their property and have built homes to close to the shore line. They should be ashamed of themselves, they don't see the whole picture. It is up to you to rectify the wrong that has been occurring for so many years. Stop the degradation of the River. Protect the habitat and do the right thing. This is why I strongly support Plan 2014. Help stop the destroying of fish and wild life habitat along the St. Lawrence River. If this is done, and we go back to a more natural water level (high-highs and low-lows) cattails won't and filling in Bays such as Goose Bay and other areas along the St. Lawrence. Thank you for your consideration and help stop the wrong that has been occurring for so many years. You have the power, use it wisely. Carol Lamoureux, Concerned Citizen

Evelyn and Robert Saphier 28th August 2013 16:09:52
NY, Hammond,
We wish to register our support for Plan 2014. We understand the plan to be a once in a lifetime opportunity to restore the health of our beloved St. Lawrence River. The economy of our region is intimately connected to the health of the majestic St. Lawrence, a river that attracts people the world over.

Richard Worner 28th August 2013 16:04:55
New York, Rochester,
I have lived on the south shore of Lake Ontario for over 60 years and have personally experienced the high water events in the 50s, 70s and 90s. I am a conservationist and have observed the great changes in the shoreline marshes due to upstream development and low water levels. While I enjoy the higher water levels in the summer I am very wary of high water in the spring. The entire nature of the South shore was changed by the 1973 storms when many people were forced to install emergency breakwalls. These structures changed the action of the waves and currents along the shoreline. Prior to this time most homes had some sandy beach in front of their homes in the summer and fall of the year. Most of these breakwalls were never removed after 1973. In order to avoid another catastrophic event I urge the IJC to REJECT the 2014 plan and to create a new plan that will protect the south shore from another major spring flood.

Thomas Hurley 28th August 2013 15:13:25
NY, Wilson,
Having attended many of the IJC meetings and read the comments it is obvious the facts and folks DO NOT WANT PLAN 2014. There is no need for me to restate the reasons you have heard and seen the reasons many times. DO NOT PUT PLAN 2014 INTO ACTION!

Jeff pennington 28th August 2013 15:06:30
Pa, Philadelphia,
I support plan 2014. It is fair and balanced, and should be implemented immediately.
Colleen Stuerwald 28th August 2013 15:03:28
New York, Sodus,
I am writing to express my objection to the Plan 2014 as currently written. I certainly understand the need to balance the needs of both man and nature as well as the north and south shores of the lake. This plan seems to have an imbalance in that it negatively impacts those homeowners of the southern shore. I have lived on the shore of Lake Ontario in Sodus since 1991. When I purchased my lakefront property I knew of the risks of damage from erosion, however; this was based on the plan for the water levels in place at the time of the purchase with the 1958DD Plan. Even with the current water level plan I have seen storms and wind whip the lake into tremendous waves creating significant erosion. I have willingly invested considerable dollars to protect the current shoreline of my property. This plan has no provision for creating any protective measures to prevent the damage for those certainly bound to have loss of property. People want their homes and property protected. Go back to the drawing board to create a solution that does not come at the expense of the south shore property owners.

Shirley Dittman 28th August 2013 14:57:16
New York, Rochester,
I STRONGLY oppose Plan 2014. I live on the south shores of Lake Ontario in Monroe County. This property has been in my family since 1895. During the 1950s - U.S. and Canada developed the St. Lawrence Seaway Project. This created Lake St. Lawrence, hydropower and navigation of large vessels. The plan predicted what property would be damaged. From this plan, approximately 6000 people were relocated OR compensated for their losses. But, it also created a trust in property owners (as explained by my grandfather) that in the future lake front owners would be protected from the extreme high water levels. Fast Forward to 2013 – Rumor #1: IJC and other groups have had closed door meetings to promote BV7 and then Plan 2014. Yet, as I understand, these plans were not even among the plans recommended to the IJC from their own Study Board. Also, Professor Doug Wilcox stated that improving wetlands required high water but no higher than seen under the current plan. Fast Forward to 2013 – Rumor #2 - There is a map showing how many homes will be damaged or destroyed (1800 to 2000), yet this is not going to be presented to the public. Why? Also closed door meetings? The new plan mainly promotes Hydro Power, Shipping and “their” (conservation groups) viewpoints about Climate Change. I had one person tell me – “Your house will be destroyed by Climate Change anyways – next subject.” This has been the attitude of some of the people in the ‘groups’ pushing for high water. We were also told by an IJC representative in a Hilton, NY during a 2012 public meeting: “You shouldn’t worry about taxes because once the first line of homes is destroyed, the second line of homes can now be taxed at a higher rate because they are now waterfront property.” Town officials at that meeting were outraged. Also, the citizens at that meeting questioned the environmental damage due to compromised sewer infrastructure, septic systems, flooded roads, destroyed homes, and a flooded water treatment plant in Town of Greece to name a few. Plan 2014 has “trigger points” but NOT “action points” … these are ONLY suggestions to possibly lower OR Raise the water levels IF there might be need per IJC. Yet, how many people will be left homeless while a government agency is trying to make up their minds IF it is time to take action? IJC needs to go back to the drawing board – stop catering to the whims of special interests groups.

Nels Magnuson 28th August 2013 14:34:34
NY, Manlius,
I have a residence in the Town of Hammond, St. Lawrence County, NY. I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. I appreciate your consideration. Thank you. Nels Magnuson PS, I remember voting for Ms. Pollack when she ran for Congress when we lived in Ann Arbor, MI. I know she will do her best to correct the environmental damage caused by the construction of the power project and locks.
Mary Ellen Carroll 28th August 2013 14:27:52
NY, Watertown,
The community I live in relies heavily on tourism for our economic well-being. The health of our local economy is directly tied to the health of the river/lake. Please support Plan 2014.

Brian Krystek 28th August 2013 14:11:40
NC, Cary,
I’ve been visiting the St. Lawrence River for 23 years and I have been able to watch the River evolve over the years. It wasn’t until the last few years that I began to notice drastic changes above and below water. That is why I strongly urge you to support Plan 2014. The River needs our care if it is to remain a place people want to visit year after year and a place people want to live.

Janice Souch 28th August 2013 14:03:05
New York, Sodus Point,
I do not approve of Plan 2014. Please rethink your ideas. What if it was your house involved?

Richard Dittman 28th August 2013 13:53:31
New York, Rochester,
I am opposed to the IJC PLAN2014. My Crescent Beach home is on the south shore of Lake Ontario in Monroe County, Town of Greece. Our friends and family are in shock over the attitude of the IJC and U.S. Federal Government regarding the total disrespect towards residents’ homes. As stated by an IJC representative at a 2012 Public Meeting, “IF Plan2014 does property damage – the property owners OWN that damage.” They are outraged that the government can damage or “TAKE” our homes by knowingly creating an artificial flooding situation, yet take no responsibility. Plan2014 benefits Hydropower, shipping plus the false beliefs from conservation groups saying high water will help restore the wetlands. On Edgemere Drive we own water-to-water from Buck Pond to the shores of Lake Ontario. Until DEC or any government group takes action to control invasive species in that pond, no amount of high water will help make it healthier. We have tried engaging the DEC to assist with this problem but they have refused. By the way, the invasive species is due to Shipping which is the second benefactor to your Plan2014. Plan2014 should not be implemented. Try a plan that will not disproportionately affect ONE area over another on Lake Ontario. I believe one of your responsibilities is to NOT affect one area negatively on the Lake or river in favor of another area.

Derek Allerton 28th August 2013 13:53:22
Nova Scotia, Wolfville,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Derek Allerton

Martha Cline 28th August 2013 13:30:42
NY, Hammond,
Plan 2014 is a good compromise, and is the best course of action. We’re ready! Let’s do it!
Daniel Zielinski 28th August 2013 13:25:25
NY, Jefferson,
The bottom line is that Plan 2014 punishes south shore property owners and will devastate non marsh shorelines. Where's the concern about those environments? Where's the concern about unnecessary erosion? To anyone suggesting that those of us on the south shore should have known better than build on a flood plain, let me remind you that there is a control structure at the outlet of Lake Ontario. Those dams can control the lake level to quite an extent. They have done so, with few exceptions, ever since the dams went in. A standard has been set. Therefore, south shore residents have a right to expect continued protection in the future. To now pull the rug out and tell lakeshore property owners that lake levels will be allowed to rise higher than ever seen since the dams went in amounts to a government taking of private property. To claim it's just Mother Nature is false and disingenuous. Plan 1958DD has been in effect for 55 years. Property owners have a right to expect protection. If the government wants to take and/or destroy our property, we should be compensated at the current market value. Or the government can offer shoreline protection. Either way if fair…but flooding us out is not.

NY, Jefferson,
Wow. Special interest groups have been busy beating the bushes for internet generated responses from people who have little stake and/or knowledge of what is happening to the water levels in Lake Ontario. I asked the commissioner, Lana Pollack, on the teleconference yesterday to give me a hint of where to find data on the wetlands being affected by lake levels as it was hard to find. So here we go. A few others here will recognize the authors name...Wilcox. Here's a key sentence from his 2008 paper on the predicted effects of the new plan on the marsh meadows: "...during periods of high net total water supplies, all plans lack the ability to force lower lake levels that would promote increases in meadow marsh. From a meadow marsh perspective, the difference between plans is their ability to allow lower lake levels when supplies are low (Wilcox and Xie 2007)." So, the bottom line is this...the problem with the current plan is mostly the fact that it doesn't allow the lake levels to get low enough to kill the cattails...not so much that it doesn't allow the water to get high enough to kill upland vegetation. So, commissioners...here's my solution: rework Plan 2014 so it matches the current plan, 1958DD for peak lake levels, but allows lower water levels than plan 1958DD or even your proposed Plan 2014. Those lower levels could be restricted to the non tourist season so boaters won't complain. I don't believe that the low water levels in the St Lawrence River during the fall are primarily the fault of plan 1958DD. Those low levels are mainly due to hydropower generation. If River residents don't like the low river levels...complain to the people running the hydropower...but don't blame those of us who own property on the south shore because the lake is low in the fall. HOW DID IT GET LOW?!?!?! HYDRO RAN ALL THE WATER OUT, THAT'S HOW!

Art Kirch 28th August 2013 13:18:58
NY, Rochester,
2014 is a joke! As a shorefront owner at both ends of Lake Ontario(Guffins Bay,water high)& (Kendall,water low)this week ! This plan will destroy the South Shore of the Lake! Comments are useless , if you are not a stakeholder on the South Shore, of coarse your for the plan!!!

Jim Widmaier 28th August 2013 13:02:51
NY, Rochester,
I strongly support the Plan 2014 and the efforts of the IJC to commence implementation. I grew up along the western shore of Lake Michigan and spent many hours of my youth enjoying the benefits it provided our community. I have lived my entire adult life along the southern shore of Lake Ontario and have had the privilege of property ownership on the shores of the St. Lawrence
River. Enhancing the ecology of the Great Lakes Basin is a major concern of mine and I am hopeful that a change in water level management will be approved. Change breeds improvement.

William Breitenbuecher 28th August 2013 12:43:12  
new York, Morristown,  
We need natural water levels on the St Lawrence not only for recreation but more importantly for the wildlife and native plants.

Paul Matthews 28th August 2013 12:32:07  
NY, Vestal,  
I support 2014, and believe it should be implemented as soon as possible. It makes so much more sense than anything else that has been proposed!

Barbara L Schrier 28th August 2013 11:46:07  
NY, Waverly,  
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Doris J. Britt 28th August 2013 11:37:02  
NY, Webster,  
I am against the proposal as it leaves those of us who live on the lake subject to more flooding. Since I have lived here I have been through several major floods which destroyed our homes and land. It is heartbreaking to have to constantly worry about the safety of your own home when it is being held hostage by man-made controls

Dr. Leslie D. Ulm 28th August 2013 11:31:08  
NY, Liverpool,  
Having worked summers during college on lakes in New York, Illinois, and elsewhere, and having moved to the Syracuse area a dozen years ago to be amazed at the clean up of Onondaga Lake near where I live, and now being regular visitors to Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence, we are fully supportive of the new Plan 2014.

Betty Jane Block 28th August 2013 11:28:10  
NY, Solvay,  
I support a modern water levels plan - #Plan2014” I would like to see the River Saved ! This beautiful area has been summer home for generations to myself and family.

Nico Castellano 28th August 2013 11:26:31  
New York, kattskill bay,  
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. The environment can wait no longer and we are the only ones that can reverse the damage we have done. Please take the step.

Ron Peterson 28th August 2013 11:24:31  
NY, Henderson Harbor,  
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

John Grieco 28th August 2013 10:57:48  
NY, Cape Vincent,  
I support regulation 2014, its very important to keep the water level high.
Richard G Lockwood 28th August 2013 10:16:00
NY, Ogdensburg,
Having a home on the shores of the St Lawrence River, I am concerned about water levels and water level fluctuations. Therefore, I urge you to support plan 2014. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Richard Lockwood

Richard Wright 28th August 2013 10:00:20
New York, Hammond,
I support Plan 2014. It should have been implemented years ago. Since it hasn't, it should be implemented as soon as possible for the sake of the River, its communities on both banks, and for future generations.

David Siver 28th August 2013 09:41:27
New York, Chaumont,
Continue to keep the water high as it has been this year.

Carol Lyng 28th August 2013 09:41:16
NY, Watertown,
I Stongly Support Plan 2014. I have grown up on the St. Lawrence River. Over those many years I have seen a drastic reduction in the water levels. That reduction has adversely affected tourism activities, of which this area heavily depends on, and the reduction of wet lands. Everyone in the Thousand Islands area should be able to enjoy sporting activities on the river from Spring thru Summer and LATE FALL! As a tax payer and a boat owner in the Thousand Islands area I feel my voice should be heard & counted

Georgia Barker 28th August 2013 09:40:04
NY, Clayton,
Implementing Plan 2014 will benefit more people than it may hurt - It's time to consider the tourist industry in NNY and the harm that lower water levels cause in addition to home owners along the St. Lawrence River who have to take their boats out early in the season. Too many homes were built where they shouldn't have been allowed.

Deborah Roney 28th August 2013 09:28:04
PA, Huntingdon,
I support Plan 2014. It is critical to maintain the ecosystems of the River environment that supports all the human uses we find pleasurable and/or beneficial. I've been coming to the St Lawrence for decades, and the changes are palpable and discouraging. We need to act now.

David Schenker 28th August 2013 09:26:33
Missouri, Columbia,
I strongly support Plan 2014 and think that it should be implemented now.

Jennifer Bandala 28th August 2013 09:25:52
California, Pacific Grove,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Valerie Gilbert 28th August 2013 09:15:32
New York, New York,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.
Julie Mathien 28th August 2013 09:08:05
Ontario and New York, Toronto and Thousand Island Park,
I strongly support Plan 2014. I have summered on the St Lawrence since a child and I am deeply concerned about the long-term sustainability of the river. Climate change has triggered changes throughout our entire ecological structure, including the St Lawrence/Great Lakes system. The IJC must respond through responsible future planning.

Patrick Schiller 28th August 2013 09:05:31
Ontario, Gananoque,
I strongly support Plan 2014--having more natural fluctuations in river flow will allow for ecosystems to last longer for generations to come!

James Brown 28th August 2013 08:48:44
NY, DeRuyter,
I strongly support Plan 2014. I have visited the St. Lawrence River for 70 yr. as my aunt owned a motel in Alexander Bay. For many years I have had a boat in Clayton, NY. I would like to see the river come back to the way it was then. I think Plan 2014 could come close to accomplishing that. As far as the Lake Ontario People worrying about high water which usually occurs in the spring, I have not seen one comment that wants that. More frequent adjustments under Plan 2014 should help to prevent that. The river people are concerned about LOW water that occurs in the fall. We are on the same side. Why are we arguing? Plan 2014 as soon as possible. We do not need more endless surveys and discussions. Jim

Peter B. Sweeny 28th August 2013 08:40:01
New York, Pleasantville,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Janice Agen 28th August 2013 08:30:49
NY, Fayetteville,
"I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now."

Robert Emerson 28th August 2013 08:09:15
NY, Pittsford,
Plan 2014 has clear benefits for recreational boating, hunting, fishing, and hydroelectric production. The result will be a thriving Lake / River environment that will enrich the quality of life for all citizens of the ecosystem.

Karen Schiller 28th August 2013 07:50:49
ONT, Gananoque,
Dear IJC, I have been visiting Lindsay Island, Gananoque, ONT for almost 50 years. I strongly support Plan 2014. It is critical to change the Seaway Management System to more closely mimic natural flows if our great St. Lawrence River is to survive as a healthy ecosystem. Thank you.

Dale M. Skinner 28th August 2013 07:46:45
New York, Wolcott,
I am a property owner on Sodus Bay, NY which shares its water levels with Lake Ontario. After hearing arguments on both sides of this issue, I am convinced that allowing a greater range of water levels will do more harm than good. With my current docks, any lake level above 247 feet results in damage. I also have a boat house built prior to 1950 which is above the normal lake levels and is used for dry storage. Of course, I could raise my structures to accommodate higher water levels but who will pay for it? Why should I pay for it? Also, If I sustain damage from higher water levels, who is responsible? Should my insurance pay for it? What if they raise my rates?
Why should I pay for the increase? If lake levels become too low I would be unable to use the docks for my boat. Allowing a greater range in water levels provides no benefit to me and makes it very likely I will be subject to great financial loss. Please reject Plan 2014 in its current form.

Sherman Ward III 28th August 2013 07:41:23
Ohio, Cincinnati,
Fifty years of human-regulated water levels have significantly altered the St. Lawrence River's natural processes, damaging the environment by reducing habitat diversity, decimating populations of key native species, shortening our recreational boating season and harming our tourism-based economy. After years of study and public input the International Joint Commission has put forward a modern approach. Plan 2014 will achieve a balance of benefits for all interests by taking into account the needs of the River and Lake Ontario ecosystem for the first time. I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Floyd C. Kitto, P.E. 28th August 2013 07:39:31
New York, Dexter,
My wife and I support Plan 2014. We own and operate Kitto’s Marina located just off Co. Rte. 59, Town of Brownville, Jefferson County, New York. This has been a family owned business for 64 years. The water level in 2012 has had a very negative impact on our 2013 seasonal dockage customers. We have 26 seasonal slips, however only 14 are filled this year. This might be a small thing in the overall picture, but it is having a big financial impact on our business. I am also concerned that if the low water levels of 2012 are permitted to be the norm, there will be a great impact on all of the wet lands that are adjacent to this great and important water shed. I strongly suggest that the water levels of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River be kept at a higher level for a longer period in the fall months. Many recreational boaters and people interested in fishing now have to take their boats out around Labor Day because of the low water levels. It is my opinion that presently the IJC allows the release of too large a volume of water starting in August which is way too soon.

James Allan 28th August 2013 07:30:52
NY, Morristown,
I am a shoreline property owner and support Plan 2014. However, please note that my boating season extends to the Columbus Day - Canadian Thanksgiving weekend. Do not "pull the plug" at the end of August as has been done so often in the past.

Dawn Sucee 28th August 2013 07:24:45
Ontario, Peterborough,
On behalf of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (OFAH), its 100,000 members, subscribers and supporters, and 710 member clubs, we have reviewed the IJC's latest proposal (Plan 2014) for managing water levels and flows in the Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence River system. Please see attached for OFAH comments.

Heather F White 28th August 2013 07:24:44
NY, Watertown,
I support Plan 2014! This is a good plan that balances all interested parties while helping to revitalize the wildlife that share the lake and river. We need to be good stewards for the next generation and all those who follow. Please act now and implement Plan 2014 a good choice for our precious water.
Peg Churchill 28th August 2013 07:21:52
New York, Lyons,
Attached is file for Cover Letter to go with WC IDA Resolution opposing PLAN2014. A process and a plan providing more equity and participation should be sought.
Attachment

W. Jakaitis 28th August 2013 07:21:43
New York, Port Crane,
Reducing water levels has a Very large economical impact on the 1000 islands region. It cuts the boating season by a minimum of 2 months in some places. This can have devastating effects on the local economy. Last season alone we were NOT even able to get our Pontoon boat out of our marina in Sackets harbor after the end of July. Some of us pay to have our boats in a marina and all they can do is sit there. Please consider raising these water levels so EVERYONE can enjoy the entire boating season. Thank You

Peg Churchill, Wayne County Industrial Development Agency 28th August 2013 07:19:19
New York, Lyons,
Attached are cover letter to western, south shore NYS elected officials and a resolution passed unanimously by the Wayne County Industrial Development Agency on August 23, 2013. PLAN2014 should be abandoned and a more equitable manner of attaining balance sought.
Attachment

Wesley D. Bacon Jr. 28th August 2013 07:13:51
New York, Liverpool,
As a former owner of waterfront property on Lake Ontario that was in our family for over 80 years, and as a current boater on Lake Ontario based out of Sackets Harbor, I strongly urge you to bring back the water levels that used to be the norm prior to the current state that is is in. Consistently low water levels have literally forced people out of boating due to inability to launch boats, cottages are shuttered early for the same reason, the fishing industry and associated tourism industries have been heavily impacted, and the entire seasonal enjoyment of the waterfront area has been greatly diminished. Please correct this long-term debacle and return the Lake and River levels to their former state.

David and Carol White 28th August 2013 07:12:50
New York, Clinton,
We support Plan 2014.

Clinton Textor 28th August 2013 07:11:11
CALIFORNIA, Los Altos,
I support plan 2014 and believe we need to make it official as soon as possible.

Jill Greene 28th August 2013 07:04:57
New York, Ithaca,
I support Plan 2014. It has clear benefits for recreational boating, hunting, fishing, and hydroelectric production. The result will be a thriving Lake / River environment that will enrich the quality of life for all citizens of the ecosystem.
Susan Bryant 28th August 2013 07:03:47
Ontario, Elmira,
I have been visiting the family cottage in the 1000 Islands for 6 decades, and the health of the river and the Great Lakes ecosystem and economy (one depends on the other) is very important to us personally. I have followed the consultations and support the Plan 2014 as a sensible approach to protecting the area and balancing competing interests and uses.

John Solberg 28th August 2013 06:54:17
NY, Ontario,
The IJC Plan 2014 provides considerable environmental benefits and additional benefits to individuals enjoying water sports, and moves toward the goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment...” I support these benefits. But benefits do not come without costs, and the Plan simply ignores the costly impact its changes will have on people and communities on the shores of Lake Ontario. Some people will lose their homes, some communities may become unsustainable. Many will have to invest thousands and tens of thousands to dollars to protect and maintain their shorelines and their homes. While the goals and benefits are of great value to the environmental and social system as a whole, it is irresponsible to relegate the costs to a few, and to do so without even an acknowledgement or plan. Until the proposed plan treats both the benefits and its cost with equal integrity, I cannot and will not support it.

Melanie Phillips 28th August 2013 06:50:51
NY, Philadelphia,
I live very close to the 1000 Islands and frequently visit for recreation, shopping, and dining. The region depends on the health and vitality of its waterways. Healthier lake and river wetlands will support stronger populations of native fish and wildlife, improving the area’s hunting and angling, and strengthening the recreational economies that rely upon them. I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. Thank you, Melanie Phillips

Swami Sarvaananda 28th August 2013 06:45:27
VA, Buckingham,
Please--after spending 70 of 71 years at the Saint Lawrence River, Spicer Bay, in the summer and early Fall, Pass the Plan 2014! It is better than what we have at the moment and may bring the River back to my childhood levels of water on the shore.

Laranda 28th August 2013 06:44:20
Manitoba, Winnipeg,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Laranda Odell
Lisa D’Annunzio 28th August 2013 06:39:55
Pa, Malvern,
I am writing to support Plan2014 as I want to speak up for the St. Lawrence River. If this plan doesn't go through, The River may lose its last best chance for more natural levels and flows and a reversal of the slow choking death of its bays and the precipitous decline of many indigenous species. Please help Save The River!

Caroline Larson 28th August 2013 06:38:14
NY, Clayton,
Dear IJC, I strongly support Plan 2014. For 62 years I have enjoyed summers on the St. Lawrence. In recent years the ecology of The River has profoundly changed. It is critical to change the Seaway Management System to more closely mimic natural flows if our great St. Lawrence River is to survive as a healthy ecosystem. Please save our River for generations to come.

Margaret Dorsey-Nocilly 28th August 2013 06:34:48
New York, Auburn,
I and my husband support Plan 2014. This a balanced approach to controlling water levels that will protect the environment and and the economic stability of these regions.

Bridget Wright 28th August 2013 06:18:12
NY, Clayton,
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented immediately. Please help save the integrity of our wetlands!

Judy Martin 28th August 2013 06:16:03
Ontario, Guelph,
It is high time for implementing a plan that better respects natural processes and supports a healthier river system. I strongly urge that immediate action be taken on the 2014 plan.

Joseph M. Agen 28th August 2013 06:08:42
NY, Fineview,
I support the immediate implementation of Plan 2014.

Bruce Gilman 28th August 2013 05:37:39
New York, Canandaigua,
I fully support Plan 2014. Having conducted my master's field research in the coastal wetlands at the eastern end of Lake Ontario and along the St. Lawrence River, I believe that returning the hydrology to a more natural pattern will benefit the biological diversity, productivity, and natural services provided by these wetland communities. This is the correct choice for now and the future.

Michael Brown 28th August 2013 05:27:44
NY, Chippewa Bay,
I support Plan 2014 and ask for you to implement it as soon as is practical. We have owned property on Oak Island for over a decade and the changing water levels due to the current plan does not follow a natural pattern as closely as I would like to see and creates significant impacts on our ability to navigate the bay we are on.
Elizabeth Raisbeck 28th August 2013 05:25:28
New York, Clayton,
Dear IJC, I strongly support Plan 2014. It is critical to change the Seaway Management System to more closely mimic natural flows if our great St. Lawrence River is to survive as a healthy ecosystem.

John & Mary Brownell 28th August 2013 05:05:51
New York, Cayton,
I support Plan 2014. This summer we experienced the difference with the proper water levels. The boating and fishing were great!

Deborah E. Boots 28th August 2013 04:57:40
North Carolina, Franklin,
As a frequent visitor to 1000 Islands, I encourage you to implement plan 2014 this year as it is a well-reasoned solution to past negative regulation that has degraded portions of the natural river and lake ecosystem. Thank you.

Fred Hamaker 28th August 2013 04:56:01
NY, Rochester,
I counter-propose that the IJC withhold and sequester annually monies from the power and sporting industries in the amount comparable to the expected shoreline damages. Then this can be paid out to those who will certainly bear the loss from this plan.

Emmett 28th August 2013 04:55:57
NY, Clayton,
I support Plan 2014 and think it should be implemented now! We have had decades to accumulate data on the damaging impact of the current water levels plan. It is time to make the right choice for the St Lawrence River.

RICHARD PIETROSKI 28th August 2013 04:54:15
NEW YORK, SACKETS HARBOR,
I SUPPORT PLAN 2014 BRING LAKE LAKE LEVELS UP FOR LONGER AND SAFER BOATING SEASON, I HAVE LAKE FRONT ON THE SOUTH SHORE OF LAKE ONTARIO.

Sharon Walty 28th August 2013 04:52:10
New York, Henderson Harbor,
The current program reduces our water levels so low that the fishing recreational season is shortened by at least two months. The economical impact is felt at all levels; boat rentals, fishing, shopping and restaurants all of which are tax paying business that support the needs of the community. If people cease planning their vacations to the St Lawrence and Lake Ontario region, the impact will be devastating.

Charles Brown 28th August 2013 04:50:47
New York, Clayton,
I support the 2014 plan.

Stephen G Weatherly 28th August 2013 04:49:01
NY, Wellesley Island,
I support Plan 2014 and want to see it implemented.
Patrick Agen 28th August 2013 04:25:22
NY, Alexandria Bay,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. I am a second generation resident on Seaway Ave and the River needs its ebbs and flows and generally higher levels throughout the seasons.

Laura Neiman 28th August 2013 04:23:53
New York, New York,
Please support PLAN 2014

Jean Hoehn 28th August 2013 04:22:22
NY, Clayton,
Our family has lived on the river for 5 generations. Last years extreme low water greatly shortened our season and enjoyment of the river because we had to close early. Due to low water we could not get into our mainland dock, when docked at our island we were free falling into the boat because the dock was to high out of the water, we could not get out of the boat at the gas dock and several injuries occurred as we tried to cope with the dangerously low water. Additionally Low water levels had a major impact on the wild life and on the economy.

Scott Miller 28th August 2013 04:16:31
NY - New York, Norwood,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Louisette Lanteigne 28th August 2013 04:03:53
Ontario, Waterloo,
I support this plan and I would also like to implore that more protection is given to protect natural recharge areas that recharge Great Lakes systems. Pits, development and fracking pose enormous risks that must be averted to secure long term protection of water quality, water flow, flow rates and water temperatures and water volumes. Thank you.

Sidney Manes 28th August 2013 04:02:13
New York, Manlius,
I support Plan 2014 after 50 years of chaos and broken promises made by Robert Moses when he spear headed the creation of the St. Lawrence seaway. Its time to correct the mistakes made.

Patricia Merry 28th August 2013 03:53:42
NY - New York, HAMMOND,
Since the time frame for submitting comments is nearly at an end, I urge you to implement the 2014 water level plan now. We have been waiting for too many years for action.

Doris Luther 28th August 2013 03:52:44
New York, Chippewa Bay,
I support plan 2014 for water levels. It is a balanced plan which protects waterfront owners as well as environment, tourism and navigation. I urge the board to approve this fair plan. - See more at: [http://ijc.org/en_/losl/Submit_a_Comment#sthash.cdKKfhSh.dpuf](http://ijc.org/en_/losl/Submit_a_Comment#sthash.cdKKfhSh.dpuf)

Roger Peinkofer 28th August 2013 03:49:06
NY, Mendon,
As a fellow riparian, it is my choice to own a home on the water. With this choice, I feel we accept the risk of damage as well as the responsibility to help leave the basin in a better state than we’ve found it. Therefore, I strongly support the plan to make the water levels less static. I’ve had the opportunity to attend the meetings in the Rochester area and find fault in the arguments of loss...
of tax revenue and homes. First of all, and back to my opening statement, by owning property on any body of water, there is an assumption of risk. Erosion is an inevitability. By having more lows, beaches and waterfront has the chance to rebuild (ask the folks who lose beaches on the ocean - tidal fluctuations rebuild them all on their own!) For me, the opportunity and privilege of living on the water FAR outweighs the risks. Hence my CHOICE to do so. One of the arguments from politicians and town supervisors at the meetings was loss of revenue via taxes and the towns inability to survive. The thing that wasn't mentioned was that, even if there is some property loss (folks shouldn't have built on a flood plain), the neighboring properties will then become waterfront properties and their taxes will increase to offset the loss. Sounds harsh, I know, but it's basic math. There is no way the town won't get their "piece of flesh". Lastly, it is appalling that it has taken 50+ years for the environment to have a voice in governmental policy. There was mention of eagles, osprey and others making a comeback. This is directly related to the ban of pcbs and other toxic chemicals that were harming the wildlife, their food source, and the environment. We have the Clean Air and Clean Water acts. New legislation doesn't get written (or passed) without a thorough environmental assessment. Why is our water levels plan any different? I want my children and my children's children to enjoy Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River as much as I do and it be a healthy, thriving, viable watershed. We make conscious choices everyday (recycle, don't litter, etc) to make the world a better place. Why would we pass on the opportunity to make a big, real difference. Thank you for considering my comment.

Jane Law 28th August 2013 03:48:16
New York, New York,
We support 2014 and we want it now!

VL Brandt 28th August 2013 03:41:53
NY, New York,
Fifty years of human-regulated water levels have significantly altered the St. Lawrence River’s natural processes, damaging the environment by reducing habitat diversity, decimating populations of key native species, shortening our recreational boating season and harming our tourism-based economy. After years of study and public input the International Joint Commission has put forward a modern approach. Plan 2014 will achieve a balance of benefits for all interests by taking into account the needs of the River and Lake Ontario ecosystem for the first time. When implemented, it will begin to reverse the damage caused by 50 years of destructive regulation, and allow the River and Lake to once again thrive.

Ralph A. (Bud) Andress 28th August 2013 03:41:01
ON, Hill Island, Lansdowne,
Please implement Plan 2014 now, as requested by the majority of those using the St. Lawrence River and be the Regulators seen by future generations as those who made the environmentally wise choice for the River and its people.

David G. Dickover 28th August 2013 03:39:41
VA, Virginia Beach,
I support Plan 2014 and ask for implementation. I am a summer resident of Hammond NY. I am a “New Yorker” from Goshen and the U of R, class of ’68. It is time to address the flow and water levels of the River. Dave

Marilyn Rowland 28th August 2013 03:33:52
New York, Ithaca,
I am heartily in favor of Plan 2014. After many decades of damage and degradation to the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario, this plan will go a long way toward restoring them, while balancing the interests of all involved. Even hydroelectric power generation will improve. It is a testament to what can be done when people work together to solve problems!
Richard Dickover 28th August 2013 03:28:47  
NY, Hammond,  
I have been involved on the St Lawrence River for Fifty Years and I support plan 2014.

John Catherine 28th August 2013 03:25:09  
NY, New York,  
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Margaret Lisewski 28th August 2013 03:21:14  
NY, Hammond,  
We have had a cottage on the river for 22 years and I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Carlton Watkins 28th August 2013 03:20:25  
NY, Hammond,  
Please implement PLAN 2014 ASAP, So I have enough water to use my boat all of the boating season!!! Low water levels and where I dock my boat turns to mud!!

Thomas G. Murphy 28th August 2013 03:15:39  
New York, Syracuse,  
My family supports Plan 2014 and believes that enough time has passed. It is important that the IJC act quickly to implement Plan 2014 to help stem the damage done to the ecosystem of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. Don't delay any longer. Mother Nature is losing her patience!

Steve Hart 28th August 2013 03:11:24  
NY New York, rochester,  
I support plan 2014 for water levels. It is a balanced plan which protects waterfront owners as well as environment, tourism and navigation. I urge the board to approve this fair plan.

Megan D Dunn 28th August 2013 03:02:59  
NY, Pittsford,  
I support Plan 2014. Do it.

Linda Ainsworth 28th August 2013 03:02:57  
NY, Canton,  
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

James T. Mecomber 28th August 2013 03:02:41  
NY, Alexandria Bay,  
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. I have lived on the St. Lawrence River for 68 years and am a waterfront owner. I believe the river should be returned to its natural state and this plan is best able to do that.

Abigale M Dunn 28th August 2013 03:00:18  
NY, Pittsford,  
I love the 1000 Islands and support the Plan 2014. Please implement ASAP.
Lisa M. Dunn 28th August 2013 02:56:30  
N.Y., Pittsford,  
I have been lucky enough to be a summer resident of the 1000 Islands on the St. Lawrence River for over 50 years. I strongly support Plan 2014. Please put this plan in place as quickly as possible. Thank you.

Nicholas Quarrier 28th August 2013 02:55:33  
NY, Ithaca,  
I support Plan 2014 and hope it is implemented ASAP!

Andrea Smith 28th August 2013 02:53:49  
New York, Old Forge,  
I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now. The health of the St. Lawrence River is near and dear to my heart and is crucial for so many environmental and economic reasons. Please act now in support of Plan 2014 now. Thank you.

Robert Gastwirth 28th August 2013 02:43:24  
NY, Hammond,  
I support Plan 2014. I have lived on the river for more then 20 summers and the water is lower and lower each as I look at it this am it's lower again as a summer person I will now be forced to leave early again stop the bath tub. dont pull the plug before late Sept NOT LATE AUG.

Daniel Sheedy 28th August 2013 02:43:02  
New York, Clayton,  
As a 6 month per year resident of the St Lawrence River community, I support Plan 2014. Implement the plan now and stop bowing to the interests of hyrdo and shipping. The river is here for everyone, not just commercial interests.

James L. Steryaart 28th August 2013 02:37:55  
New York, Wellesley Island,  
I urge your adoption of the plan known as “2014”. Years of contemplation, millions of dollars and thousands of man-hours have brought us to this place - finally. Pull the trigger and finally DO what is right for our environment and the entire ecosystem. I am a 73 year old summer resident for six months every year who has been connected with this beautiful river for my entire life. It is sad to see the unnecessary changes the old plan has wrought. Lets make it right - implement 2014. Thank you. Jim Steyaart

Elizabeth Kincaid-Ehlers 28th August 2013 02:37:45  
CT, West Hartford,  
I support plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented

Robert Scofield 28th August 2013 02:27:03  
NY, Hammond,  
Way over due

Steve Taylor 28th August 2013 02:24:07  
NY, Thousand Island Park,  
It's time to think beyond selfish interests and take the high road that will restore balance and health to the Lake Ontario basins ecosystem. The fear of special interests should not get in the way for they too will benefit from a healthier lake.
Martien Mulder 28th August 2013 02:22:18  
NY, Clayton,  
I support plan 2014. It should be implimented now!

Stanley E Doan 28th August 2013 02:20:54  
FL, Bradenton,  
I strongly support the 2014 plan and hope it is implimented ASAP. It's about time we had a plan that would save the river for the future.

Peter Johnston 28th August 2013 02:17:43  
Ontario, Rockport,  
As a Marina operator in the 1000 Islands, I support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Daniel Macfarlane 28th August 2013 02:16:12  
Ontario, Ottawa,  
I support Plan2014 over the existing method of regulation, but even Plan2014 is deeply flawed because it is built upon studies and assumptions of the 1950s which themselves are deeply flawed.

Casey Scott 28th August 2013 02:13:21  
QC, N.D.I.P.,  
see attached letter  
Attachment

MJ Lutz 28th August 2013 02:11:01  
ny, clayton,  
I support plan 2014

Bud and Diane Ames 28th August 2013 02:08:40  
NY, Wellesley Island,  
We support Plan 2014.

Heather Chitty 28th August 2013 02:05:31  
Ontario, Kingston,  
I support a modern water levels plan. The Thousand Islands National Park, the first national park west of the Rockies, and the historic St. Lawrence River deserve to be managed responsibly.

David Taylor 28th August 2013 02:01:45  
NY, Wellesley Island,  
I support plan 2014 as it more conforms to natural levels and meets the majority of those effected.

Carol D. Murphy 28th August 2013 01:59:10  
New York, Syracuse,  
I SUPPORT PLAN 2014. PLEASE IMPLEMENT THIS PLAN NOW.
CAROL REESOR 28th August 2013 01:59:04
ON, Brockville,
WE ARE ON THE NORTH COAST OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, AND HAVE NOTICED A DECLINE IN THE WATER CONDITIONS OVER TEN YEARS, LOWER LEVELS AND TOO MUCH ALGAE. WE HOPE AND EXPECT THIS GREAT NATURAL NATIONAL RESOURCE TO BE PROTECTED AND ADDRESSED BY THE IJC.

Dan Gold 28th August 2013 01:56:24
NY, Cape Vincent,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.

Barry & Margaret James 28th August 2013 01:56:24
New York, Clayton,
The approach of plan 2014 creates conditions for additional recreational opportunities by lengthening the boating season in most years. Although we may have a few years out of 100 during which water is lower than I would like for boating, we are willing to trade that off for a healthy St. Lawrence River & Lake Ontario.

Jim Stansfield 28th August 2013 01:54:03
Ont, Brockville,
Many years of research and many dollars have been spent to reach the conclusion that there is a better way to control the flow of the river than the way being used presently. Plan 2014 provides the most benefit to all stakeholders. PLEASE, implement it now.

Pamela McDowell 28th August 2013 01:53:40
New York, Clayton,
We support Plan 2014 and hope that you implement it soon, rather than wait longer. Thank you for your hard work on this!

WAYNE & BARBARA HAEFELE 28th August 2013 01:47:57
New York, Napels,
We have been coming to the St Lawrence River for over 50 years and have a great love for it. We implore you to implement Plan 2014. Thank you. Wayne & Barb Haefele

Lori Moose 28th August 2013 01:43:54
NY, Canandaigua,
I LOVE the St Lawrence River, its in my blood and soul, I fully SUPPORT a modern water levels plan and want you to know ! Thank You.
Attachment

Michael Agen 28th August 2013 01:37:24
NY, Syracuse,
I have a summer home on the River and have been going there for 56 years. I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now

Tom Wild 28th August 2013 01:36:28
NY, Rochester,
I Support Plan 2014 and believe it should be implemented now.
Marlena Lange 28th August 2013 01:34:45  
New York (NY), MIDDLETOWN,  
I support Plan 2014. As a director of my local Land Trust, I know the importance of water quality to the ecosystem and to people's lives. Healthier lake and river wetlands will support stronger populations of native fish and wildlife, improving the area's hunting and angling, and strengthening the recreational economies that rely upon them.

Lori Arnot 28th August 2013 01:33:41  
NY, Clayton,  
I support plan 2014!

William Jeffers 28th August 2013 01:24:32  
NY, Sodus,  
NO, I do not support Plan 2014. This plan allows big money shipping and power companies to raise the lake level like they have wanted to for years. The average lake level has been drastically raised since the Saint Lawrence seaway was constructed in the late 50's. They keep recalculating the average lake level based on time periods since they built the seaway for guess who? Big Shipping and Power Companies. Anyone who supports this plan lives nowhere near the lake and has no vested interest.

Diana F. Cramer 28th August 2013 01:21:11  
New York, Syracuse,  
I strongly support Plan 2014. Thank you.

Bob Beadel 28th August 2013 01:14:38  
MA, Boston,  
We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to restore the health of the Lake / River. I support Plan 2014 and urge its full and speedy implementation. The plan will begin to reverse more than 50 years of damage to our Lake/River, and ensure that future generations will inherit and enjoy a world class body of water.

Phillip Barton 28th August 2013 01:12:50  
On., Brockville,  
Please implement the 2014 plan for the river.

Margaret Crenshaw 28th August 2013 01:00:49  
DC, Washington,  
I support Plan 2014 and want it implemented now!

Tom and Mary McNeill 28th August 2013 01:00:34  
NY, Wellesley Island,  
Please, please, please stop procrastinating and pass this plan. While not perfect, it is so much better than what we have had for 50 years. Do not let the "big money" cloud your vision of what this beautiful River was and can be again. We have watched and waited for the past 10 years while studies have been made and proposals proposed. This is the plan you have come up with and all of us who love the River are willing to accept. Act now. Thank you.

Gregory Brooks 28th August 2013 01:00:33  
ny, rochester,  
I live next to Lake Ontario and have A summer home 1000 Islands! I'm in favor the new plan 2014 plan. I have head 2 close the cottage early in the fall each year because of low water Andy inability to get to the doc from mainland
Paul J. Blake 28th August 2013 00:57:37
NY, Rochester,
I support the proposed legislation to slightly allow water levels to rise in Lake Ontario. I believe this will help to renew the ecological environment and restore the wetlands damaged by low lake levels.

Margaret Dolan 28th August 2013 00:57:07
NY, Cape Vincent,
Please adapt the new Save the River plan 2014 to balance our Eco system and protect our beautiful river! It will also save the economy of river towns. Thank you.

Sharron Grant 28th August 2013 00:57:04
NY, Clayton,
As an owner and year round occupant of a waterfront home on the river, I support Plan 2014’s approach because it shows that benefits for the environment and the regional economy can go hand-in-hand.

Melissa Carlson 28th August 2013 00:50:13
NY, Rochester,
I support plan 2014. Thank you very much for putting the environment first above electric power. I am very blessed to live in a water rich environment, and I honor the watershed with my actions in gardening, farming, canoeing and outdoor activities. It takes little actions at home and big actions in policy to keep these lakes Great. Thank you!

Kathleen Byrne 28th August 2013 00:28:04
ny, rochester,
NO I DO NOT SUPPORT PLAN 2014

Edmund Varga 27th August 2013 22:57:51
NY, Webster,
I am opposed to the new regulation limits. There are many errors in your proposed lake levels from previous data calculations. First of all is you are including data before 1950 when the lake level was not regulated. So that data should be thrown out because it is skewing your conclusions. Next you completely grossly underestimate the flood damage costs from high lake levels. Third is that billions upon billions of dollars were invested since 1960 on infrastructure and housing along the south shoreline using the existing lake level model, you cannot simply change your mind and disregard that. And lastly, your data doesn't consider the wind effect as that also increases the lake level on the south shore. I have personally seen lake levels shift over 1 foot in minutes from high winds. And your data doesn't include any mention of what damage is caused by large waves from the high winds, not to mention the damage caused by the combination of high lake level and high winds. I personally have seen drastic shoreline erosion in 2011, when lake levels were over 75.2 meters for only 2 months. With your new plan it would be greater than 75.2 meters for over 5 months, more than doubling the damage I would have sustained. My residence is on Oklahoma Beach where the "beach" has completely disappeared. It wasn't named Oklahoma Beach for no reason back on maps I have from early 1900. A significant amount of money should be invested for south shore residents to recoup the shoreline that has already been lost. The wildlife has had over 60 years of the existing lake level plan and have adjusted. Their habitat hasn't been destroyed, rather moved to other areas on the lake that are higher or lower depending on what habitat it is.
Sue Jerome 27th August 2013 17:08:07
NY, Pulaski,
No No No ! For the IJC to even consider levels that have previously caused millions of dollars worth of damages borders on insanity. This is what a 20 million dollar study buys us? You folks scare the heck out of us as you hold the keys to our homes in your hand and seem to want to sit by and watch as your wanted higher highs wash us away. No compensation.. No mitigation..Just possibly,maybe,someday environmental gains while shipping & hydro run to the bank.. Wrong.. Wrong ..Wrong..

Marilyn Crumlish 27th August 2013 16:53:08
NY, Rochester,
"NO, I do not support Plan 2014."

Howard Warren 27th August 2013 15:54:00
New York, Morristown,
I have a boat repair shop and I feel the water levels need to be kept higher for the entire boating season .lots of my customers have to pull there boats early when the water levels start dropping making a short season for them and me please keep the levels up thru September . howard warren

Patrick Verbridge 27th August 2013 15:51:19
New York, Sodus Point,
As a frequent user of the water, I urge you to please reconsider the proposed maximum lake level for Lake Ontario. My main concern would be the drainage, sewage, and gas lines for our area, and many others along the shoreline. Just this summer we received an influx of visible debris, and I am sure a lot of undetected outwash from the flood conditions in Toronto. As I kept swimming further and further out to try to get to "fresh" water, I wondered if I was even safe, and I surely wasn't going to send my family out in it. It was a major disappointment. I would hate to see what happens around the entire lake if/when the water goes up. There will be untreated sewage as all of the septic and treatment plants are flooded, and I am sure more trash from garages, yards, and basements will be strewn about. I know that people from both nations want to keep their waters as safe and clean as possible, and we all want our children to be able to enjoy what is left of our beautiful lake. Raising the level would create unnecessary bouts of pollution. Thank you for your consideration.

John B Van Etten 27th August 2013 15:44:36
New York, Rochester,
The proposed new plan will be a tremendous investment in what may be our most valuable resource in NYS/ Canada. Restoring a more healthy balance to the Lake/River ecosystem makes sense.

Jill Campbell 27th August 2013 15:21:04
NY, Sodus Point,
why do you want to ruin Sodus Point, NY? My family has owned property on this island for over 125 years. I want my children to have the wonderful childhood that I had at Sodus Point.

Gregory Pien 27th August 2013 15:10:34
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to plan 2014. Our properties on the South Shore are built to operate according to the current lake level control plan. Plan 2014 will likely result in dramatic level excursions that will be detrimental to (and possibly destroy) our homes and our communities infrastructure. We don't want to be the next New Orleans. Plan 2014 threatens our way of life - please don't destroy our homes!
Susan Lison 27th August 2013 14:33:53
NY, Baldwinsville,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. Thank you for helping to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Jill Hodgson 27th August 2013 14:26:12
ON, Cornwall,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Jill Hodgson

Robert Webb 27th August 2013 14:15:55
New York, Sandy Creek,
1972-1973 due to hurricane Agnes our property & our neighbors’ property were under water. We had to use rowboats from the woods off of route 3 to reach our land. The properties had to be rebuilt with many truck loads of gravel and top soil. Whenever there is high wind (we have had waves of up to 8 feet hit our windows on the pond side of our house), the water from North Sandy Pond covers the wall of rocks we had built to protect our land and our house from high water. Our property cannot survive the proposed Plan 2014.

Murray Clamen 27th August 2013 13:40:47
Ontario, Ottawa,
Statement submitted on August 27 teleconference attached.
Attachment

ALAN J W WOODALL 27th August 2013 13:38:22
New York, Norfolk,
I have property on Stony Point, Town of Henderson, Jefferson County, NY. The property has been in my family since 1950. The 2014 plan as proposed will destroy our shoreline and property, valuable fresh water supply (drilled well by my father). This is where i have grown to be a man and now a retiree. This property was to be my legacy to my family and heirs. If this proposal is instituted I feel certain that all will be lost. My wife of 44 years, Margaret, strongly and I, oppose the 2014 Plan as currently offered. Please don't do this to us. Property owners will suffer irreparable physical and emotional pain and loss. Thank You

Mark & Renee Waterbury 27th August 2013 13:33:28
N.Y., Watertown,
We are very much in favor of the 2014 plan. Our family has owned property on the St. Lawrence [Wellsley Is.] for over four decades. During that time we have seen radical changes in water levels each season. The environmental damage and economic costs of these conditions cannot be under estimated.
Ronald H. Spooner Sr. 27th August 2013 13:32:17
NY, Alexandria Bay,
I strongly support the regulation. After 50 years it needed to be reviewed.

NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014. By raising the water level for those few who will reap great rewards by the millions of dollars, does not justify the thousands of homes and business's that will be under water if a huge storm comes along. We all know this is bound to happen.

Diane Steszewski 27th August 2013 13:08:28
New York, Pittsford,
My family and I own property on the east end of Lake Ontario and as a child spent our summers there. I do not agree with the Plan 2014 - leave the water levels alone.

Pete Baltradis 27th August 2013 13:03:07
NY, Ogdensburg,
Please...do whatever possible to protect the St. Lawrence River. This river cannot lose what it has become for generations...a mighty but beautiful waterway. A larger body of water can easily adapt to sudden changes in water-levels...not the St. Lawrence.

Mark Phillips 27th August 2013 12:59:10
NY, Rochester,
To the IJC and all supporters of Plan 2014- On this second anniversary of Hurricane Irene coming into the northeast I submit this brief You Tube clip shot on the south shore of Lake Ontario. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PhKLElEmNjg (please copy and paste into your browser as necessary to watch) Thank goodness the lake was about at it's long term average of 245' during this event. Note how the beach in front of these homes is providing the only barrier to huge waves that are whipped up by a storm hundreds of miles away. Now compare that video to footage shot in the spring of 1993 from the exact same location except the lake level is at 247'. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7eizS9CroVo Does the IJC believe that even with "Triggers" in place to lower the lake in an emergency, they could respond to a 24-48hr weather forecast of a hurricane track and lower the lake to a safe level? It's impossible. Have they even considered the effects of climate change in their studies? Since the studies were completed we've now had two hurricanes in two years impact the south shore. If the lake had been at 248' or even higher during these events it would have looked more like the south Jersey shore after Sandy. Except it would have been a MAN MADE disaster thanks to an artificially manipulated lake level. And speaking of Sandy- one last video from the same location. It depicts the night last October an evacuation was ordered for homes along the south shore in Greece NY and Monroe County as the hurricane tracked north. Residents and property owners were just very lucky the lake level was low. Would any of you supporters of Plan 2014 like hearing a knock on your door in the middle of the night telling you to get out? No one should have to go thru that or worry that they might lose their home. Please watch these videos and then Please abandon Plan 2014. It's not workable. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=elli76IRbY

NY, Sodus Point,
I STRONGLY OPPOSE Plan 2014!!!!!!!!! Sodus Point stands to be the most affected by this proposal. Higher water levels will cause flooding that will result in the loss of services to everyone in the village. We stand to be evicted from our family cottage of 69 years!!!!!!!!!!
David Schneider 27th August 2013 12:51:42
NY, Freeville,
I am in overall support of Plan 2014 and its overall purpose to help begin to improve this area's use in a more sustainable way. Thank you for your time and consideration to this.

Susan Bell 27th August 2013 12:44:10
ny, Liverpool ny,
I strongly support implementation of Plan 2014, to preserve the St Lawrence and Lake Ontario. This area is a jewel in the crown of New York State. Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Rachel Treichler 27th August 2013 12:30:53
New York, Hammondsport,
I support the implementation of Plan 2014 and the restoration of the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River to allow fish populations to regenerate.

Keith Bard 27th August 2013 12:14:20
NY, Plymouth,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

Kim Benson 27th August 2013 12:08:56
New York, Canandaigua,
• I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014.
• Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Joy L Swensen 27th August 2013 12:03:10
NY, Baldwinsville,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014.

Patricia A. Percy 27th August 2013 11:45:59
New York, Henrietta,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. They cleaned Lake Erie, why not Lake Ontario?

Erika Kronwald-deBruyn 27th August 2013 11:41:17
ON, Toronto,
I support Plan 2014 in order to ensure water flow management of these crucial ecosystem. Through proper management these areas can be restored to a healthier state.
Rosa Fox 27th August 2013 11:28:53
New York, Wolcott,
The International Joint Commission was created for the purpose of helping to prevent and resolve disputes between the United States and Canadian Boundary Waters. “Signed in 1909, the Boundary Waters Treaty “provides the principles and mechanisms to help resolve disputes and to prevent future ones, primarily those concerning water quantity and water quality along the boundary between Canada and the United States.” (IJC website) By introducing Plan 2014, it appears the IJC has reversed its role as set forth in the 1909 treaty. The IJC has created a mechanism to provide numerous disputes and conflicts between the Canadian and US boundary waters for years to come. Also from the IJC website - “The Boundary Waters Treaty requires that the Commission give all interested parties a “convenient opportunity to be heard” on matters under consideration. The Commission invites public participation and advice … .” I attended an IJC Technical Hearing in Rochester, New York on July 16, 2013, and two public hearings that same day in Rochester and Williamson. Because of the oppositional nature of Plan 2014 to the South Shore of Lake Ontario, many individuals were in attendance to speak at these forums. Due to the time restrictions the IJC imposed, the time permitted these individuals to address the IJC was extremely limited. At the public hearings, people were barely allowed 3-5 minutes to present their comments. This was not a fair allotment of time for anyone to express their concerns pertaining to Plan 2014. The residents of Canada, the environmental lobbyists, the shipping industry of the Great Lakes, and the Hydro-Power Authority all have valid concerns. But their concerns do not outweigh the concerns of the residents of South Shore Lake Ontario. Their concerns do not outweigh the impact that Plan 2014 has upon the environment due to factors which were not addressed within the plan such as the south shore embayments, coastal erosion, municipal sewer and private septic facilities, etc. Plan 2014 was sloppy, presented in haste, and poorly thought through from an environmental perspective. The IJC must return to the original directive of the 1909 treaty and act as they are intended to by that agreement. The IJC must spend additional time in the impacted areas to visit sites, study the detailed information presented by various parties, and listen more and longer. The haste with which Plan 2014 was rolled out and introduced is not environmentally responsible, nor is it humanely responsible. I am strongly opposed to Plan 2014. I truly hope the International Joint Commission has the vision to step back, slow down, and listen to the voice of all the people and to the voice of reason. Rosa Fox Lake Bluff, Sodus Bay

Barbara Hill 27th August 2013 10:25:02
NY, Amherst,
I strongly support Proposition 2014 to help restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario.

Carol Kellogg 27th August 2013 10:19:16
NY, Rochester,
As a lakeshore property owner in Orleans county, I am opposed to Plan 2014. All available information indicates that this plan will unfairly adversely affect Orleans and neighboring counties, sparing counties further to the east. Orleans county would not be able to sustain the economic downturn from the consequences of Plan 2014.

Jared Pistoia 27th August 2013 10:11:28
new york, west islip,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014 as this is a modern plan which benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Emily Giles 27th August 2013 10:10:21
ON, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by
returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Emily Giles

Diana L Thatcher 27th August 2013 09:51:47
NY, Carthage,
The area is too precious not to preserve. We need to do what can be done to save the ecosystem.

Lynn Shreve 27th August 2013 09:47:38
NY, Ithaca,
In support of clean, healthy, ecologically sound waterways, I strongly encourage the clean-up of Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence River: Plan 2014

Jacob McCaffery 27th August 2013 09:16:11
New York, Farmingdale,
I'm submitting a comment to express my full support of the implementation of Plan 2014. Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Please take action to protect one of the vital resources in the world by implementing Plan 2014!

Anja Heidenreich 27th August 2013 08:28:04
Ontario, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Anja Heidenreich

Jonathan Greene 27th August 2013 08:17:33
New York, Ithaca,
While I have only been coming to the Upper St Lawrence region for over a decade my family has been a long time resident of the area. And I am firmly supportive of the balanced 2014 plan. I am troubled to hear the comments that many people view the 2014 plan as “potentially damaging” due to the higher water levels, when in fact the plan calls for merely managing the levels more evenly throughout the year. Having water levels that fluctuate a matter of feet is not only disruptive to the river’s ecology, but also creates logistical challenges for those of us wanting to use boats to reach our homes later in the season. I support an approach that balances the long-term ecological needs of the area with the practical needs of people. But simply stated - wetlands are much harder to replace then docks. And even so it is doubtful that this plan even come close
to the type of damage most perceive that might happen by simply maintaining current water levels across the season.

**Linda Michielson** 27th August 2013 07:49:37
NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

**Michael Zambito** 27th August 2013 06:54:29
New York, Hilton,
I am opposed to Plan 2014

**Frederick Brautigam** 27th August 2013 06:52:08
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014. There is strong evidence that implementation of this plan would eventually result in substantial damage to property, both private & public, as well as infrastructure on the south shore of Lake Ontario. There is potential for catastrophic damage, possibly loss of life during periods of high water combined with storms. Even if that were not a very real threat, there is not adequate conclusive evidence that this plan would achieve the results that it's proponents make claim to. To implement a plan with known extreme risk would be bad enough. To implement it without any proven gain would be unconscionable, and therefore, should, leave the interests involved in promotion, also liable for it's consequences. Thank you,

**Eileen Balsley** 27th August 2013 05:57:18
New York, Pulaski,
I am opposed to raising the water level any higher. Been property owner since 1955 and lost sand dunes surrounding my camp in high water storm of 1974. We need to save what is left of our lake shore property for tourism revenue and to compete with the other Great Lakes in scenic beauty.

**Robert B. Laird** 27th August 2013 05:13:46
NY, Sodus,
Please continue controlling water levels as at present. Properties on the southern and eastern shores of Lake Ontario have been bought, sold, maintained and taxed based upon the implicit contract with the IJC. You will wreak havoc in those locales by unilaterally altering it. In particular, flooding of Sodus Point will occur from time to time, mixing sewage into the Lake and dealing devastating property damage. Wildlife and foliage has acclimated for 50 years to the present regulation. Mankind is equally important with wildlife. One can love nature and love mankind, and strike a balance. That is what we have now. Please do not alter it, opening us all up to huge problems, some known and some unanticipated!

**Johanna Cummings** 27th August 2013 05:10:01
NY, Rochester,
I support Plan 2014 which is a balanced approach that has taken into account the concerns of residents who live along the shores of Lake Ontario. We must consider the long term environmental impact of not doing anything versus a more beneficial approach.

**Maria Soeffing** 27th August 2013 04:50:55
New York, Sodus Point,
I oppose Plan 2014. It will cause flooding and property damage to existing homes and businesses. This Plan has nothing in place to protect any existing home or business owners.
Jean McCarthy 27th August 2013 03:55:03
New York, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014...

Scott 27th August 2013 03:25:53
Rochester, NY
The water level should not be changed and should remain just how it has been. Don't fix something that is not broken. This year shows how mother nature takes care of things. Because of all the rain lake levels were higher than they have been in years. Had the level been higher to start the year we would have had flooding.

Glenda Hinsman 27th August 2013 03:16:02
New York, Sodus Point,
With the future unknown with respect to the effect climate change itself will have on Lake Ontario water levels, now is not the time to implement new, man-made changes. By all accounts, lake levels will increase on their own without further human intervention. Let's just hang-tight with a wait-and-see approach.

David E. Godfrey 27th August 2013 02:44:52
NY, Wilson,
I am opposed to Plan 2014!

Cheryl Bruni 27th August 2013 01:59:07
NY, Sodus Point,
NO TO PLAN 2014! This plan greatly impacts the village of Sodus Point. Higher water levels will cause flooding that will result in the loss of services to everyone in the village. Lower water levels will impact the local and regional economy.

James Shea 27th August 2013 01:24:52
New York, Syracuse and Pulaski,
• This new water level plan for the Lake will result in substantial shoreline destruction which will create loss and damage to lakeshore homes. I have seen my family cottage nearly destroyed several times over the past 50 years and invested considerable money into re-building and protecting the shoreline from further damage. This plan will do nothing but create havoc for property owners and subsequent loss of tax revenue for municipalities. There are 10,025 private or public parcels in the six county region of the southern and eastern shores of the Lake with a total assessed value of $3.7 billion. • Shoreline property owners, upon purchase of property, understood the lake level interval to be that of the 1958DD Plan. To cause “higher highs” by going above the current upper limit with Plan 2014, particularly in the spring, is unconscionable and unfair...and cause for litigation against the government if property damage occurs. The current plan has no mitigation resources/process available, which is stipulated in the original treaty. • Shipping, hydropower, and environmental interests will be the winners from Plan 2014 and the property owners will be the losers. Is a muskrat or tern move valuable than someone’s home? (If muskrats are declining, stop trapping them!) If the Plan goes through, they should charge shipping and hydro a fee to cover mitigation costs for potential property destruction! • The Plan supposedly includes “trigger points” which can initiate action to change the lake level if it become dangerously high or low. However, it has been noted that it takes a week to lower the Lake by one inch! How will that prevent destruction of property in the event of an incoming severe storm? When brought to the attention of the hearing Panels this summer, no one had a response/answer to this concern. If my lake property is damaged again as a result of any plan to raise lake levels for the benefit of the shipping industry, myself and everyone of my neighbors will spend every nickel we have in lawsuits. Has the joint commission not learned any lessons from the massive destruction that occurred in the mid to late 70's ????
Craig Wollesen 27th August 2013 00:58:07
NY, Sodus,
I have seen what high water can do for boating. Also the homes and shops where people earn their livings near the water. Please see attached, the 1st boat was found well North of Terry Town, and the other is on the IIRR train bridge over the Hudson. There were hundreds more all over the down state area. Please be careful with our water levels. High water and one storm can do massive amounts of damage. Thanks, Craig New York State Department of Homeland Security/Office of Emergency Management DR-4085-NY Craig Wollesen Disaster Assistance Representative cwollesen@aidrc.com 315-483-2241
Attachment

Stephanie 27th August 2013 00:31:44
ON, Barrie,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Stephanie Carter

Cheryl R. Gravelle 26th August 2013 20:19:16
NY, Williamson,
I am opposed to Plan 2014 as proposed by the IJC. It will cause devastating damage to private properties, municipal infrastructure and local economies. The benefits to commercial shipping and hydroelectric production should not be allowed to literally engulf the interests of American citizens who have built homes and communities based on established water level maintenance policies that have been in place for decades.

Steve and Wendy Bell and family 26th August 2013 18:29:56
NY, Rochester,
We are opposed to plan 2014. Please do not devalue our property.

Dawn Sevone 26th August 2013 17:35:30
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014. For over fifty years, people have relied upon the commitment to target Lake Ontario within the four-foot range in the design and construction of shore protection, public and private marine facilities and public infrastructure. I live right across from the Monroe County Water Authority and have received several "warning" calls to evacuate my home due to high wave activity over the last few years; what precautions will be in place if the level is raised?

Julie Pecorino 26th August 2013 17:16:06
New York, Hilton,
"I am opposed to Plan 2014".
Edith Farrington 26th August 2013 17:07:12
New York, Sodus Point,
I don't know how some of you can say that the PLAN 2014 will be helping the economy and residents along the Lake Ontario Shore. It will certainly not be helpful to those along the Southern Shore of Lake Ontario! It will be very harmful to our economy and residents here. Guess we are not seeing the same environment. We will have additional erosion and wipe our beaches, homes and businesses, putting all kinds of stuff into our Lake. Don't see how this is helping our economy and "respecting the interests of those concerned". There must be other ways of helping the wetlands. Know there are invasive plants, such as the Purple Loosestrife that can be controlled by beetles. Don't think any of us want to see more damage to our environment and wildlife, but we do not want to see our shoreline eroded and villages wiped out either. Please do not let PLAN 2014 go into effect! It is not of best interest to EVERYONE, as some seem to think. In fact, in many situations, it is very destructive to the New York State Lake Ontario southern shoreline. Show you care about us and do not put PLAN 2014 into effect.

James Ebmeyer 26th August 2013 16:34:26
New York, Penfield,
I strongly object to the Plan, for the following reasons: A. Citizens of shore-side communities and properties around Lake Ontario (particularly on the eastern and south shores) will absorb the costs. The cost/benefits information provided at various public sessions does not distinguish benefits or cost exposures, between New York and Canadian shores. Furthermore, the column “Unregulated (Plan E)” is generally meaningless. Unregulated would suggest the period before the Seaway was constructed—pre-1955. There were no locks, dams and hydro plants then. Boaters, fish and animals took what Mother Nature provided. B. If the higher water levels allowed under the Plan cause a sewage treatment system in some shore-side area, to become flooded and spill into Lake Ontario, why should the citizens have to pay to repairs, etc. Why should a home owner be subject to losing their house to high waves? Is the IJC going to have a reserve fund, to pay for remediation of such incidents? C. While the total benefits are stated at $3.12M annually, the benefits are all to Hydropower and Recreational Boating in “Lake St. Lawrence” and “Below Dam”. Everyone else suffers!! D. It is clear that under Plan 2014, the recreational boating interests gaining are principally in Quebec, while those in the U.S. and Canada (either on the St. Lawrence River or Lake Ontario) lose. E. Wind induced shore damage will be more severe under this plan, and I believe the south shore will suffer more. The western end of the Lake Ontario typically is less affected by wind, than areas to the east, hence I see citizens there as largely unaffected by any Lake water level management scheme. Therefore, their opinions matter less. F. Issues with navigation of large ships in the Montreal area have been cited as a problem, thus favoring increasing the flow from Lake Ontario during dry and low water periods. Well, dredging is periodically required in many harbors in New York State, to deal with low water and siltting. Let Montreal dredge, instead of people and entities on Lake Ontario having to foot the bill! G. While environmentalists have favored changing the strategy for managing Lake Ontario water levels, even that area sees less benefit than the current management strategy. The fish, muskrats, etc. have had 50+ generations to adjust. I think they have adapted well. The influence of 50+ years of environmental contamination from sewage and other inflows in the Lake, isn’t mentioned, when water level management is discussed. I have to believe that lake contamination has contributed more to declining fish and animal populations, than the management of the Lake level. The implementation of Plan 2014 unduly throws cost (covered by tax payers) onto people, who have for years and generations lived under a “contract”, with the IJC. Now you want to change the contract, but in a way that throws unknown costs onto them. This CANNOT be allowed to happen. Do not change from the current Lake Ontario level management system.

Daniel Engert 26th August 2013 16:31:26
New York, Barker,
I am honored to represent the taxpayers in Somerset, NY along the southern shore of Lake Ontario. The Town has 165 residential and 15 vacant parcels along the shoreline as well as one
large business. The total assessed value of affected properties along the Somerset shoreline is more than $427,000,000. I am strongly opposed to IJC Plan 2014.

Tom Crumlish 26th August 2013 16:24:29
NY, Rochester,
I am opposed to Plan 2014! It will only benefit the power companies and shipping and destroy our property on the south shore. I’ve lived here 25 years and the levels they are putting in this plan will destroy my house! I welcome any IJC board member to come to my house and have a look at what they’re suggestions mean to my property. I daily doubt they will! Stop Plan 2014

Elizabeth Fisher 26th August 2013 15:54:47
Ontario, Scarborough,
I write in support of Plan 2014 and the conservation and protection of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River system. This has traditionally been a waterway into the heart of our continent and it must be kept from invasive species, pollution and from being depleted by withdrawal of too much of this vital resource. Both Governments must take these issues very seriously and commit to the defense of this water system.

Minch Lewis 26th August 2013 15:15:53
NY, Syracuse,
Plan 2014 as proposed will have a significant negative effect on the economies of several southern shore communities. In particular, the village of Sodus Point, located on Sodus Bay, will be laid waste. High water events will flood the sanitary sewer system. Low water levels will wipe out the boating economy. The marginal benefits to the wet-land ecology are not worth the costs which will be borne by the southern shore communities. Please maintain the current plan. Thank you. Minchin G. Lewis Former Syracuse City Auditor Member: Sodus Bay Yacht Club

Decroix 26th August 2013 14:58:32
Québec, Montréal,
I write to you today as a citizen of St. Lawrence River community to voice my strong support for this new approach to water level regulation, which will restore the health of an ecosystem that is a global and local treasure.

Nola 26th August 2013 14:51:59
Ontario, Hamilton,
My father was from New Brunswick and the family traveled every to visit my Grandmother. We would travel along Trans-Canada and stop to camp along the St. Lawrence river many times. I remember my sister saving me from a gigantic wave as watching in awe at the many waves splashing against the rocks. I have a dream to also see some whales some day too.....

Patricia M. Costanzo, Ph.D., J.D. 26th August 2013 14:47:39
New York, Sodus Point,
The increase of the range of water levels proposed by Plan 2014 threatens Lake Ontario shorelines and its bays, particularly the south shore. Why then have the bays been excluded from every IJC study? Plan 2014 and the people supporting the plan ignore the devastating effects the new proposed lake levels will have on our local properties. High water levels and storms can not only flood a good portion of the Village of Sodus Point, they can damage the sewage system requiring evacuations for homes and businesses on low and high lands. Low water levels will devastate marinas and all other docking areas. Sail boats will have to be moored in deeper water. Land values will plummet. Tax income will also. And, Plan 2014 does not include compensation for damages. The expanded range of high and low water in Lake Ontario may improve the wetlands by only 8%, but can result in a much larger percentage of damage to human lives and
We were going to enlarge our Sodus Point home, but maybe now we will reconsider investing any more in an area threatened by Plan 2014.

Richard Garlock 26th August 2013 14:43:16
New York, Lockport,

Dear Commissioners, I do not support the Plan 2014 as proposed. As many other residents who use the Lake have stated, this plan does not address several key issues. I believe the best option would be to submit a revised plan that would alleviate the concerns of boaters, such as myself, and the lakefront property owners. The goal of restoring wetlands is admirable, but is it practical in this plan? I do not believe so. Please do not approve this proposal as it is today.

Dr. Daniel Barletta 26th August 2013 14:36:24
NY, Rochester,

19 counties endorse resolution rejecting change in Lake Ontario’s water level. Buffalo News By Susan Chiappone | Chautauqua Correspondent on August 16, 2013 - 8:09 PM CHAUTAUQUA – Representatives from the 19 counties in the Western New York region endorsed a resolution presented by the Wayne County Board of Supervisors, opposing a proposition by the International Joint Commission to lower the water level of Lake Ontario. The resolution states that the lower water level would have an adverse effect on the shoreline communities of the lake and would contribute to erosion and loss of revenues from recreational fishing and water sports. The resolution was unanimously supported by the Inter-County Association of Western New York which includes the following counties: Allegany, Cattaraugus, Cayuga, Chautauqua, Chemung, Erie, Genesee, Livingston, Monroe, Niagara, Ontario, Orleans, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Tompkins, Wayne, Wyoming and Yates. The association, which meets monthly, got together Friday morning at the Turner Center, Chautauqua Institution. At the meeting, the group heard from Sen. Catherine Young (R-Olean), who told them to share concerns with her staff.

Melanie G 26th August 2013 14:13:44
Manitoba, Winnipeg,

I support Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Erica Rothschild 26th August 2013 13:52:20
Québec, Gatineau,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Erica Rothschild

NY, Rochester,

I am unable to support Plan 2014 and call for the current plan to stay in place for the safety of all those in close proximity to Lake Ontario shores and the shores of its Bays, and the financial stability of other communities that will be impacted. Everyday we see on the news the devastation flooding in so many areas of the US and Canada has caused. Flooding will cause devastation to water supplies and sewers away from the shore as well. Why would we approve a plan that will
bring that kind of devastation to these areas. The financial impact to the communities outside of the lake side communities will also be devastating. It is well known that the tax base for many NY counties with lake shore is usually the burden of those properties close to the shore. These counties will be devastated immediately as assessments are adjusted for property that will likely flood. I would imagine the same is true for the other states and Canada. Plan 2014 will help ensure devastation to property, and the creation of the poorest communities in NY through out Upstate and Western NY. Thank you for considering my facts.

Michael Yuzdepski 26th August 2013 12:32:49
AB, Calgary,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Michael Yuzdepski

Brittany Smith 26th August 2013 12:32:44
Ontario, Mississauga, 
Please clean Lake Ontario and the St.Lawrence River! They are very important to the ecosystem and the animals and people who depend on these fresh water resources. It's time to take care of the planet and live in harmony with it. Not destroy it.

Jay Baran 26th August 2013 11:00:06
ny, sodus point, 
I am writing you because this plan T will cause a man made natural disaster. The levels you are talking will flood my family property,state highway rt.14,Sodus Point sewer system,and the village of Sodus Point. I know this because in the seventies when it went to the level you are talking i was catching carp in the middle of state highway rt. 14. I am sure that all of you that want to raise these levels and it was going to flood your property you would not do it. My family has lived here since the early 1940'sand this is inexcusable for the environmental and property damage it will cause. Wayne county depends on revenues from the taxes it recieves from the waterfront properties.

Pamela Young 26th August 2013 10:07:51
Ontario, Markham, 
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Pamela Young
Mark Phillips 26th August 2013 09:57:31
NY, Rochester,
At a meeting I attended some years back (during one of the previous proposals) a Hydro Quebec official was present to answer questions. Perhaps this was before the days of political correctness or maybe they just sent the wrong guy. But his blunt answer to one question will tell you all you need to know about this current Plan 2014. He was asked by a home owner about high lake levels. I will never forget how arrogantly and dismissively he addressed this citizen- stating that they consider all the water on Lake Ontario to be basically theirs. Their "supplies", in his words. "Any water going over a spillway or not flowing thru our turbines is like dollar bills down the drain" I remember there was an audible gasp from those present. But that pretty much tells you their attitude. Let the home owners be damned. So which well funded entity do you believe might have the greatest influence on getting what they want? Wake up folks.

William Boddy 26th August 2013 09:46:48
Ontario, Gilford,
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

Thomas 26th August 2013 09:34:32
British Columbia, Vancouver,
Water is so important to our livelihood. We need to protect it.

Nature Québec 26th August 2013 08:44:24
Québec, Québec,
Attachment

Daniel Hallowell 26th August 2013 08:24:46
NY, Hilton,
It appears that all our neighbors to the north support 2014, and all us to the south do not. With good reason. We suffer that damages, flooding, loss of property, insurance premiums, etc. The value of the benefits can't be weighed against damages if the property owners are paying for it. Is the IJC or anyone else going to make me whole when my family household is lost to flooding? As a lakefront resident, I want a healthy lake more as much (or more) as anyone. Please continue to work to find a solution that does not come at the expense of south shore property owners. I strongly oppose this plan.

LUANNE FAIRLIE-PEREIRA 26th August 2013 08:23:29
Ontario, Vaughan,
Please support Plan 2014 and help protect Lake Ontario and the St. Laurence River!!! These waters are extremely important to our life and the well being of our Earth herself. Why did we mess it up in the first place? Well at least lets fix and take care of it. Thank you.
Daniel Zielinski 26th August 2013 08:23:07
NY, Jefferson,
I'm seeing a disconnect is some of the comments supporting plan 2014. Some of the St Lawrence shoreline residents seem to believe that Plan 2014 will benefit them. Another claim for Plan 2014 is that it benefits the ecology by allowing a more natural water level. What I don't understand is how higher, natural water levels in Lake Ontario will benefit shoreline owners along the St Lawrence. Is is really necessary for Lake Ontario to hit 248 to keep acceptable water levels on the St Lawrence in September or October? More likely, the St Lawrence shoreline owners have been led to believe the cause of their problems is something that's simply not the case. Management of hydropower and the consequent river levels is the obvious source of any low water levels in the river. How will this change with Plan 2014? It sounds like some on the St Lawrence want to see the pool elevation for the hydropower project called Lake Ontario raised high enough that it can feed the turbines all summer and still have enough water in the fall so the river doesn't fluctuate so widely. You know, the hydropower producers could achieve the same result by reducing power production. Give Plan 2014 a few years and, with increased energy demand leading to increased hydropower production, the river levels will likely fluctuate the same as they are under the current plan.

Jerry Graham 26th August 2013 08:20:59
NY, Rochester,
NO, I do not support Plan 2014!!

Al Fagan 26th August 2013 08:11:05
New York, Sodus Point,
No No No to Plan 2014. It almost seems like we are in a time warp on this issue. For years I have been attending meetings objecting to the latest IJC water level proposals. How many times and how many ways do we have to say what a disaster these plans are before they are stopped. It reminds me of the Movie Ground Hog Day. Every day we wake up and relive the same story. On the plus side I am so thankful for our Elected Officials who have argued so passionately against these proposals. Each year they get better and stronger in their opposition to these plans. I am so impressed that so many folks have taken the time to write and state their opposition to the latest proposal and for attending the various hearings and meetings. As I look at some of the comments supporting Plan 2014 I see that some support it because they want to eliminate the low water that makes boating impossible for them in the late summer and fall. Am I missing something? I was under the impression that the new plans would result in higher highs and lower lows. I think some folks hear the higher highs and missed the lower lows. Both in my view are bad. I have seen nothing proposed that improves on our current state and I would recommend and support no change. The only positive changes would be higher Lows and lower Highs. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and thank you for listening. For you it must be Ground Hog Day times a thousand. For your sake and for ours, I hope this is the end of it.

Jan Beintema 26th August 2013 08:01:44
British Columbia, Victoria,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence
John Hinsman 26th August 2013 07:42:44  
NY, Sodus Point,  
As a lakeside resident of Sodus Point, NY, I strongly oppose Plan 2014. My home, into which I have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars, will be destroyed by lake water and village sewage. There will be no compensation for this devastation. Indeed, the entire village of Sodus Point will be bankrupted, and the economy of Wayne County will be in ruin. I realize how hard the committee has worked, but more study is required as to the impact Plan 2014 will have on the southern shore.

ANDREAS HOBYAN 26th August 2013 07:36:29  
BC, UCLUELET,  
It is time to start treating one of the largest fresh water resources in the world as the icon that it truly is. It's natural environment and flows must be prioritized over purely economic benefits. Let us move forward on restoring this waterway for us and future generations.

Angela 26th August 2013 07:31:40  
Quebec, Sainte Anne de Bellevue,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Angela

Chris Kitchen 26th August 2013 07:30:50  
Ontario, Barrie,  
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Chris Kitchen

Paul Desaulniers 26th August 2013 07:23:17  
Ontario, Toronto,  
Water is essential to not only humans, but to animals and plantlife. Having a sustainability plan is crucial to maintaining a healthy ecosystem for all. Please enact Plan 2014.
Daniel Zielinski 26th August 2013 07:22:29  
NY, Jefferson,  
I just received an email concerning the IJC plan 2014 from Audubon of New York. The email urges the recipient to send in a form letter to the IJC in support of the plan (whether you've read it or not...Audubon doesn't seem to care). Here's one of the reasons they list for supporting the plan: "The IJC’s new proposal achieves a balance of benefits for all interests, and will make significant progress toward restoring the health of the Lake and River while benefiting New York State’s economy through increased recreational opportunities and increased production of the low-cost and low-emission hydro power." The email is authored by, "Sean Mahar Director of Government Relations" for Audubon NY. So, Sean..."a balance of benefits for all interests..." Really??? What about the lakeshore owners? Plan 2014 admits that lakeshore owners will suffer property loss and lakeshore erosion as a result of this plan. I understand why you would want to encourage your members to support birds, but really, is it necessary to lie to them??? The only thing in Sean's letter that rings true is the claim that Plan 2014 will increase hydro power. But he forgot to mention the profits from that increased production which I contend is the real reason behind the push for Plan 2014. The birds are a fig leaf. Sorry Sean. I have yet to see any data that supports the contention of significant ecological benefit versus the significant damage to property owners. Plan 2014 is a money grab by the power interests and as such, I oppose it.

Priyanka Sekhar 26th August 2013 07:18:28  
Ontario, Oakville,  
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife.

Caroline Beaudette 26th August 2013 07:14:11  
QC, Ste-Barbe,  
please help keep canada's natural world pristine <3

Caroline Bakalarz 26th August 2013 07:13:23  
Ontario, Toronto,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Caroline Bakalarz

Karlene Gunter 26th August 2013 07:08:25  
New York, Rochester,  
Over the last fifty years, since the completion of the Moses-Saunders dam and the subsequent regulation of water levels, we have observed a drastic reduction in and degradation of the coastal wetlands and marshlands at many Important Bird Areas (IBAs) and throughout the region. The loss of these important habitats caused a significant decline in wetland dependent birds, such as the Black Tern. Wetlands are good not only for birds, but they also purify water. The IJC's new proposal achieves a balance of benefits for all interests, and will make significant progress toward restoring the health of the Lake and River while benefiting New York State's economy through
increased recreational opportunities and increased production of the low-cost and low-emission hydro power.

**Pete Backus** 26th August 2013 07:03:57
NY, Pulaski,

On behalf of the North Rainbow Shores Homeowners Association (approximately 40 property owners along the eastern shoreline), and as President, I respectfully submit our opposition to Plan 2014. It is clear this Plan disregards the interests of property owners by allowing higher lake levels, which in combination with spring storms, can destroy our property and homes. When we purchased our properties, we were aware of the lake levels regulated by the 1958 DD Plan and chose to live with those regulations. To intentionally change those parameters for the lake levels, in particular --to cause "higher highs"-- is unconscionable and possibly illegal, without some provision for mitigation which seems to be missing from this Plan. IJC should be embarrassed by the process whereby selected interests, environmentalists in particular, were at the table, and property owners were on the outside. The resulting Plan clearly is indicative of their input. Apparently the property owners (10,025 in the six county area of the eastern shore, and their $3.7 billion assessed property value) come in behind the tern and muskrat and the profits of shipping and hydropower. Yes, we are angry, and who wouldn't be when someone's actions jeopardize your home. Please re-consider this Plan to balance the interests of all stakeholders and allow us to stay in our homes safely and continue to provide the necessary tax base for our municipalities.

**Scott Montani** 26th August 2013 06:59:16
Ontario, Thorold,

The United Nations have designated certain portions of Canada as being protected for the Environment and our Nature's Diversity. I put to you that we need to ensure a Healthy and safe water systems within Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence. Please look at what is being proposed today.

**Carolyn T** 26th August 2013 06:57:24
Ontario, Toronto,

If there's but one thing we need in this world (apart from oxygen) it's a healthy water supply. I don't have much to add to the comments posted previously, but please consider the health of your citizens, your children, and your children's children as you draft these proposals. We all have to swallow our own decisions - literally.

**Cindy Dell** 26th August 2013 06:42:05
Ontario, Port Dover,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Cindy Dell

**Heather Davies** 26th August 2013 06:33:21
Ontario, Stratford,

I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will
help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Heather Davies

Jessica Perry 26th August 2013 06:19:18
Quebec, Montreal,
I support restoring Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence River. Please support Plan 2014 to ensure a healthy environment.

Charles Willette 26th August 2013 06:16:42
NY, Williamson,
We are Lake Ontario shoreline residents who are strongly opposed to the IJC Proposed Plan 2013. In the past we have experienced damage to our shoreline due to high wave action from Lake Ontario storms. (See attached photos of damage incurred in 1993). Our home was originally built in 1934, prior to the St. Lawrence Seaway project. At that time the lake levels were significantly lower. After building a new revetment in 1993, we have had to repair this revetment three times due to high water erosion. We estimate that we have spent nearly $20,000 to built and maintain this barrier. Now, the International Joint Commission (IJC) is proposing to allow the lake levels to raise even higher without regard to the additional damage that will certainly occur to shoreline property owners – and without any recourse to compensation for damages – all for the benefit of minor improvements to wetlands. There are few interested parties (e.g. environmentalists, shipping, Canadians, etc) that care about what will happen to the south shore residences properties, the Village of Sodus Point, or property values.

Attachment

Gyllian Porteous 26th August 2013 06:03:42
Ontario, Windsor,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Gyllian Porteous

Cristiann Kannen 26th August 2013 05:58:36
Ontario, Sudbury,
Please take care of our water ways.....it may not matter to you....but it will matter to your grandchildren....and their grandchildren. Do it for them.....
Kristina Lubomski 26th August 2013 05:58:22
Illinois, Palatine,
this natural landmark must be preserved for the safety and well being of the animals and nature that live within it. please help save this beautiful place.

Cher Keith 26th August 2013 05:58:21
Ontario, Penetanguishene,
Living world, living people. Dead world, dead people. Wake up.

Mr. And Mrs. John Morsch 26th August 2013 05:06:13
New York, Fairport,
We are summer residents of Crescent Beach, the barrier island on Sodus Bay. We have fought for 30 years to save our property from high water damage and storm surge. My parents lost a two story addition from their cottage with water sweeping through and wiping out the entire contents of the first floor. We are totally opposed to the IJC 2014 plan that would allow lake high water levels to be even higher. If we lose our fight, and the island is breached by the lake...it is merely feet wide in some places now where whole cottages used to be.....the entire complexion of the bay will change. Bay front properties will become lake front properties and the destruction to homes and businesses will be monumental. Sodus Point itself could be underwater! Please, please do not pass this plan as it stands.

William J. Sarver 26th August 2013 04:04:26
New York, North Rose,
I am opposed to the Plan 2014. We replaced an existing cottage on Sodus Bay and the building codes in place at the time, 2011 mandated that the finished 1st floor be 2 feet above the 100 year flood plane. We complied with this regulation and if Plan 2014 is put in place this very expensive structure will be in danger of being destroyed by high water. In addition, over the last 20 years my family and neighbors have installed expensive steel break walls, also built based on the current Lake Ontario plan. These walls could fail if Plan 2014 is adopted. We are also part of the habitat and need to be protected!!

LARRY E. LAFORCE 26th August 2013 02:32:43
NY, Sodus Point,
Upon reviewing IJC's Plan 2014, we find it very disturbing that one group of people....namely the environmentalists who will benefit at the expense of others. The environment is healthy, along with muskrats, black turns, Northern Pike & cattails. The NYS DEC & environmentalists have been on the same team for years and for some reason are screaming that all of a sudden the Lake Ontario ecosystem is falling apart. Why does the DEC have a different set of standards for the entire southern shore of Lake Ontario but the upper & lower St Lawrence River is benefiting on the shipping industry & hydro power electric producers that do not have to pay for the large scale damages that will surely effect massive private & public property damage? High water will flood our streets, homes, businesses, parks & the tourist industry. The sewer & water systems will be compromised allowing contaminated water to gain entry into Great Sodus Bay & other adjoining embayment's all along the South Shore of Lake Ontario. The economy of Sodus Point, Wayne County and the other 4 adjoining counties of New York will experience an economic disaster at least 6 times over a span of 20 years per the peak high water points on this latest IJC Plan! Property values will plummet, thus taking the overall tax burdens further inland to share the costs of keeping municipalities & governmental functions going. People have their life savings in their homes & business and it should not be taken away because of this ill conceived IJC plan! THE FUTURE OF UPSTATE NEW YORK'S SOUTH SHORE COUNTIES'S ECONOMY ARE IN YOUR HANDS!
Henry S. Stewart 25th August 2013 12:27:41
New York, Rochester, Town of Greece, Monroe County; and, Town of Huron, Wayne County,
I am strongly opposed to Plan 2014 and ask that it not be enacted or adopted. Please refer to and consider my comments prepared for presentation at the Public Meeting in Williamson, New York, on July 16, 2013, which are attached.
Attachment

Donna Belcher 24th August 2013 23:55:06
NY, Sodus Point,
My husband and I have worked hard for may year to be able to have our home. I feel special interest and big money is pushing this issue. Just to make more money for themselves with no regard for many others. We bought our home knowing that we were being protected by the water being controlled at certain times of the year. Now your just going to say SORRY! I don't think so!! I don't see how you can morally or legally Be able to do this to not just me, but to many other people and businesses. Yes I said PEOPLE!!!! Not a RAT!! It saddens me that our country has become so uncaring to the people, who's families built it!!! Do you go to church on Sunday? Maybe more people should try going back to church they may learn something about thinking of others more than GREED! And as far as the Canadian http://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=10151353647698519&set=a.10150459295048519.355730.74936643518&type=1, all these people are not aware of the flooding it will cause in Toronto. Maybe you should make everyone aware of this proposition, before you try ramming it through. This is BiG BUSINESS not ecology

Art Kirch 24th August 2013 16:14:35
NY, Rochester,
As a owner of shorefront property at both ends of Lake Ontario (Guffins bay )& (Kendall ) it's unbelievable you don't consider the 37,593 home owners (assuming 100ft. lots). How stupid can you be??? East end water is high for this time of year & west low? I'm sure the stubnose snail is more important??? Hope your department & State & Province can survive on the votes & taxes they provide? How much lake front property do you tree hugers own & taxes you pay from your make work cushy jobs??? GET REAL!!!

Linda Barber 24th August 2013 08:50:46
ny, Sodus Point,
Please do not approve the IJC 2014 Plan for Sodus Point - I do not want to lose my home

Vernon R Bishop 24th August 2013 07:58:45
New York, Sterling,
I own waterfront property on Lake Ontario in the Moon Beach area of the Town of Sterling, Cayuga Co.. Presently we have a severe coastal erosion problem in this area and raising the lake level will make things worse. I and my neighbors strongly encourage you to leave the lake level management as it is now and has bee for many years.

MIKE AND KATHY KENT 24th August 2013 02:04:06
NEW YORK, WEBSTER,
We support the "Plan 2014". As seasonal residents in Clayton, NY, we support any proposal that extends the higher water levels. In 2012 our dock was on dry land by early September. Our main purpose for staying in the area is the ability to keep our boat in the water. Any extension of boating and fishing will keep our dollars being spent in the Clayton business community.

ny, Rochester,

I am totally opposed to you current plan as it will cost millions of dollars in damage to much of the southern Lake Ontario shoreline!!! You need to come up with a plan that is more fair to all parties.

CONNIE PRASAD 23rd August 2013 12:13:46

NY, WILLIAMSON,

My family has had south shore lake front property for more than 30 years. We've watched as the erosion has taken our property. Our taxes are still on the original footage which are intentionally higher along the lake. Property values will drop with higher water levels, negatively impacting the surrounding areas currently receiving this financial support from the taxes. This has been pointed out repeatedly. There are so many who have studied the south shore and have voiced their opposition including dr. D. Barletta and mr. J. Steinkamp. Dr. F. Sciremammano, a member of the international st. Lawrence river board of control who also sits on the international lake ontario st. Lawrence river study board of ijc, was featured by the times editor in the aug. 4, 2013 times of wayne county. It was reported strongly and clearly he does not support plan2014. A very good article. I am amazed at the number of people supporting the plan when it's been made clear their neighbors on the south shore literally will lose their land. It is unfortunate when boats can't get out toward the end of the summer for 4 wks. But to have your home and land destroyed by the lake, which can be very ferocious as those of us know living here and to willingly increase the odds for us to lose the land seems unconscionable. Many on islands on the north side support the plan. They are not having the same damage. Are they willing to give up their homes for the plan? Are they willing to accept a plan that will require thousands and thousands of dollars for a new accommodating breakwater, which requires a specialist because of all the rules and regulations from various agencies? I think a thanks goes out to those who have persisted in following this situation so closely for us on the south shore. It's been going on for years as though over time we will roll over. I do not support plan2014. Sincerely, Connie Prasad

Gary J. Arnold 23rd August 2013 08:38:17

New York, Hammond,

We have been summer residents on the St Lawrence River for many years and have watched in dismay the continuously variable water levels. We support Plan 2014 as a way to finally stabilize water levels along the river. At various IJC meetings, we heard residents along Lake Ontario's South shore express concerns about the levels proposed trigger levels in Plan 2014 and have asked that water levels be lowered in the spring. While we certainly sympathize with their difficulties, this is precisely the action that has resulted in catastrophic low levels all along the river. In 2009 and again in 2012, the IJC released large amounts of spring water in the lake resulting in disastrously low levels down stream for the entire summer season. This is clearly not in the best interest of the majority of stakeholders along the river. We suggest that there be consideration given in the new plan for supporting obviously necessary shoreline and water system remediation efforts along the south shore of the lake.

Glen Runions 23rd August 2013 07:58:06

Ontario, Cornwall,

Managing water levels About 4 years ago a meeting was held in Cornwall relating to water levels in the Great Lakes / St. Lawrence Watersheds. Concerns of cottagers, the fishing community and land owners of property along the river & lake were addressed. My question as to high water levels on Lake St. Francis was addressed by a rep from Hydro Quebec. Twice in the previous year’s massive rainfalls had flooded farm fields of corn and soybeans for several days. His response to opening the gates at Valleyfield to alleviate high water was that the land in this part of the watershed was so close in elevation that lowering water levels would be of no help. Since that meeting and at least 2 times in the previous 18 months, massive rain falls have struck the area. A Bainsville dairy farmer told me they had to have bypassed the dam for this water to have gotten away so quickly. This response is appreciated by agriculture and those living near flooded
drainage ditches who don’t need sump pumps running around the clock for days. Whether we believe or not on global warming, weather patterns are changing and collectively we try our best to adapt. Glen Runions Cornwall, Ont.

**Attachment**

**Stuart Hotchkiss** 23rd August 2013 04:35:49  
New York, Williamson,  
This is clearly a bad idea. If it were not so it would have been implemented years ago. Obviously the plan caters to commercial ventures (shipping, marinas, etc.), environmentalists (muskrats?!?) and recreational interests. The plan is an effort to make adjustments for today’s environment without adequate consideration or compensation for undesirable impacts on existing surroundings. Lake levels already artificially fluctuate and this plan would only aggravate harmful effects. I must oppose it.

**Lucy D’Annunzio** 23rd August 2013 02:27:53  
NY, Rochester,  
NO, NO, NO, I Do Not Support Plan 2014

**Gary H. Rushmer** 22nd August 2013 15:49:57  
New York, Wellesley Island,  
I am a native of Niagara County, NY and received bachelor, master and law degrees from Cornell. I have spent part or all of 70 summers at my grandparents’ cottages in the 1000 Islands, near Alexandria Bay, NY. My wife and I own over 650 feet of waterfront land on Wellesley Island, including our cottage, which faces Canada. I own a motor boat and a row boat, and have observed water levels here all my life. THE BIGGEST PROBLEM THE 1000 ISLANDS FACES IS ABNORMALLY LOW WATER LEVELS IN LATE AUGUST AND ALL OF SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER. That problem is apparently created by Montreal harbor being too shallow for the larger and larger container ships that dock there, and therefore requesting the release of more water from the dam. The right solution to that problem is either to put a size limit on such ships, or to make the harbor deeper by digging, dredging, etc. The second reason for our low water level problem is the desire of the hydroelectric companies to release water in the late summer, even when the water level is low. By giving Montreal Harbor and the hydroelectric companies priority over the users of the upper St Lawrence River, those entities don’t have to deal with the CAUSES of their problems, namely a harbor that is too shallow for the bigger ships they want to accommodate, and finding alternative sources of electricity when seasonal factors reduce the amount of water that can be prudently released. For centuries, people have tried to build homes, etc on low land close to water. Following Hurricane Sandy last October, New Jersey municipalities are requiring all new construction to be higher above sea level. By acceding to the wishes of low land owners on the south shore of Lake Ontario, you are letting them ignore the cause of their problem, and encouraging others to build on low land, in reliance on the IJC “protecting” them from high water. Finally, I do not believe that flooding is an issue on the upper St Lawrence River. In conclusion, Plan 2014 seems like a reasonable proposal for the short term, but the CAUSES of the biggest problems should be addressed soon. Thank you for your attention.

**Dr. Daniel Barletta** 22nd August 2013 14:49:27  
NY, Rochester,  
During the LOSL Study, I repeatedly spoke out that the study was not looking into the effects of high water levels and its effect on the sewer systems that are along the south shore of Lake Ontario. The Technical working group failed to address the concerns I raised. Recently I learned that the Village of Sodus Point, NY, may due to an overloaded sewer system with high water have to shut off the water supply to inland areas of the town to reduce inflow. This could lead to the evacuation of the town. I have asked the Town of Greece if a similar situation exists in the
town. Attached are three maps of the town showing that with high water levels not only will the shoreline have problems but the inland highlands will also have sewer problems. This will effect another 700+ homes in these areas alone. There are other areas of the town that is being investigated. The County of Monroe is doing the same.

Dr. Daniel Barletta 22nd August 2013 14:37:24
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 24
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 22nd August 2013 14:36:27
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 23
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 22nd August 2013 14:35:36
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 22
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 22nd August 2013 14:34:41
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 21
Attachment

Gary Palmeter 22nd August 2013 13:51:00
NY, Sandy Creek,
I support Plan 2014 that will keep the water levels at or near what they were in 2013. I've been going to Sandy Pond since 1970, and last year, 2012, was the worst water level I've ever seen. I have property on the north pond. Everyone on my canal had to move their boats out of the canal around the first of August or risk having their boats stranded in the canal. In addition, it was extremely difficult to get out to Lake Ontario due to the low water levels. If the water level was to return to the 2012 level and remain there, the value of the property of North & South Sandy Pond would plummet. That would result in a tremendous loss of revenue to the community. I, personally, collected over a 1000 signatures in 2012 on a petition to help maintain the channel to the lake. Those 1000+ people were very concerned about the water levels of the lake, which affects the pond. That petition was sent to NY Representative Patti Ritchie. If these 1000+ people do not have access via Sandy Pond channel to the lake because of low water levels, the property values and the revenues for the community will be severely affected. I urge you to adopt the plan for 2014 & keep the water levels at least at the 2013 level. Thank you.

Molly Bihl 22nd August 2013 12:35:55
NY, Rochester,
My parents live on Lake Ontario. They are not wealthy. They love the lake and their home. I have witnessed storms while watching from their window, it can be terrifying. Do not underestimate the power of this Lake. How can any plan even consider raising lake levels over what is currently in the covenant of 58DD? My parents had to evacuate last October and that was a wind event, If the lake had been higher their house would have been in serious jeopardy. How can any one group decide to virtually wipe out private property, businesses, and threaten the very infrastructure of
the whole South Shore? Do not go forward with plan 2014. All entities must share the burden, this plan is unfair to all lakeshore dwellers.

Nancy Krill 22nd August 2013 12:32:47
New York, Redwood,
I support IJC's Plan 2014 that will restore our river water level to a more natural level.

Christine Brady 22nd August 2013 12:23:22
NY, Rochester,
MY husband and I live on Lake Ontario. This has been our dream. Plan 2014 doesn't only threaten our home and those of our neighbors, but thousands of homes and businesses along the south shore. To have any plan being proposed without the people who have the most to lose is absolutely unacceptable. Why is the burden of this plan laid squarely on our shoulders? Please watch the tapes that I know have been shared with the catastrophic damage that has occurred in the past and WILL (not might) occur again if the IJC approves this plan. The lake level cannot be higher than 246. Please, we have everything to lose. No to plan 2014.

Dave Youmans 22nd August 2013 11:59:10
NY, Mannsville,
I am writing to voice my concerns, and make suggestions, regarding Plan 2014. I have two concerns that should be addressed: 1. Plan 2014 still allows for higher high water levels than the current plan. This action would have severe economic impact to many areas on the eastern and southern shores of Lake Ontario. 2. Plan 2014 does not adequately evaluate the impact of storm surges for eastern Lake Ontario. This additional storm water and associated severe wave action, when combined with higher water levels, will cause even further damage to unique natural dunes and marshes, and residential and business property. Correspondingly I have four suggestions: Change #1: Lower the high water triggers of Plan 2014 to reflect 5% (not 2%) exceedence frequency. Change #2: Give the Board the ability to anticipate a short term trigger. Change #3: Require the Board to act if the triggers are hit. Change #4: Be sure the Adaptive Management Strategy is articulated well and funded and able to act quickly. For more details see the attached document
Attachment

Jim Andre 22nd August 2013 11:09:23
NY, Spencerport,
I am writing in support of the 2014 plan of the IJC. Current water levels are not natural. I have lived in this area and vacationed in the Thousand Islands region all of my life. Current water levels are much lower than they used to be. This is not good for nature, shipping or recreation.

Mark Phillips 22nd August 2013 08:36:51
NY, Rochester,
To the IJC and any supporters of Plan 2014, I just have to say- anyone promoting or buying into this notion that somehow higher lake levels build up and restore beaches is just flat out wrong. Unless you have lived right on the shore as I have for nearly 40 years you have no idea what you are talking about. I have personally witnessed how higher lake levels have washed away sand and beaches at neighbors properties that NEVER came back. Chimney Bluffs is a NYS Park directly on the south shore. Does the IJC propose eroding the base of this unique area that was formed by the last glacier? Is the IJC even aware of the unique and remote area at the far eastern end of Lake Ontario that is characterized by miles of sand dunes and pristine beaches? You CANNOT raise the level of the lake to 248ft. without impacting these natural features, not to mention what would probably constitute the illegal taking of private property.
Edward D Allyn 22nd August 2013 05:54:36
New York, Sodus Point,

I live on a spit of land that separates Lake Ontario from Great Sodus Bay. Over the past decade and more I have seen our beaches become gravel and stone from the original sand that we used to enjoy. Higher water levels have been a major contributor to this problem. The quality of our beaches directly effects out tourist industry as well as the value of real estate in the area. Some of us have lost land due to shore erosion, and our main street, Grieg street has become a wading pool virtually shutting down our business district and making homes uninhabitable. I appreciate the need for responsible husbandry of our natural resources and habitats, but allowing the flooding of areas which have historically have been immune from flooding does not seem to be the answer. Global warming may be causing the blooms of blue-green algae that we have experienced in the last few years, but I am dubious that greater fluctuation of the lake levels will provide relief from that menace to wild life, as well as human usage of our natural resources. Any solution to these problems need to be based on scientific facts, not on our equally important need for green energy. The cures may be costly for both of these programs, but doing one at the expense of the other is not an acceptable option. We need to find a middle ground that neither sacrifices the property along the lake shore or endangers the wildlife that makes this environment such a wonderful place to live. Best Regards Edward D. Allyn

William A. Petrilli 22nd August 2013 04:56:35
ny, chadwicks,

I support the 2014 plan to keep the waters high. As a 30 year summer resident in Goose Bay we are not only fighting invasive plants but our waterfront properties are becoming swamps because of the lack of proper water levels. Our taxes continue to rise yet our property values have decreased. Several residents along with myself have had their property up for sale for the last few years with no success. Its bad enough that the government to totally responsible (and doing little to nothing) regarding the invasive milfoil problem and recently you have turned off the hose! Please call I'd love to talk to someone who cares.

Laurie Andre'-Amis 22nd August 2013 03:34:27
NY, Redwood,

I strongly support the IJC Plan 2014! I have personally witnessed the degradation of the bays and tributaries along the Saint Lawrence River, over the years, due to low water levels. As water levels drop during the summer, many shoreline areas become muck and swamps, thus reducing fish habitat and navigable waters early in the season. Plan 2014 will help restore natural habitats for aquatic wildlife.

George Bott/ Sandy Creek Beach Association 22nd August 2013 03:28:34
NY, Hamlin,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Sandy Creek Beach Association which consists of the Brockport Yacht Club and 22 individual cottage owners. The homes are bordered by Sandy Creek on the eastern boundary and all of the homes are Lakefront properties on the South shore of Lake Ontario. Many of the homes have received extensive renovation and remodeling during the past few years and our concern is that these properties could experience severe property damage resulting from damaging water levels. Residents have made such expenditures with the reasonable expectation that the level of Lake Ontario would be held to a value which would not endanger the quality of their homes and that they would continue to enjoy the benefits of lakefront living without the threat of damage caused by higher water levels. It is our understanding that The International Joint Commission, which has been charged with reviewing and recommending for implementation measures to control lake levels, has been given the assignment of developing and presenting an updated plan. Many Lakeshore owners feel that a level of 246 feet above sea level offers acceptable safety and provides for optimum use of their property. We would encourage that levels at 247 feet above sea level, which may occur during the spring months be minimized and allowed to go no higher than the 2.8% of the time specified in the Plan identified.
as Modeled 58DD. We appreciate your support in encouraging a plan which will provide for the safety and enjoyment of our homes. Sincerely, George W. Bott

Harold Deisenroth 22nd August 2013 02:53:55
NY, Webster,
We own a cottage at Leone drive off West Port Bay Rd on Lake Ontario town of Huron. Twenty years ago we put in a break wall that was twenty feet or more back of the lake. Today the lake is AT the wall and we have no beach. To date we have invested $10,000 in addition to the original cost of the wall. I do not understand how the NEW plan will prevent additional erosion. Please reply

Mark Vande 22nd August 2013 01:17:39
NY, Sodus Point,
I can't believe that this is being considered without an evaluation of ALL the consequences or what the economic cost will be to both the government and to the people surrounding Lake Ontario. And I don't mean just me as a property owner in Sodus Bay, NY looking out our channel into the Lake - what effect will it have on the whole state and Ontario and Quebec trying to tax and economically make up for this decision. I would hate to be in your shoes to have this legacy of such a decision attached to you for the rest of your life!!!!!

Bernie Campbell 21st August 2013 14:14:15
NY, Clayton,
As a seasonal Saint Lawrence River resident since 1998 I have observed the water levels fluctuate based on the 1958 DD plan. The plan does not allow for the natural fluctuation patterns as it set arbitrary limits on high and low water levels. Climate, land use and water consumption has changed since 1958 when the plan was adopted. The IJC has spent many years and dollars researching and studying the best water management program to serve the environment, recreational and commercial use of the Great Lakes Water shed. Their recommendation, mirroring the natural fluctuation, based on years of data and new technology should "hold water". Each party looks only at how their situation will be adversely affected and prey on the maybe fears. This is the 21st century. I support Plan 2014 and the science that underscores its adoption. The plan is designed to do the greatest good for environment and those that use it resources.

Marc Hamilton 21st August 2013 13:14:18
New York, Penfield,
NO, I do not support Plan 2014

Diane Chappell-Daly 21st August 2013 11:53:29
NY, Syracuse,
I do not support Plan 2014. The water levels in Lake Ontario have been manipulated for years to the detriment of coastal areas including property owners and municipalities along the lake.

Betsy Gisleson 21st August 2013 11:43:13
New York, Sodus,
IJC Plan 2014 is absolutely ludicrous! I totally oppose, oppose, oppose this plan! Focus on improving the water quality of Lake Ontario, not raising the level of the water!

John Rudgers 21st August 2013 11:16:49
New York, Rochester,
For those of you who still believe this is about restoring lake levels in support of conservation or the so called normal lake levels get a clue. Plan 2014 is just another plan in support of higher lake level by shipping and power lobbyists. They still want to control the levels, not allow nature to do its thing. There is no reason to change the 1958DD plan, it hasn't affected conservation in the
least. Communities have built around plan 1958DD and changing it will disrupt the entire balance including the existing wildlife as well as the surrounding communities. Who is going to pay for all the damage. Plan 2014 supports intentional flooding which has a value of nearly half a billion dollars of taxable property and that's just one town. Are you serious. I'M IN OPPOSITION TO PLAN 2014!!!!!!

**Jens Rodenberg** 21st August 2013 10:50:10
NY, Rochester,
I oppose Plan 2014. For many years I have spent much time in, on or near Lake Ontario. At Braddock Bay (near Rochester, NY) and the nearby ponds, the wetlands are thriving and don't look like they need any help. At Sodus Point and Sodus Bay, any decrease of typical water levels will greatly reduce access to Sodus Bay (and other nearby bays) and any increase of typical water levels will increase erosion and even flood the properties of many homeowners and businesses. Is this plan purely for the benefit of the St. Lawrence River while neglecting all of Lake Ontario and its connected bodies of water?

**Alan R. Buyck** 21st August 2013 09:58:56
NY, Sodus Point ,
I have flood insurance. Will I need it?

**Gale Kordzikowski** 21st August 2013 08:46:06
NY, Sodus Point,
leave the lake levels alone, I have lost shore line already and do not WANT TO LOSE ANYMORE LEAVE THE LEVELS ALONE, LEAVE THE LEVELS ALONE,

**Michelle Rings** 21st August 2013 04:04:18
N.Y., East Rochester,
I do not support the IJC water level plan for 2014 and am appalled that it would ever be considered! My family lives on the lake in Hilton NY and would be severely impacted by this proposal.

**Don Rupp** 21st August 2013 04:01:52
New York, Redwood,
I support the 2014 plan. As an avid fisherman /environmentalist, I am very concerned about the health of our wetlands and bays as they are important habitat for aquatic organisms and they have been adversely affected by the old plan. Also higher water levels promote business along the St Lawerence River.

**Tim Schoen** 21st August 2013 02:24:56
NY, Whitesboro,
I support the 2014 plan to review water levels on Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence River

**Joseph Piekunka** 20th August 2013 17:15:32
New York, DRYDEN,
The US and Canada made a Covenant between these nations and the people of these nations to keep water levels at a given level. Law abiding citizens of both nations have built property based on this long-standing Covenant. When you brake the Covenant, the sewage system of Sodus Point will eventually be flooded. Homes will become useless, property values will plummet, no one will want to buy homes where sewage can backup into the homes. Bankruptcies, back taxes, and municipal revenue shortfalls will occur. Are you above the Law? Are you above the Covenant? If you think you are, the sewage will be yours to deal with, in this life or in your next life. For the sake of humanity, please put public health and good government above the needs of wildlife and expanded wetlands. Your designs will otherwise put raw sewage on the streets of
Sodus Point, NY. Class Action Law suits will abound on your doorstep. With a complete lack of trust in the IJC, I am, Joseph Piekunka, former resident of Sodus and Sodus Point. P.S. As I write this comment, your spell checker does not recognize 'Sodus.' Are you even aware of Sodus Point? Why won't you hold a meeting in Sodus Point? One can only speculate on your awareness of Sodus Point. (August 2013)

Larry Partridge 20th August 2013 16:41:31
NY, Redwood,
I have been around the river, mainly Goose Bay, all of my life, and don't like the effects I am seeing in the wetlands with the current plan. I feel the more natural highs and lows would be beneficial to the ecosystem. I support plan 2014.

Jill Partridge 20th August 2013 16:33:31
NY, Redwood,
I have lived on Goose Bay for 15 years, and feel that enough damage has been done with the previous unsuccessful plans. I support 2014.

David A Daniels 20th August 2013 14:20:21
NY, Clayton,
I am a seasonal resident in the Clayton, NY area. My stay in the area during the spring, summer, and fall months depends exclusively on how long I can keep my 2 boats in the water and use them. In the past I have had to pull the boats by early Sept, thus shortening my summer residence. Consequently, I contribute less to the local economy. I look forward to the implementation of the new "Plan 2014" since it will extend my boating season.

Gary Mitchell 20th August 2013 14:02:20
NY, Rochester,
I support Plan 2014. More natural water levels would make for an improved lake ecosystem.

Martha Maywalt 20th August 2013 13:43:40
NY, Syracuse,
My family has been enjoying Fair Haven Beach State Park since before I was born. Now the next two generations enjoy it. We want it to be there and be beautiful and support the variety of wildlife that inhabit the lake area for future generations. We support Plan 2014 and urge you to adopt it. Thank you.

Dave Pierson 20th August 2013 13:00:13
ny, binghamton,
Teresa A Sith 20th August 2013 11:33:49
New York, Clayton,
I support Plan 2014. This plan would return water levels to their more natural state. The wet lands and it's inhabitants need the natural seasonal fluctuation. It would seem best for a greater majority to allow water levels to ebb and flow at more natural seasonal rates. We need to think in terms of long range not just for home owners who knew the risks of building on a shore line. Most important, is protecting the largest fresh water resource in North America.

Mark Phillips 20th August 2013 11:30:47
NY, Rochester,
We keep hearing references to the "devastated wetlands" that the current plan has created and how the new plan 2014 will restore them. With respect to Dr. Wilcox, I would like to know where these devastated wetlands are and how have they been ruined? Where is the evidence? Where are the before and after aerial photos? I have lived across from Round Pond Marsh and near the other ponds along the lakeshore in Greece, NY for the majority of my sixty years. I have seen with my own eyes (I am also a pilot) how Braddock Bay and the other ponds look essentially the same as they did 50 years ago- contrary to the claims of some others making comments on this site. In fact it has only been in the past few years we have seen the comeback of Herons, Osprey and even Bald Eagles! If the number of muskrats I see as roadkill on my bike rides is any indication, I would say they are thriving too. The real problem with the ponds, bays and wetlands is lawn fertilizer runoff, invasive species like purple loosestrife, hydrilla and milfoil. After years of study and millions of dollars of tax payer money, one would think the IJC would come to a conclusion other than there are to many cattails in a few thousand acres of wetland around the lake- therefore we better flood out tens of thousands of private property owners and business, destroy public parks and beaches, sewer systems and public water supplies- to "Save The Muskrat". Could it be they have other intentions? After all, they did come up with this proposed plan after abruptly shutting down the previous proposal and going behind closed doors for secret meetings. Anyone who believes this is about "the environment" is either naive or fooling themselves.

Kathleen Spitz 20th August 2013 10:11:44
NY, Rochester,
I oppose plan 2014 for Lake Ontario----strongly oppose.

Terr Weiller 20th August 2013 09:12:45
NY, Watertown,
There are more people them myself in the Watertown area who are in opposition to the IJC Plan 2014. As usual this plan is all about shipping and hydropower. My family is from the Williamson, NY area. I have spent many summers in Sodus Point and familiar with this small town. My family is not wealthy nor is anyone else in that town. I understand their concerns and I am in opposition.
William Quarrier 20th August 2013 07:24:51
New York, Hammond,
My family has owned an island in Chippewa bay since 1895 ,when 1958DD was put in place we were forced to build all new docks to handle the new water levels. The plan was flawed from the start. The water never was the way the plan said it would be. It's to bad the lake properties were built in the flood plain ,they never should have been built in the first place. I would like to see the 2014 plan put in use.

Carol Derefinco 20th August 2013 07:00:23
New York, Hilton,
Let me start out with this old saying AN ONCE OF PREVENTION IS WORTH A POUND OF CURE. This is going to be a terrible loss to the homeowners and a great loss of taxes. Thank you I know you really care

Virginia Elliott 20th August 2013 06:16:19
Quebec, Westmount,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife.
The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Virignia Elliott

Bernard Carr 20th August 2013 06:09:59
NY, Pulaski,
I have boated and lived on Sandy Pond more than 60 years. I have seen the beach flooded and the channel move itself. I have seen man try and control for his benefit and gain all of those years, He has guessed wrong every time. You cannot control mother nature. Each and every try makes it worse. It is past fixing. Everyday someone stacks the deck against us land owners to prove a incorrect survery for the benifit of government and industry, who in turn make it worse. The shipping polutes the waters. When I came here we could drink from the Pond, Today I cannot see bottom at a depth of one foot. When I lived in Massena electricity was 4 cents /kwh, Metal co's less than 2 cents. Here at the Pond 17 cents and i have loss shore line.to do it. For that I pay some of the highest taxes around and live on a dirt road. Stop messing or get your facts straight. Even the IJC figures are taken when it best suits them.

Sally Sessler 20th August 2013 05:11:31
New York, Sandy Creek,
My main objection to this plan is the high water levels allowed. We have accepted the current four foot range, although even the high end of that is dangerous for our shoreline when there are high winds and waves. I was not able to attend any of the meetings, so I do not understand the trigger points that are proposed. I would accept low levels at any time, but I do not understand how shipping will allow for these.
William & Laura McKee 20th August 2013 05:02:18
NY, Lyndonville,
We are totally opposed to the proposed change. As a property owner for 30 plus years with 150 ft of frontage it would be totally cost prohibitive to build a breakwall to prevent wave action from wash, we have seen severe damage every time Lake Ontario is high. The Army Corps put in boulders in 1975, the high water has washed out several and they have fallen into the lake. With these levels with wave action property has washed away. We cannot afford the cost of replacing these boulders. The proposed plan would increase the wave damage to our property, we urge you to reject the plan. Bill & Laura McKee

Patrick DiNicola 20th August 2013 04:03:36
NY, Waterport,
As a previous supporter of the new regulation I am withdrawing my support as a result of having more information. As such I do not support the new proposal. The basis for this change is that the economic gain that will accrue to the shipping and hydro electric interests are at the expense of the property and towns on the south shore. Until some of that economic benefit is taken and applied to assist those damaged by the change I can not support this proposition. In addition having a web site supporting this proposal with a Muscratt hunter saying he would be able to hunt the muscratts the environmentalists are trying to save, seems to be counterproductive. Latly based on the attached from the Army corps the water levels in Ontario appear to be managed well under current plan and as such remain in effect. Attachment

Joanne Mitchell 20th August 2013 03:56:50
NY, Rochester,
I support Plan 2014. Lake Ontario belongs to all of us, not just to property owners. Plan 2014 would restore more natural water level variations and will help restore wetlands. Wetlands are essential areas for fish and waterfowl. This Plan will also restore more seasonal variations in water level that will help move sand and sediment out of creeks and ponds into the lake, replenishing beaches. The Nature Conservancy supports Plan 2014 and I do, too.

Heather Lee Murphy 20th August 2013 03:33:42
NY, Hilton/Hamlin,
I oppose any and all plans to raise the water levels on Lake Ontario! Thousands of South Shore residents and business will suffer millions of dollars of damages! I am a recently divorced single mom of three that struggled to keep my very modest lakefront home to give stability to my children while going through so many changes with a divorce. The breakwall that was here when the property was purchased (2000) is already failing at the current lake levels due to wave action. Higher water levels will dramatically accelerate the demise of the breakwall and undercut the lawn behind it. I already have a sinkhole situation in my yard from the failing breakwall, leaving part of my small yard to safe for my children. I have been unable to fix the situation as of yet due to lack of funds. If the situation continues and more damage is done it could quite literally bankrupt my family. In addition to the loss of property on the north side with the breakwall and sinkhole, higher lake levels could cause flooding in the crawl space under my home and damages to my septic system. Another cost burden my family could not bear to fix. My situation is not unique. Property loss and concerns for septic systems are the talk of the street, the neighborhood and the whole South Shore. The tax base will suffer if homes lose their value. Infrastructure will suffer and can the state and towns afford to fix culverts and bridges (etc) flooded out by higher water levels. What about public sewer systems near the shore? Who will pay for these costly repairs? We already pay high enough taxes! I am dramatically opposed to any water raising plan!!!!!
James Wheaton 20th August 2013 03:29:58
Clayton, Clayton,
Having lived and boated in the Rochester, NY area for most of my life and hearing the comments opposed to Plan 2014 I find them very self serving. Braddock Bay on the west side of Rochester where I boated most of my life has been damaged by the the current plan and requires greater water level variation to repair some of the damage. I hear the south shore comments about having to build breakwalls to protect their properties, just as I had to do on my property on the St. Lawrence river where I now live to protect from erosion. Those from the south shore that complain have homes built on flood plains that were once only fishing camps and small cottages. Why should the everyone suffer due to the lack of foresight of a few well connected property owners that do not want to protect their properties. I fully support Plan 2014 having seen the issues with our current plan from both sides of Lake Ontario.

Richard Scott 20th August 2013 03:23:34
New York, Wellesley Island,
I strongly support Plan 2014. I have been a resident on the St Lawrence River for almost 70 years and have watched the wetlands disappear and the economies of the cities, towns and villages suffer as a result of the outdated plan now in use. With the real time technology now available to monitor water levels Plan 2014 is a much better option.

David Whitt 20th August 2013 03:18:48
NY, Greece,
NO, I do not support Plan 2014. The water is too high now. Lots of erosion is occurring and my family is at risk, Our home is at risk. Raising the water level would make it worst. The natural vegetation would either erode away, drown then rot away. The wildlife along the shore would be endangered too if forced to retreat to higher ground closer to residents and roads, and with nothing to feed on nor live in.

Pat Cummings 20th August 2013 02:26:15
NY, Waterport,
No, I do not support Plan 2014

Thomas M. Voelkl 20th August 2013 02:00:55
New York, Hamlin,
TASK FORCE: PREPARE FOR FLOODING (Rochester Democrat and Chronicle 8/20/2013) According to a report issued by a presidential task force: “spending now on protective measures could save money later.” Protective measures? Wake up IJC - Plan 2014 is going in the wrong direction! Stop wasting money trying to push your single-interest agenda - over 20 million dollars to date - and use it to protect the shoreline. Abandon plan 2014 now and keep your promises.

Jeff Gould 20th August 2013 01:55:48
NY, Webster,
I am strongly opposed to Plan 2014! As south shore residents we have all accepted the shoreline damages we receive from the lake now, from Plan 58D levels. If you plan to sign a document changing this plan’s allowable lake levels you should be prepared to sign a second document providing funding to mitigate the increase in shoreline damages that will result. If you aren’t prepared to sign the second document, you have no business signing the first!

Edith Farrington 20th August 2013 01:45:40
New York, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to PLAN 2014. After speaking to the head of our Sewer Treatment Plant and with several neighbors, I feel this plan is an unjust one for the residents of our community and all
those living along our shore-line. We have planned & built our homes and sewer systems based on the plan into effect since 1958. If you change it now, you will be ruining us. This is not fair nor morally correct. How can you change the laws knowing it will surely cause damage to so many who have invested so much into their homes and property, sometimes for generations? Weather-related disasters are one thing, but those that could be prevented by laws are another. Please do not allow this PLAN 2014 to go into effect causing so much damage when it could be prevented.

Marlene Ferguson 20th August 2013 00:49:19
NY, Sodus Point,
I strongly oppose Plan 2014. I can’t imagine how anyone would benefit from the effects of this plan. The pollution to the waters alone negate any economic or environmental gains.

Gregory T Schiller 19th August 2013 12:45:27
NY, Wolcott, ,
Plan 2014 for Lake Ontario is insanity and irresponsible. When will it stop? Any proposal that includes raising the water level any higher than it is today is ludicrous to any South shore land owner.

Peter G. Grassl 19th August 2013 11:46:17
NY, Sodus Point,
Peter G. Grassl 8603 Greig Str. NY, Sodus Point Reviewing IJC’s PLAN 2014, one must ask the question why change a plan in effect over 50 years. The answer in such a case is always that a powerful interest greatly benefits from the change while less influential groups are affected detrimental. By analyzing who gains and who looses one can find the underlying reason for this specific request. The shipping industry may benefit some because a higher Lake Ontario water level may slow the fall of levels in the upper Great Lakes (currently at historical lows). Shipping in Lake Ontario was fine for over 50 years at the prevailing levels so an increase of 0.7 feet is difficult to justify. The environmentalist won’t gain the benefit of frequent and large level fluctuations because they don’t have access to the controlling devices. The small business community and private citizenry will be negatively impacted by shore erosion, loss of use of property, damaged infrastructure, loss of business, higher insurance premiums etc. That leaves the power generators as the only interest group benefiting by slowing the unused water outflow from Lake Ontario and ultimately from the Upper Great Lakes. This slowing causes the Lake Ontario level to remain high for the foreseeable future having a very negative impact on residents and businesses on the south shore. As a resident of Sodus Point, a Village which is in danger of being made uninhabitable, I implore you to abstain from implementing PLAN 2014 or any other plan to increase the high water mark currently in force.

John Hinsman 19th August 2013 11:23:18
New York, Sodus Point,
I am vehemently opposed to Plan 2014.

Kevin Lloyd 19th August 2013 10:41:40
NY, Mexico,
I and all my neighbors are opposed to this plan. Water levels have fluctuated a few inches for 50 some years and we lake front property owners have spent lots of money over the years in response to this. Most of us pay very steep property taxes and have lost many feet of property to the lake already. The expectation of state and federal agencies of we the property owners to protect against a possible 4 foot rise in lake levels is criminal at best. The local government should have made us more aware of this 10 year ongoing study much earlier than this week, as I only heard about it via word of mouth yesterday. There is a real STINK to this whole proposal and I don't think it's fair at all!
Deborah Viniski 19th August 2013 10:08:53  
New York, sodus point,  
No, I do not support Plan 2014.

Chris Tsai 19th August 2013 09:31:20  
NY, Sodus Point,  
We are vehemently opposed to Plan 2014. My family and I own three cottages on Crescent Beach, the barrier sandbar that separates Lake Ontario from Sodus Bay. If Plan 2014 is allowed to proceed we and our neighbors will lose our property to the lake. Over the last 25 years, we have invested significant money and “sweat equity” in these properties and continue to invest in them to comply with regulations imposed by the State and the DEC. We dutifully pay our taxes and contribute to the local economy every year and plan to do so for decades to come. This plan is not a well thought out, balanced plan and the financials behind it are a joke.

John J Wickett 19th August 2013 09:10:44  
New York, Ontario,  
As a water front home owner that pays a lot of property taxes and a recreational boater, I say NO to Plan 2014. Please stop this unsound plan!

David Williamson 19th August 2013 07:22:19  
NY, Sodus Pt.,  
We are totally opposed to the proposed change. As a property owner since 1975 and who has 490 ft of frontage it would be totally cost prohibitive to build a breakwall to prevent wave action from washing into our home. In addition the structure was built to building codes established under the current plan. With these levels with wave action we would literally have water coming into the crawl spaces resulting in health issues as well as damage to plumbing & heating. Please consider those who have built to the building codes. We cannot raise this home higher due to the codes in place for height restrictions as well. This cost prohibitive for the community as well the destruction of business and homes. David Williamson

Bill Towner 19th August 2013 06:45:55  
NY, Rochester,  
I do not support the 2014 Plan to vary the Lake Ontario water levels as presented. Living near the lake shore and an avid sailor i have seen the damages done to the shore by high water plus know the costs marinas have to inccur for both extreme high and low waters. Many will become either inaccessible or worse put out of business due to the high costs of dredging in low water or replacment of docks in high water. Either way this plan needs to be re-thought out.

Michael F. Sullivan 19th August 2013 06:31:07  
NY, Sodus Point,  
Plan 2014 for Lake Ontario water level regulation is irresponsible at best and willful destruction of private and public property at worst. This is another in a series of nearly identical, destructive plans that the IJC has put forth over the last 7 years or so. This one is rebranded Plan 2014 which is essentially B+, BV7 with “trigger levels” added. Those upper level trigger levels are above flood stage in the Village of Sodus Point. Large areas will be flooded, sewer and water systems damaged and inoperable, many homes and businesses severely damaged or simply destroyed. Please note that installation of the village sewer system and reconstruction of many seasonal cottages into year round homes occurred AFTER Plan 1958DD was implemented. That would not have happened if the lake level had not been “stabilized”. Let me assure you that the estimates of economic consequences to the south shore of Lake Ontario and the embayments are grossly underestimated in the IJC presentations. This has to stop now.
Linda J Wilson 19th August 2013 06:22:48
New York, Webster,
“NO, I do not support Plan 2014” The IJC’s Water Level “PLAN 2014” Will Cause Loss Damages to Recreational Boaters, Waterfront Properties & Businesses

Barbara Zaepfel 19th August 2013 06:09:20
new york, sodus point,
I am strongly against any proposal for raising the water level on Lake Ontario, please repel IJC Plan 2014!

Minnie Osteyee 19th August 2013 04:59:07
NY, North Rose,
I am strongly opposed to Plan 2014. Data given by the IJC clearly shows an economic benefit to hydroelectric power and recreational activities below the dam on the St. Lawrence River while punishing, both physically and economically, New York State's Lake Ontario south shore, Sodus Bay, its Watershed and the other embayments. Infrastructure, businesses, marinas, residences, boat houses and docks were constructed to accommodate the four (4) foot range of lake levels established in Plan 58D. Plan 2014 proposes to change the lake level range to 7-11’. The higher highs and lower lows will mark the end of Sodus Point, Crescent Beach and the shorelines of Lake Ontario and its embayments as they are today. All this, without including compensation in Plan 2014, is totally unacceptable. Quebec, Canada has said it will not accept any damage as a result of Plan 2014. New York State must also say "NO"! This disproportionate plan must be rejected. The IJC needs to conduct a transparent environmental study that identifies the real issues facing Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Once the real issues are known, a remediation plan can follow that will not have disproportionate effects on any stakeholders.

Laurey Costich Ritchie 19th August 2013 04:31:15
NY, Webster,
I attended our yearly Crescent Beach Association Picnic and the two major issues were The Town of Huron's new sanitary sewer law and the proposed 2014 Plan. Crescent Beach is located between Lake Ontario and Sodus Bay. This barrier peninsula provides protection from wave action damage to Sodus Bay and is what makes the Bay the Bay and not part of Lake Ontario. Loss of this barrier island will have major negative impacts to Sodus Bay. Because of our location, traditional septic systems cannot be installed and all residents are now required to install anaerobic systems at a cost of approximately $10,000 per cottage. This is a major investment for seasonal residences. High water levels proposed by the 2014 Plan will destroy these new structures. What recompense is proposed for the landowners on Crescent Beach by the IJC? Tourism and recreational values have a major impact on the lake shore town's tax bases. Our property taxes fund town services from which we do not even benefit. The Town of Sodus Point, the numerous marinas, the Sodus Bay Yacht Club and numerous bayside restaurants will also be severely impacted. We do not want the Plan 2014 and cannot accept that the environmental damage that proposed high water will cause has been seriously calculated and considered in the plan. We also cannot accept the lack of financial reimbursement such damage will cost. The installation of the new sanitary systems will easily top half a million dollars for the residents of Crescent Beach alone. Please go back to the drawing board and produce a plan that balances the needs of all stake holders. This plan is unacceptable to those who live on the Lake.

Chris 19th August 2013 03:35:06
NY, Williamson,
Any proposal that includes raising the water level on Lake Ontario is ludicrous. 500 words is not nearly enough to properly explain all of the negative impacts that this would have, not only for shore residents, but for residents throughout the state. I strongly oppose any proposal that includes raising the Lake Ontario water level and I will fight strongly to make sure it doesn't take effect.
Jeanine Agnello 19th August 2013 02:12:17
NY, Hilton,
I do not support Plan 2014!

Michele Milborrow Wrue 19th August 2013 01:09:14
NY, Rochester,
I am fully AGAINST Plan 2014! My family has lived along the south shore of Lake Ontario for over 50 years. Lake level worries plague this community constantly. Mother nature brings her own mixed bag of issues, but throw a higher lake level in the mix, and ALL residents and businesses along the shore will be negatively impacted. The lake is becoming increasingly "angry", especially with recent weather events. We have watched property, docks and boat hoists be taken by waves in "regular" weather events. If the lake level increases, people along the shore will be held captive by the lake they love. Lower lake levels offer some security from flooding and damage to life and property. PLEASE LISTEN to the people of the south shore! THEY ARE YOUR RESIDENT EXPERTS! They live the lake each day and all year. They know her habits, threats, and joys. Please take their pleas, advice, and concerns seriously, as they will be the ones on the front lines of your decisions. Thank you.

James Carlin 18th August 2013 23:23:06
NY, Webster,
I find it hard to believe that an irresponsible plan such as Plan 2014 could be implemented without regard to property damage and consequences to homeowners. I recognize other factors such as wetlands that would like to be improved, but at what cost? I think a serious look at our priorities are in order here.

Anthony M Cotsworth 18th August 2013 16:35:10
NY, Hamlin,
No, I do not support Plan 2014

Susan Wormer 18th August 2013 14:50:15
NY, Williamson,
I DO NOT SUPPORT PLAN 2014. WE ALREADY EXPERIENCE PROBLEMS WITH EROSION AND LITTERING FROM LAKE ONTARIO WASHING UP ON OUR SHORE WHEN THE WATER IS AT ITS CURRENT LEVEL. IT TAKES DAYS TO WASH UP THE DEBRIS THAT COMES IN FROM THE LAKE, INCLUDING APPARENTLY BOATERS' WASTE (INCLUDING TOXIC SPECIES SUCH AS TAMpons AND USED CONDOMS) - AND THIS IS AT THE CURRENT LEVEL. PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE THE WATER LEVELS OR I WILL BE FORCED TO SELL BECAUSE CHANGING IT WILL IN FACT SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER THE FAIR MARKET VALUE. SINCERELY, SUSAN WORMER

Thomas Callens 18th August 2013 12:16:30
New York, Sodus Point,
As a 30 year resident of Sodus Point I would like to object to the latest plan to regulate the waters of Lake Ontario. A stable water level is the best for both wildlife and human activities. Extreme highs and lows would cause problems with structures in the village and human use of the bays and channels. As for wildlife, a stable water level is much better for swamp and shoreline animals. Extremes of water levels damage dens, lodges and nesting areas. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Tim Maxam 18th August 2013 10:11:12
NY, Sodus Point,
plan 58dd works why change it, the area cannot afford the low water levels or the high water levels proposed by plan2014
JANE SULLIVAN SPELLMAN 18th August 2013 09:50:28
   NY, Ilion,
   NO I do not approve of Plan 2014

Jennifer Beyer 18th August 2013 07:19:00
   Alberta, Edmonton,
   International Joint Commission: Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. Healthy ecosystems are important for the long term health of our fellow citizens and the sustainability of our economy. For this reason I want to express my VERY STRONG calling on you to commit to a full and speedy adoption of Plan 2014. Note that the plan clearly achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests”; there is no clear reason for you not to accept it. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,

Sue Bassage 18th August 2013 06:44:26
   New York, Sodus Point,
   If this plan is put into action, we will experience significant damage to both public and personal property in high water times, along with massive economic damage for businesses who depend on the waterfront remaining stable. The current plan works, there is no solid reason to change it.

Rahul Mehta 18th August 2013 06:19:21
   Ontario, Mississauga,
   International Joint Commission: I am writing today to express my complete support for Plan 2014 and call for the adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

Anne Ketcham 18th August 2013 06:12:38
   NY, Sodus Point,
   NO to Plan 20141 I have lived in Sodus Point on Lake Ontario and hope to continue. I feel much more thought should be given to insure a safeguards on our beloved beach.

Barbara Mead 18th August 2013 05:56:03
   New York, Sodus Point,
   I do not support plan 2014 if (and only if) it would flood and destroy our properties And others along our shoreline.
jdipoalasr 18th August 2013 05:02:46  
New York, Webster,  
I have lived on the lake front since 2002 and this is the worst year for loss of beach front with my boat filled with mud and algae after every storm or high wind. Please release water from the lake. Thank you

Erich Pfifflner 18th August 2013 05:01:06  
NY, Sodus Point,  
High water will flood our streets, homes, businesses and parks. The sewer infrastructure will be compromised allowing sewage to run into Sodus Bay and Lake Ontario. Lift stations will have to be shut down as well as the water supplies so toilets will not be able to be flushed. The economy of Sodus Point, Wayne County and many other areas along the south shore will experience an economic disaster. Property values will plummet taking the tax burden further inland to keep municipalities and governments functioning. People have their life savings in their homes and you should not take that away from them. This plan is disproportionately harmful to those on the south shore while the hydroelectric and those down river (from the dam) benefit.

Stephen Fritsch 18th August 2013 01:42:14  
NY, Greece,  
I absolutely do not support Plan 2014. The only thing this plan is sure to achieve is further erosion of already endangered lakefront property.

Erin Rupp 17th August 2013 12:24:59  
NY, Redwood,  
I support this plan. I think it is fair to all parties involved. I think everyone involved has to consider the fact that we are all in this system together. We need to consider what is best for the future of this beautiful ecosystem.

Edwin Kondratowicz 17th August 2013 11:18:36  
ny, sandy creek,  
I live on sandy pond & have suffered damage and loss of land due to high water during times of storms under the existing plan what will happen with higher water levels under this new plan?

Ashley Ferreira 17th August 2013 08:42:51  
Ontario, Newcastle,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ashley

Robert Legge 17th August 2013 07:43:46  
NY, Lyons,  
No. This is a very bad plan. There is clear evidence that both high water and low cause irreparable damage and significant economic costs that the Plan has no provisions to rectify. Plus
there is no evidence that the Plan will result in ecological benefit -- only opinions. I do not support this plan -- it is very bad policy.

**James McNaney**  17th August 2013 07:33:16  
NY, Sodus Point,  
Our only home is on Great Sodus Bay in the village of Sodus Pt. We've lived in the same neighborhood year-around since 1977. If IJC plan 2014 is implemented we will lose our home and our way of life. Water levels of 248' will be above banks and flood our entire neighborhood and all low lying residential and business areas of our village. Water levels of and above 246' during June and July are as high as they should ever go to prevent the aqua cleansing of our town and others like it along the south shore of Great Lake Ontario.

**Ellen Thiel**  17th August 2013 05:43:32  
New York, SODUS POINT,  
I have studied the 2014 plan on changing the water level of Lake Ontario, and have grave concerns regarding the changes proposed. The high levels that this plan allows for will cause flooding to our town, and a majority of the southern coast, destroying thousands of houses and businesses, the coastline, and sewage/water systems. The lows provided for in the plan would leave us without enough water to utilize this beautiful bay, leaving us with docks that lead nowhere, and would affect local businesses that rely on the water. The impact on the environment would be devastating. I implore the IJC to allow the water to remain at their current levels. It would be logical that the plan that has been in effect and working well for the past 55 years should remain in place.

**Mick Albright**  17th August 2013 05:42:10  
New York, Sodus Point,  
As a life long homeowner, taxpayer, voter, and now retired I know most of the issues that surround my beloved Wayne County! As a Vietnam Veteran returning to my home to this region I have seen the best and the worst decisions ever made by those in charge that have effected the locals in many ways. But now this water level issue is seemingly over our heads as will the water level be when certain utilities will need to be shut down, if changed as recommended by an International Joint Commission are approved! There's always something, and behind closed doors it's most generally money. I say no to this proposed change, leave well enough alone, and at the ground level that's still dry and sewers dependably working, I'm telling you that a hornets nest has been stirred up more that this Commission is aware of! It's not a pleasant situation for the Commission to possibly be in if this proposal passes, appearing to locals here as bully's who could/would be publicly scorned.

**Donald McGinn**  17th August 2013 04:58:07  
NY, Sodus Pt,  
My mother is a resident of Sodus Point and owns a year round lakefront home on the loop. I oppose this plan as any amount of substantial rain already causes the potential of flooding. Raising the lake level is not the solution and will cause major damage and loss of homes in this area. Please reconsider to alter your plan.

**Jerri Goulden**  17th August 2013 03:52:28  
N.Y., Sodus Point,  
I am opposed to Plan 2014, as I feel it would be very detrimental to the village of Sodus Point, and also to many other properties along the lake. We all have worked very hard to make things prosper; why undo so much good that has been done.
Andrew Phillis 17th August 2013 03:28:02
NY, Webster,
The proposed plan is BAD for property on Lake Onatrio’s south shore. Over 17 years I have seen the power of Lake Ontario’s waves. Last year when Sandy passed through we were spared massive damage and erosion only because the lake level was low. Had Lake Ontario been at the upper levels of this proposal, this one storm would have devastated the south shore. We already have steady erosion and damage to limited breakwalls; increasing the upper limits guarantees it will get even worse. Do not change the rules in the middle of the game on us. Do not make us sacrificial lambs to appease others.

Richard Ketzak 17th August 2013 00:41:18
New Your, Chenango Forks,
“NO, I do not support Plan 2014”

Louis V. Civiletti 16th August 2013 15:50:54
N>Y>, Rochester,
I nor my friends endorse nor support Plan 2014. It would cause considerable damage not only to homes along the shore but utilities as well. Please consider an alternate plan or leave it as it is. Thank you.

John Volker 16th August 2013 14:08:03
NY, Webster,
I oppose the 2014 plan. If our friends in Montreal need to ship more goods in larger ships, they should build a lock instead of flooding their friends to the south.

Niesha Anderson 16th August 2013 12:16:24
NY, Oswego,
Plan 2014 will erode what is left of the south shore. My mother remembered being able to drive out on the shore and have picnics and volleyball out there. No longer! What is left are OUR summer homes, please consider how man has ruined many areas to benefit big business only to have Mother Nature revolt!

Mike Novik 16th August 2013 09:38:44
NY., Sodus Point,
As a business owner/resident of Sodus Point, I am deeply worried about the future impact this really poor idea of allowing Lake Ontario’s water levels to fluctuate so drastically. Lucky for us, our home sits well above the Lake, however our home is also our B&B business. I cannot imagine the negative impact from low or high water levels that will harm our business personally, or the destruction that WILL HAPPEN to our fellow neighbors and fellow business people around our Sodus Bay! Please consider dropping this ludicrous idea. Currently Lake levels are very high and it is mid-August. If we get hit with a Hurricane like Agnis in the early 70’s, lake front homes will be sitting is 4-7 feet of water!

Chris Johnson 16th August 2013 08:08:35
NY, Rochester,
I simply do not understand how flooding sewer systems could possibly be considered a benefit to an ecosystem. In 5 plus years living on Edgemere Drive there have been a couple occasions where during high water situations my toilets wouldn’t flush properly, I can only imagine that being worse still with higher water levels. This is really the best plan?
David A Nagel 16th August 2013 08:07:35  
NY, Rochester,  
I own a home on the south shore, and have for 24 years. I have seen many lake levels in those years. I have positioned my breakwall about six feet above the lake level to protect myself and my property (House). I am totally apposed to Plan 2014, as it would do extensive damage (Uncalled for damage). When are you going to listen to lake residence? Leave well enough alone!

David Bell 16th August 2013 07:36:02  
N.Y., Rochester,  
The current Lake Level Plan has taken away approximately 17% of my property since Plan 1958DD was put into effect. My property has been surveyed to the water line of Lake Ontario at least 4 times since 1979. An average, 25ft of my property was under water and unable to be counted in regard to use for building in my Town of Greece. I have been denied use of my property due to this higher average Lake level. If the Lake level is increased on the high side, I will have even less property to use much of the year. This is removal of property without the right to due process guaranteed by the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Please give me my rights to due process to defend my property. Please don't implement a new plan and take more of my property seasonally and perhaps permanently. This new plan is the equivalent of seizure of my property by the State without compensation! Please help me. Let me know how I can defend my property.

Karl Reinhold 16th August 2013 05:15:03  
NY, Fairport,  
I support Plan 2014. The Great Lakes region is one of the most important ecological area in the world. They make up about a quarter of all fresh water in the world. The current plan is very outdated. Our wetlands and other bordering natural areas are suffering because of it. I have spoken with Dr. Doug Wilcox of SUNY Brockport, who has studied the Great Lakes nearly his entire career, about the issue on several occasions. He is in support of this plan as well. This plan will not hurt homeowners, it will only help them. They will not lose property. The plan will restore beaches, along with wetlands. People are concerned about pump stations, but if they learned more about this plan they would know that the plan calls for measures to be taken before the water level reaches certain points. I believe in this plan and I believe this plan is our hope for a better life.

Rosemary Thomas 16th August 2013 04:04:59  
New York, Sodus Point,  
An agreement/treaty was agreed upon 50 years ago...let us continue to honor that agreement. Entire communities were built on that agreement and to change things now reminds me of all the treaties that the US government had with the Indians...look what happened. Stop spending tax dollars on this issue, enough.

Jamie Hayslip 16th August 2013 02:48:02  
NY, Rochester,  
I do NOT support Plan 2014. I grew up on the south shore of Lake Ontario, and my family has a home on Sodus Bay. The economic impact of this plan would ruin the lake shore communities like Sodus Point, NY, I reject the environmental arguments such as preserving the wetlands. Any change to the environemnt will have an impact on the ecosystems and some of the effects will be negative.

Jason Hayslip 16th August 2013 02:42:34  
NY, Rochester,  
I oppose plan 2014. As a frequent recreational boater and customer of both shoreline marinas, waterfront businesses and properties I know that drastic water level changes would both interfere
with the ability to use and enjoy the lake and harbors as well as drive away the property owners and businesses that are on the lakeshore. Environmentally speaking, the worse thing that could happen for the lake would be a loss of the caring interested parties that have a stake in the lakes health and cleanliness (property and business owners). If they are eliminated because a wildly fluctuating lake is unuseable and impossible to maintain property around, then you can bet that support both financial and social for all kinds of water quality and improvement initiatives will walk away with them. That scenario will be the real environmental disaster, harkening back to an age when no one used the lake so no one cared what went in there or what happened to it.

Jim Yates 16th August 2013 01:35:08
New York, Wolcott,
I do not support the 2014 plan for allowing more change in Lake Ontario sea level. I believe this will cause more erosion to my lake front property.

Alan Christodaro 16th August 2013 01:30:38
New York, Rochester,
I do not support Plan 2014. This plan is not the answer.

Karen A. Marsh 16th August 2013 01:04:07
New York, Rochester,
I do not support plan 2014.

Daniel Engert 15th August 2013 15:21:57
New York, Barker,
I am an elected Town Supervisor in Somerset, NY. I represent private citizens and businesses located along the southern lake shore of Lake Ontario. A NYS Park at Golden Hill is situated in my town along this lake. A total of 165 private parcels and 15 vacant land parcels along this lake shore represents almost $428,000,000 of assessed valuation. The Plan 2014 is a disaster for my town, it's a disaster for Niagara County and it's a disaster for the entire southern shore region in New York State! My constituents are strongly opposed to this plan and so am I. Please re-consider this effort to maximize profits of big business at the expense of taxpayers and property owners on the southern shore of Lake Ontario.

David Dimbleby 15th August 2013 15:15:21
New York, Hamlin,
I live on Lake Ontario and oppose the most recent lake level management plan. My property includes 500’ of lakeshore which includes woodlands and protected wetlands. I have already witnessed current high waters eroding the land separating the lake and protected land. Higher lake levels will breach the wetlands and woodlands further and over time destroy federal and state protected land. This property is home to woodland plants and animals, some that are endangered and protected. The proposed higher water levels will not only damage homes, it will erode shoreline, and land that is home to people, animals and plants. I ask that the joint committee considering plans actually spend time visiting shoreline properties prior to making any decisions with potentially adverse outcomes.

Gwen Comstra 15th August 2013 15:12:42
New York, Hilton,
I can not support the new plan for the levels of the water in Lake Ontario. The high water this summer has caused damage to my breakwall and has prevented me from using my jetski as I can not leave the jetski in the hoist as I have for 13 years due to the potential for loss during high waves. I always have some beach by now, but because of the rain this year, the water is high and when the waves come in they simply bounce off the wall creating even more turbulence . I know this is an "act of nature" this year as we have had significant rain. However, to maintain this level
during the fall and spring storms will cause great damage. I pay higher taxes to have the privilege of lakefront living. I don't believe that higher cost should include higher losses of property and the inability to utilize my watercraft. I have not seen any explanation for the need for higher water in Lake Ontario other than to profit power companies. If someone needs to make more of a profit from this lake, they should be responsible to compensate those who stand to lose their homes.

Ellen Prosser 15th August 2013 14:41:33  
NY, Webster,  
I have a summer home in Sodus Point, NY. I am totally against Plan 2014. Our beaches, homes and businesses will be devastated with the flooding that will happen with this new plan. It seems to be, the shipping and hydroelectric industries will be the ones that will benefit from this Plan 2014. We need to protect our Lake Ontario south shore communities from this disastrous plan. Please consider everyone that will be impacted with this plan. Thank You, Ellen Prosser

Douglas Klock 15th August 2013 14:26:57  
NY, Hilton,  
To those concerned: I wish to convey, in the strongest terms possible, my objection to the proposed plan for regulation of Lake Ontario water levels. Please read completely the details that follow. I am extremely concerned that riparian interests are being ignored by the International Joint Commission in its deliberations concerning the 2014 alternative for regulating the level of Lake Ontario. This plan is so obviously ludicrous that I have been assuming it was only some political ploy to appease an environmental interest. But it is beginning to appear that you are actually serious. Already home values have been lowered considerably on just the rumors of this plan’s implementation. You do realize that, if executed, it is just a matter of time and the (im)proper winds, that the south shore of Lake Ontario will be completely wiped out. I can only believe, for some perverse reason, that that is your goal! Having lived on the shore of Lake Ontario for nearly 45 years, I have witnessed personally the devastation that high water levels can bring about, not only to the shoreline but also to our homes. Most recently, my house is still now standing only because hurricane Sandy came through last fall with the lake level low. Even so, authorities at that time felt the need to evacuate the shoreline homes. Had the storm come to this location during a spring in which lake levels were even marginally above the current LTA, the entire south shore of Lake Ontario would have been wiped out. The desolation would have resembled the New Jersey shore. This new proposal for Lake Ontario would not require a hurricane to accomplish the same. While you have apparently found a solution with the 2014 plan that appeases the multi-billion dollar power & shipping interests, the plant and wildlife interests, and sometimes the weekend boaters; you are only able to advise the people who are most directly affected by your decisions, the people who have their homes on the lake, to suck it up. The only guidance you give to us is to become “educated and informed with respect to the basic hydrology of the Great Lakes-St Lawrence system” - - translation: learn how to spend more money to protect what we have for many years already paid taxes and more to maintain. Additionally, you will restrict further what we are able to do to protect our own property. All this because, for some arcane reason which I can only imagine must be political, you prefer to assuage corporations and animals while endangering the welfare of people! And with the new proposal, it will be financially prohibitive for many of us even to try to effectively protect our homes.

Denise Washburn 15th August 2013 14:06:59  
NY, Sodus Point,  
Repeated coming up with alternatives to a plan that has worked since 1958 is ALREADY hurting communities along the south shore. Constant “change” in the future does not bode well for real estate. Instead of trying to adjust water levels, let’s address the water quality. Lake Ontario is the receptacle for all the other great lakes.......it’s not doing well.
Emily Seneca 15th August 2013 10:42:42
NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to this plan because of the adverse effects it will have on me and my neighbors who live along the lake shore. High water levels will cause flooding and destruction of homes and businesses as well as disruption to our water and sewer lines. Please think of the vast number of people who live or have businesses along the lake shore when you are making these decisions.

Elaine Allis 15th August 2013 02:04:17
New York, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to this plan. We would lose our summer homes due to the higher water level. We have only crawl spaces. This year the water is high and the break wall has seen the water come over it constantly this year. Please consider that sewers, and water will not be operable for us if the water level is raised. Most are not insured for flood, the FEMA, NY State are all ready out of money, who is going to pay for damage to businesses, homes, water authority, municipalities? Please please reconsider your plan and leave the water level right where it is now. Thank you, Mrs. Elaine Allis

Mark Phillips 14th August 2013 09:48:08
NY, Rochester,
Once again I believe the IJC is showing their natural bias for the environmentalists over the private and public property holders by flooding (pun intended) this comment site with a preponderance of supportive form letters ("I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach") while refusing to publish the many critical comments I have submitted in the past. I have copied my elected representatives on each of my submissions so it will be easy for their staff to cross reference and note how the IJC choose not to approve my comments critical of plan 2014. I suggest the IJC begin to include ALL comments both positive and negative, lest they open themselves up to future law suits. Right now this is NOT an open and transparent process. As a final note - everyone is entitled to their opinion, if it is indeed their own. But what does a resident of Calgary, 1000 miles away, sending a form letter, really understand about this proposal and the destruction it will create?

Christian Tertinek 14th August 2013 09:21:44
New York, Sodus Point,
The Village of Sodus Point has a number of pump stations for sewer that will become inoperative if water goes over 247.3 feet ASL. To reduce the amount of pollution they will cause, water to buildings on higher elevation will have to be shut off. This represents 90% of the village without water. On the attachment it shows the flooding (FEMA map for part of the Village) that will occur if water or wind driven level rises above 248 feet ASL. Homes businesses and the economy will be wiped out for the benefit of power generation and windfall economy for those around the dam and downriver. Please reject the idea of Plan 2014. It is the morally correct thing to do.

Laurie Amorese 14th August 2013 08:35:13
New York, Hamlin,
Why is my original comment drafted on the 12th not published? Too passionate perhaps? I know it doesn't start out with the standard "International Joint Commission: I write to you today to express my strong support for Plan 2014" as so many of our Canadian counterpoints have. How very odd to see so many comments, all begin with the exact same sentence?? I guess you pick and choose what comments are viewed. I strongly suggest you publish everyone’s comments irregardless of point of view. In our country we strongly support, Freedom of Speech. I will just submit my original comment to the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle for publication. Sincerely, Laurie Amorese
Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th August 2013 08:04:40
New York, Rochester,
I had made an earlier comment regarding the Number of private and public parcels along with the total assessed values for the 6 counties along the south shore of Lake Ontario. The number of parcels reported was incorrect the number should be 10025 with a total value of over $3.7 billion

Chandra Reader 14th August 2013 05:52:18
Ontario, Port Hope,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Chandra Reader

Gerard Palmer 14th August 2013 05:10:09
NY, Sodus Point,
I am commenting on the proposed new 2014 Plan to regulate Lake Ontario. First of all your premise that this will “continue to contribute to the economic health of communities throughout the region” is false. If anything, it will destroy the economic health of many of the south shore communities from Sackets & Henderson Harbors on the east all the way around the south shore of lake to the Niagara River. Any municipality, business and homeowner who has built infrastructure based on the long standing 1958 plan, will suffer serious economic consequences if this plan to allow a 248 foot level is implemented. As residents of Sodus Point, NY we have been told that our sewer and water will have to turned off if the lake level reaches 248. This will make our village not habitable. Is this what the IJC wants, to destroy villages and places where we live? You state "The aim of the management plan is to reduce flooding and erosion on the Lake Ontario shoreline”. Implementation of this 2014 plan will increase flooding and cause further erosion on the south shore, the exact opposite of what you state is the intent. Thousands of lake shore homes and businesses will suffer because of this higher 248 level. Please retain the 1958 plan and do not adopt the 2014 plan. Gerard Palmer Sodus Point, NY

Dr. Dan Barletta 14th August 2013 04:37:37
New York, Rochester,
• The six counties on south shore has with exception of parcels west of Oswego in Oswego county have 9547 private and public parcels with a total assessed value of $3.7 billion dollars • At an average 4% property and school tax rate, there is $148 million going into supporting local economies • At an average of 1% (data found on cost of annual maintenance of property) the annual cost to just maintain the properties equals $37 million into local economies • If just 10% of properties are damaged due to Plan 2014, this will equal damages amounting to $370 million. o As a reference in 1973, there was a state and federal disaster called for the shore of Lake Ontario. In tow of the affected counties alone (Jefferson and Monroe) the total amount of damages then was 16.5 million in today’s dollars that equals $87.8 million. This does not include adjustments for house that were seasonal in 1973 that have become year-round family homes today.
David Pierson 14th August 2013 01:24:36

ny, binghamton,

Attached is analysis of all water levels since 1930's. It shows lowest level versus highest level for each year. This shows IJC's "Natural flow" theory is a myth. Only twice during preplan was there a more diverse range of levels that the current 4' range. In fact post plan had more years and wider range of water flows. So to summarize: - Tern and Muskrat losses are common across many u.s. states. Obvious 1958dd did not cause the losses. Also obvious plan 2014 won't bring them back. - Plan 2014 does not need ("stochastically two") water levels above 248'. Proven by two flood years ('73 and '93) that did nothing for wetlands, and wildlife losses. Why flood people when there is no need? - Plan 2014 lacks lower lows. On average for 14 qtr months in the dead of winter (dec-mar), the average low is 1.09" below current 1958dd low limit. How does IJC expect us to believe this one less inch of frozen water will help the wetlands, and that this will do anything for beach replenishment. Preplan had way lower lows, and not just in winter. The current plan has 12 more quarter months of lower lows than Plan 2014. Seems obvious to me these lows during these months exactly follow the schedule of when ships sail. - On the flip side, Plan 2014 allows water levels to raise on average 5" for 17 qtr months. And 5 qtr months IJC will not even trigger an action until the lake is at or above flood level (248'). In '73 and '93, IJC couldn't stop the lake from flooding till is was full foot above the upper limit (247.3'). So if IJC does nothing until lake reaches 248.13', will anyone bet that it won't reach 248.5, or 249? Yeah - you bet with dollars, we lose our houses. Again this UNNECESSARY based on historical facts, and ijc's own bv7 scientist Mr. Wilcox. - Natural flows argument doesn't wash. Post plan has provided more range more often. Do your own analysis, and make your own decision. Shoreline owners love the water and wildlife just like you do. We have no more money than those rich river folks. I feel like we're paying for someone else's screw up and greed.

Attachment

Edith Farrington 13th August 2013 13:44:40

New York, Sodus Point,

I am oposed to PLAN 2014. I believe in doing what is best for our environment, but flooding on the South Shore of Lake Ontario would not be the best answer. We all want clean waters. Flooding and in-operable sewer systems would not help our environment. Please do not allow this to happen to our beautiful community and waters. There must be a better answer for everyone and our waters. We need to take everyone's needs into consideration and this PLAN 2014 would be very damaging to the Sodus Point community, including homes, businesses and our public beach.

David J. Bell 13th August 2013 13:28:33

N.Y., Rochester,

I live on the shore of Lake Ontario. According to Monroe County, N.Y., I own 50 ft. of frontage and a lot 150 ft. deep. However, my property has been surveyed 4 times since 1979 and on an average I now have only 125 ft. above the water line. In the Spring this year I had only 100 ft. When the Lake is at 246.5 ft. above sea level, 34% of my property is under water. With the new water level plan I could have even more of my property under water. I would like to know how to be compensated for this loss and for the potential loss of even more of my property with the new plan being proposed by the I.J.C. Please inform me of my legal rights and how to obtain legal representation for my loss. The 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides me the right to due process due to the loss of property to the State. Can you help me obtain legal representation to save my property? Sincerely, David J. Bell

Doug & Diane Black 13th August 2013 09:51:12

Ontario, Toronto,

Our cottage is situated on the shore of the St. Lawrence River about 4 miles west of Brockville. It has been in the family for five generations and we have seen the river drop by quite a bit, first
from the construction of the Seaway, and since then because of several droughts over the past years. It would be great if the levels came up enough to maintain the wetlands and protect wildlife that is so threatened. I can understand property owners not wanting to see their lands flooded, but surely a compromise can be made to consider both concerns? A healthy environment is so necessary to humanity as well as to other creatures. Diane & Doug Black

David Pierson 13th August 2013 07:24:21
ny, binghamton, 
Attached chart shows the hypocrisy of plan 2014. While maxing out the high triggers near the highest recorded flood levels ever, this low chart shows they don't want low lows, especially during the months ships sail. 1958dd actually has (12) more low qtr months than plan 2014. 
Attachment

David Pierson 13th August 2013 06:48:15 
ny, binghamton, 
This attachment kinda supports my previous comment submission. Darn website wouldn't allow me to attach to the rather wordy last one... This chart is a snippet of ijc high deviation triggers. Water levels could be 249.99 for 6 qtr months and not even trip a trigger (45 days). Can you say intentional flooding ? So how come Montreal gets a different set of triggers that actually save them from flooding ? 
Attachment

David Pierson 13th August 2013 06:36:30 
ny, binghamton, 
Plan 2014 is a smoke screen to raise levels for shipping and hydro. Why is the average highest high 5" above the current high limit (17 qtr months), yet the average lowest low is only 1.09" below current low limit (243.3') ? What happened to the painful "gainful" lows like preplan ? And has anyone else noticed that all the plan 2014 lows only occur in the dead of winter (dec-mar) ? Can one less inch of frozen water help the wetlands ? Ha. Besides, the Terns and Muskrats weren't lost because of the water levels anyway. All mid atlantic and northeast states has seen drastic muskrats declines. And if 1958dd is the cause of Tern losses, then why does Pennsylvania, Vermont, Ohio, Maine, Michigan, and even the state of Washington all claim to have similar Tern losses and rate the bird as endangered. 1958dd didn't drive away wildlife any more than plan 2014 will bring them back to lake o and the rest of the other states. IJC, this reasoning is no longer valid. "Stochastically", IJC predicts 248'+ in next 100 years. Why, who's this for ? These levels are not needed for wetlands. History proves it. In '73 and '93 (span of 20 years) we had those flooding high waters. So if we already had those two high levels in span of 20 years and the wetlands are still tainted, then what is reason for two more in the next 100 years. Simple - there is no reason to have such highs. Mr. Wilcox (bv7 scientist) and others have said, "higher" highs are not needed to fix the wetlands. Further proof that plan 2014 has no intention of fixing anything is the pitiful plan 2014 lows. Natural preplan lowest lows are in the mid 242's. Plan 2014 just barely gets below the 1958dd low limit (243.18 is lowest), and only for 14 qtr months, and only in the dead of winter. I have the chart of every water level for every month for every year since 30s. 242's happened frequently and in all months of the year. Not so with shipping protected levels of plan 2014. High water won't help wetlands, history proves it. And plan 2014 has 12 less qtr month lower lows than 1958dd. This is the worst plan of all. 
Attachment

Peter Hallagan 12th August 2013 16:21:53
ny, sodus point, 
I learned of this pending plan and would like to voice my opinion that this will be devastating to the environment and property that surrounds lake ontario. for over 50 years home owners have
invested in property surrounding the lake and allowing the lake to fluctuate to the stated levels will completely inundate huge portions of these lake shore properties. Additionally, there is no real compelling reason to do for the few species named as they are not endangered. We implore you to not make changes to 58DD and to scrap the IJC Plan 2014. The Plan 2014 is proposed by a group of folks who are not looking at the ethical and economic devastation that will result from such a poorly conceived plan.

Jean Hallagan 12th August 2013 14:02:02  
NY, Sodus Point,  
In trying to understanding the many plans put forth, I wrote in a previous comment, I support the B+ plan. I rescind that statement about the B+ plan. I do NOT support Plan 2014 for reasons stated in my previous post. There has to be a better solution that will not cause undue flooding, loss of sewer and septic tanks, and shoreline erosion displacing many species (including humans). Until the governments can find a solution that will not cause these new problems, we need to continue with the existing plan.

Janina Lapp 12th August 2013 13:56:30  
Ontario, Wasaga Beach,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Janina Lapp

Emile Emond 12th August 2013 12:39:31  
Québec, Québec,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,

Mark R. Dick 12th August 2013 10:36:35  
New York, Greece,  
Having lived on Lake Ontario since the mid-sixties I’m very familiar with the damage to the homes on the south shore caused by high water and the inevitable storms in the spring. My first cottage, that was later converted to a year around residence, had 50 to 75 foot of beach in the late summer and fall. The beach vanished when the water level was raised. Storms and high water in the early 70’s required sandbagging around the clock to save our residence. Thirty years ago I moved to the highest point I could afford on the lake in the same area. I had a boulder break wall
Laurie Amorese 12th August 2013 09:26:10
New York, Linwood,
I am shocked and enraged at proposed Plan 2014. I am a resident of the "South Shore", 5922 W. Wautoma Beach Rd., Hamlin,NY to be exact. Your proposed plan has the potential to wipe out mine and our neighbors lake front properties. The thought that at times our lake level could raise up to 3 feet is ludicrous!! Who proposed this?? The commission is made up by 6 people. Three Americans and three Canadians. What is the proportion of people affected on both shorelines?? Oh that's right the North Shore neighbors won't really be affected. I can't believe that our future lies in the hands of six people. Three of which have only benefits to gain for their country. I have read some of the comments of our Canadian friends saying too bad , we get what we deserve for building to close to the shoreline. Typical holier than thou attitude! Thank you my Canadian "friends! "How can a country of 34,568,211 people versus 313,914.040 population have equal representation on the joint commission of 3 and 3??? How is this possible? So the country with the lesser population ,with less people affected has an equal say about an issue that will devastate our U.S. shoreline! Let's stop hiding behind the apron of the fretting environmentalists, stop worrying about the decline of the muskrat and focus on people and property. We know this move is about the almighty dollar, Attaining more grant money to help the shipping industry. You better be prepared to air mark some of these funds to help the people who will lose there homes. You are worried about the environment? Wait til the raw sewage from flooded septic systems start pouring into the lake. Oh that's right the sewage will only be blown in, by the prevailing north winds onto the selfish, south shore American's flooded homes. Wake up and smell the sewage and the truth about this Plan 2014. I think we should rename your proposal to Plan SROTSH {Screw the Residents of the South Shore} I will be watching as will my fellow shoreline neighbors on how our 3 American commission members represent us. I am not going to sit here idly while some mad scientist has his hand on a lever ready to release destruction on our beloved shoreline. Sincerely, Laurie Amorese

Madeleine Richard 12th August 2013 09:04:43
Québec, Laval,
Je souhaite par la présente vous faire part de mon soutien au Plan 2014 et vous appeler à pleinement et entièrement adopter dès maintenant cette nouvelle approche de gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario. C'est grâce au Plan 2014 que nous pourrons assurer un avenir viable à ce bassin versant emblématique en lui permettant de retrouver des niveaux et débits plus naturels, et que nous permettrons la restauration d'un écosystème précieux pour la faune et toutes les communautés qui l'habitent.

Greg Ornt 12th August 2013 03:16:53
NY, sodus point,
I participated in our town meeting Saturday and I must say that I am totally against theBv7/plan 2014 proposal. My HOME and the community of Sodus Point would be completely destroyed if the water levels rise much above the current 247.3 high level. Communities have been built around the lake over the last 55 years based on the current water levels and there has got to be alternatives to support the wildlife. For those of you who support this plan, I have a question… If YOUR HOME and Community was to be destroyed by the plan… would you support it? Greg Ornt – Sodus Point, NY – Resident
ddudley 11th August 2013 18:38:02

ny, hilton,

Property damage will be encouraged by this plan. Sewers, structures and erosion will damage the quality of our lake homes and community tax base. The plan to use energy and shipping revenues to fortify the southern shoreline is a good one. Build sewer and erosion control systems and breakwalls to allow for higher water levels, before destruction occurs. Follow the money.

Attachment

ddudley 11th August 2013 17:33:15

ny, leicester,

please consider attachment

Attachment

Jean Hallagan 11th August 2013 15:36:31

NY, Sodus Point,

Please see the video at http://www.change.org/petitions/petition-against-plan-2014. With lake levels of about 246, the beach at Sodus Point was devastated. The current plan of levels up to 248 will decimate the beach. Each sand beach on lake Ontario has its own ecosystem - higher Lake levels will destroy these. It will also cause horrific economic damage to the relatively impoverished rural communities with the loss of homes due to flooding particularly in Wayne county, but also in many other communities. In 1973 the access roads to the Sodus Point Beach and tourism areas were flooded - the 2014 Plan would completely devastate this area. The Sodus Point village would have to close off the water and sewer systems. You simply cannot allow the loss of water and sewer to happen to so many residents, and potentially pollute lake Ontario. We can NOT afford the 2014 plan. The "B+" plan offers a better alternative.

Tom Babcock 11th August 2013 14:09:10

New York, Hilton,

I am an environmentalist, recreational user of Lake Ontario and have lived on the south shore for over 60 years. I have years of personal experience with Lake Ontario and have accessed lake-level data before and after management was established. A stated objective of Plan 2014 is to restore more natural patterns of water-level fluctuation in order to improve the environment and recreational use. There is no question that Lake Ontario water quality has degraded, but not because of water-level management. Introduction of invasive species and vegetation, many caused by the shipping industry, coupled with pollution caused by runoff, are the primary causes of Lake Ontario water quality decline. Prior to water-level management extreme lake-level lows were twice as frequent as extreme lake-level highs. Only the record high of 1952 exceeded highs that have occurred since water-level management was instituted. Lake-level control eliminated the extreme low lake levels while high levels continued, causing significant erosion and property damage. If restoring natural water-level fluctuation is important for the environment, there should be an increase in the number and magnitude of low-level events and a decrease in the number and magnitude of high-level events. Plan 2014 will not restore natural water-level fluctuation.

Lake-level management has reduced yearly variability between highs and lows, but it did little to prevent high water events. Data from the last 40 years shows a skewing to the high side of the long-term average. The shipping and hydroelectric industries are the primary beneficiaries of water-level management. Plan 2014 further benefits hydropower. Property owners, particularly those of us on the south shore of Lake Ontario, will once again shoulder the negative economic impacts. A March 1973 storm caused significant property damage to the south shore. The average lake level for that month was 247.15 ft. The proposed upper regulation limits of Plan 2014 for the months of February through August range from 247.15 ft. to 248.46 ft. It is predicted that the proposed monthly limits will not be exceeded more than 2 percent of the time. However, the probability that the lake-level will exceed 247.15 ft. is much greater than 2 percent. The potential for property damage with Plan 2014 is significantly increased and understated in the...
economic analysis. While lake shore properties will bear the brunt of the negative economic impact of Plan 2014, all taxpayers will pay through decreased property values, payment of disaster relief funds and insurance surcharges.

**Caroline Fleszar** 11th August 2013 10:37:57
New York, Sandy Creek,
Please look at the picture of Eastern Lake dune damage from one small Gale. The beaches and dunes of Eastern Lake Ontario will be destroyed under the trigger levels of Plan 2014. Please oppose Plan 2014.

**Michael & Paula Crawford** 11th August 2013 06:05:53
NY, Hilton,
We strongly urge the IJC to abolish plan 2014. We have spoken at public hearings and written to your committee the last two years. We have voiced our concerns and you come back with a new plan that benefits all interested parties EXCEPT Ontario Lake south shore property owners, public lands and municipalities. Each plan you come up with does nothing to protect Ontario Lake south shore property. There is never mention of any help for mitigation costs for shoreline property owners only that over 2 million dollars per year will be costs that we will incur, which is grossly underestimated. Why are the property owners, public lands and municipalities the only ones that have to suffer with your plans? The proposed plan 2014 supposedly brings more natural fluctuations to the Lake’s water levels in order to restore “vital wetland habitats and breeding grounds”. It is realistic that higher water levels increase the chance of flooding along the lakeshore, public beaches and municipalities. Floodwater can wash out sewers and septic systems, wash pesticides from lawns and farm runoff into the lake. Higher water will also push pollution and invasive species into areas that have never been exposed to these elements before. All of these are serious environmental issues that would be detrimental to water wildlife. Proposed Plan 2014 is misconstrued as a plan that emulates natural water levels. Since the Moses-Saunders Power Dam was built, Lake Ontario has experienced higher water levels to the benefit of Hydroelectric Power and the shipping industry and detrimental to shoreline property owners and municipalities. There is no “natural” plan when the water is actually controlled by a Power Dam. We strongly urge the IJC to abolish plan 2014 and devise a new plan that benefits every stakeholder along the shores of Lake Ontario.

**Alex & Linda Rasbach** 11th August 2013 04:41:10
NY, Hilton,
We live on the south shoreline of Lake Ontario. If this plan is put into place and the lake is allowed to rise up to 3 feet from current high levels, our property will be destroyed in a storm. Consideration of the impact on people and their property needs to take precedence over wetlands. This plan must be tabled and current lake level management left in place.

**Michael Denunzio** 11th August 2013 01:14:12
Ontario, Tecumseh,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to
the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Michael Denunzio

Michael Blenk 10th August 2013 14:55:08
New York, Youngstown,
The IJC Plan 2014 portends disastrous results for many interests on Lake Ontario! As a member of the Board of Directors of Old Fort Niagara, I have watched carefully for the last 34 years as the varying water levels and occasional storms have impacted this historic treasure. In the past six months, a very large erosion pit has opened along the shoreline which threatens to engulf the stone steps and beginning of the seawall protecting the fort. This will only be exacerbated if water levels are allowed to be even higher at the time storms hit. On a separate tact, as an avid fisherman, I greatly dread the impact on our smallmouth bass population and salmonoids if water levels are fluctuating, especially at times when the fish are spawning. It is clear that the authors of Plan 2014 have missed considering some very important issues related to Lake Ontario water levels. Please conduct truly objective investigations of all aspects of this plan. We cannot afford to cripple the sport fishing industry in western Lake Ontario, and we will all be the poorer if our 300 year old fort crumbles because of poor over site.

Karen Luza 10th August 2013 10:31:07
Ont, Scarborough,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

James Hermann 10th August 2013 06:33:04
ny, Sodus Point,
Unlike the pre-packaged positive comments which are obviously fake, I disagree with the proposed plan. The new high and low water levels will create huge economic losses for South Shore communities. Our little town of Sodus Point will virtually disappear, since flooding will destroy the village infrastructure and family homes that were built in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. As homes lose their value, taxes will rise for the rest of us. It's strange that hydroelectric power companies are projected to increase profits, while we are collateral damage. The IJC has fudged numbers to show minimal economic losses. It is unfortunate that money and questionable science are valued more than our communities.

Jenny Moyano 9th August 2013 17:57:12
Ontario, Mississauga,
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St.
Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

John Thomas 9th August 2013 14:14:23
NY, Brewerton,
I am writing to inform you that I strongly disagree with this plan. It has hardly changed from the previous plan that I strongly disagree with. The Higher levels will condemn my property and the extra step to obtain permission from the IJC Board to make deviations only adds a delay in action. This is an outrage to condemn & confiscate my property. This not eminent domain and contrary to the constitution not compensate me for me property. No assurances have been made. Who will pay me for my property? None of this has been determined or committed to. No Monies Set Aside to Fund Property Owners.

Jean-Sebastien Choiniere 9th August 2013 09:36:05
quebec, Montreal,
Je souhaite par la présente vous faire part de mon soutien au Plan 2014 et vous appeler à pleinement et entièrement adopter dès maintenant cette nouvelle approche de gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario. C'est grâce au Plan 2014 que nous pourrons assurer un avenir viable à ce bassin versant emblématique en lui permettant de retrouver des niveaux et débits plus naturels, et que nous permettrons la restauration d'un écosystème précieux pour la faune et toutes les communautés qui l'habitent.

Attachment

Loic Benoit 9th August 2013 09:33:13
quebec, Montreal,
Je souhaite par la présente vous faire part de mon soutien au Plan 2014 et vous appeler à pleinement et entièrement adopter dès maintenant cette nouvelle approche de gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario. C'est grâce au Plan 2014 que nous pourrons assurer un avenir viable à ce bassin versant emblématique en lui permettant de retrouver des niveaux et débits plus naturels, et que nous permettrons la restauration d'un écosystème précieux pour la faune et toutes les communautés qui l'habitent.

Attachment

Jim Jerome 9th August 2013 07:04:05
NY, Pulaski,
IJC. I write today to Save the Lake !!! Since the seaway and you folks have gotten involved we have seen 145 new invasive species both plant & animal hurt arrive to hurt our waters. We have seen the taking of family properties as you allowed Lake Ontario to come to us. We did NOT build too close as many have had claimed but have lost huge amounts of lands due to your mismanagement. You now ask us for a second taking of our properties with no mitigation nor compensation. Fair?? Balanced?? Reduced benefits you say to us?? A sneaky way of saying take one for the green team and like it. Trigger Points? One inch drop a week is the best you can do at full flow and that will not cut it. You claim to be another Mother Nature but you are the farthest thing from it. Hydro gains $5.5 million per yr. more than they make already. Shipping makes untold extra dollars in larger loads and deeper drafts. Sure it's all about the environment???? We folks that have been around are not quite so easily fooled into just sending form letters all about the alleged future healing of your past mistakes. Save The Lake !!
Coralie Charbonneau 9th August 2013 05:37:16
Québec, Anjou,
À la Commission mixte internationale, Je souhaite par la présente vous faire part de mon soutien au Plan 2014 et vous appeler à pleinement et entièrement adopter dès maintenant cette nouvelle approche de gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario. C’est grâce au Plan 2014 que nous pourrons assurer un avenir viable à ce bassin versant emblématique en lui permettant de retrouver des niveaux et débits plus naturels, et que nous permettrons la restauration d’un écosystème précieux pour la faune et toutes les communautés qui l’habitent. Le plan doit permettre de réaliser le but ultime de la CMI, soit de redonner des flux et débits plus naturels à ces cours d’eau, au bénéfice de l’environnement et tout en tenant compte d’autres intérêts. La santé des écosystèmes d’eau douce est indissociable de celle des communautés, de la faune et de la flore, et de la viabilité de notre économie. Ainsi en implantant une meilleure gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario, nous offrirons une meilleure qualité de vie à tous les citoyens qui vivent, travaillent et vont se ressourcer le long des berges du fleuve et du lac. Ce nouveau plan contribuera également à la viabilité économique, environnementale et sociale de cet immense bassin hydrographique que constituent le lac et le fleuve. C’est donc avec enthousiasme que j’appuie cette nouvelle démarche en vue de la régularisation des niveaux d’eau dans le fleuve Saint-Laurent et le lac Ontario. Je vous remercie de tenir compte du témoignage de ma position dans ce dossier. Cordialement, Coralie Charbonneau

Jennifer Burelle 9th August 2013 05:14:02
Québec, McMasterville,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

Laurel Imeson 9th August 2013 03:46:47
ON, Waterloo,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Laurel Imeson

Lindsay MacLennan 9th August 2013 03:39:01
Ontario, Alexandria,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St.
Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Lindsay

Margherita Picillo 9th August 2013 03:35:57
Quebec, Montreal,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens of Quebec and Ontario and our fellow Canadians. My family and I love to be by the water front to go see the whales in Tadoussac QC to swimming and enjoying the sand dumes at SandBanks, Ont. This water way needs to be cleaned, respected and maintained not only for us and our wildlife but our futur. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Margherita Picillo 1-514-924-1010

Philip Poppa 9th August 2013 02:06:41
ON, Mississauga,

Please implement Plan 2014 as quickly as possible. It is vital for the health of the greatest fresh water resource on the planet. Thank you. Regards... Phil Poppa

Claude Douesnard 9th August 2013 01:37:27
Qc., St. Lazare,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,

Brad Jones 8th August 2013 18:34:48
Alberta, Edmonton,

I strongly express my support.

Trixie Deveau 8th August 2013 17:04:40
Ontario, Toronto,

If our individual lives have any meaning, surely it must signify our commitment to future generations in preserving the Earth and its wonders, as we have been privileged to enjoy, to
restore that which through folly has been damaged as humankind's technical skills increase, not to ravage the earth, but to protect it.

Lynn Morrison 8th August 2013 16:59:00
ON, Athens,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Lynn Morrison

Tara Wellington 8th August 2013 14:46:24
New York, Syracuse,
Please look at the video of Eastern Lake Ontario high dunes falling at level 246.0 on February 25, 2012 in 8 foot waves. Two of the last 3 years have had no ice barrier to protect the dunes and beaches for the first time ever. The trigger is almost 2 feet higher and the dunes could be exposed to 25 foot waves in a major gale. The beaches and dunes will be beached under Plan 2014. These dunes protect the largest wetlands on the Lake. http://youtu.be/KcqZVazl5sDo

Christine Bacinski 8th August 2013 14:36:41
Ontario, Mississauga,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Christine Bacinski

Mallorie Milton 8th August 2013 14:36:22
Ontario, King City,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in
Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, 
Mallorie Milton

Caitlin McInerney 8th August 2013 12:58:36  
ON, Oakville,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Caitlin McInerney

Lee Steinfeldt 8th August 2013 10:31:55  
NY, Rochester,  
Your plan would destroy large portions of the lakefront along the south shore of Lake Ontario, and other areas of lake shoreline as well. Can you offer any scientific evidence to prove that causing millions, if not billions, of dollars of damage offers any kind of significant benefit to even begin to justify causing that kind of devastation to homes, water treatment plants and shoreline structures of all kinds. Insurance absolutely will not cover these costs, especially considering that the damage from high water will occur over and over and over. Low water levels will prevent many water-based businesses from operating, and may put them out of business. In a time of extreme economic hardship, a time when others throughout the state, from Gov. Cuomo to the DEC, are trying to build and strengthen Upstate NY in all ways, from the economy to the environment, your plan is somewhere between utterly irresponsible and criminal.

Maria Gosselin 8th August 2013 10:28:02  
Quebec, Montreal,  
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. As I live within a few minutes walking distance from the St. Lawrence river, its current condition is both frustrating and appalling. Fresh water should not stink like a sewer. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sarah Valentine 8th August 2013 09:56:24  
BC, Whistler,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife.
The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Sarah

8th August 2013 07:59:26
ON, Toronto,
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, N C

Jacquie Lynn 8th August 2013 07:32:10
BC, Victoria,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, JL

Amie Staples 8th August 2013 07:22:04
ON, Bolton,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Amie Staples
Jessie Eisenkrein 8th August 2013 06:40:11
alberta, edmonton,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Jessie Eisenkrein

Blaine Jones 8th August 2013 06:09:17
BC, Armstrong,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments, and good luck to the future of all our shared waterways. Sincerely, Blaine Jones

Heather 8th August 2013 06:06:36
Ontario, Waterloo,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Heather

Ann Gallie 8th August 2013 05:53:48
ON, Sudbury,

As a member of WWF, I strongly support Plan 2014.

Ted Kozlow 8th August 2013 05:48:32
ON, Toronto,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St.
Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,

Laura 8th August 2013 05:44:28
Ab, Calgary,
Save the rivers, save the wildlife! Save the wildlife, save the world! Save the world, save us!

Mary Furlong 8th August 2013 05:27:13
QC, VERDUN,
I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Mary Furlong

Andrew Jaroszinek 8th August 2013 05:23:52
Ontario, Thorold,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Andrew

Patty Carlson 8th August 2013 05:18:46
Ontario, Richmond Hill,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management
of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Patty Carlson

Anna Louise E. Fontaine 8th August 2013 04:25:11
Quebec, Lantier,

Richard Roach 8th August 2013 03:43:57
NY, Youngstown,
This is environmental extremism at its worst. In the far north the extremists use violence to stop whaling ships. Now they want to use the violence of nature to destroy whole communities. All this does not consider that people have lived in these communities for their entire life and they are now asked to be ready to abandon their homes and communities in the name of extremism. The social, economic and psychological damage that will be foisted on the public will be horrendous. Historic jewels like Old Fort Niagara in Youngstown, NY will be destroyed. The people who wish to use the violence of Lake Ontario's storms to destroy the shoreline and communities apparently see nothing wrong with it as long as their aims are met. In another part of the world these proponents of violence might use car bombs to promote their goals. The IJC must go back to the drawing boards and come up with a plan that does not exclusively cater to one special interest group and does not cause huge economic and social upheaval.

John Rudgers 8th August 2013 03:21:43
New York, Rochester,
I DO NOT SUPPORT PLAN 2014. Are you serious with these comments....from individuals that don't even live near the lake and/or without any comment why they want to changing the plan that has been in place for well over 50 years. When you think about how long the lake levels have been being controlled its a plan that hasn't really been in place very long. This plan has worked to control the water level to make everyone happy. The eco system is just fine and in alot better shape than if we hadn't controlled the levels. Its NOT time for a change in the lake levels, individuals, businesses and communities will be devastated by such a change. Who is going to pay for all the Damage !!! Is the IJC going to take ownership of the damage and foot the bill -NO, then they shouldn't be allowed to make the decisions. Lets have a vote...get everyone involved that will be effected. Don't forget about the Federal/State government for all the lost revenue from property taxes, and sales tax from lost property/businesses. STOP trying to implement a BAD (Plan 2014) or an similar plan without a good reason.

Paul Ferington 8th August 2013 02:24:37
New York, Barker,
As a south shore property/home owner, incurring thousands of dollars in shoreline damage from high water levels, the thought that individuals, not residing on the south shore, are making such decisions is beyond ludicrous! When muskrats start paying property taxes, then the Commission's decision can be supported.
**David McDowell** 8th August 2013 01:42:35  
NY, Sodus Point,  
Plan2014 will devastate the south shore of lake Ontario. The triggers are set out side of a safe range. Further, the problem that Plan2014 is seeking to resolve is not clearly defined. the benefits of this plan all go to the hydro power industry and ruin the lives of millions of people. Before moving forward a detailed study, by an independent body must be performed and shared. For 55 years the current plan has been working fine based on all the publically available information.

**Lyne Godmaire** 8th August 2013 00:33:15  
Quebec, Gatineau,  
À la Commission mixte internationale, Je souhaite par la présente vous faire part de mon soutien au Plan 2014 et vous appeler à pleinement et entièrement adopter dès maintenant cette nouvelle approche de gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario. C'est grâce au Plan 2014 que nous pourrons assurer un avenir viable à ce bassin versant emblématique en lui permettant de retrouver des niveaux et débits plus naturels, et que nous permettrons la restauration d'un écosystème précieux pour la faune et toutes les communautés qui l’habitent. Le plan doit permettre de réaliser le but ultime de la CMI, soit de redonner des flux et débits plus naturels à ces cours d’eau, au bénéfice de l’environnement et tout en tenant compte d’autres intérêts. La santé des écosystèmes d’eau douce est indissociable de celle des communautés, de la faune et de la flore, et de la viabilité de notre économie. Ainsi en implantant une meilleure gestion du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario, nous offrirons une meilleure qualité de vie à tous les citoyens qui vivent, travaillent et vont se ressourcer le long des berges du fleuve et du lac. Ce nouveau plan contribuera également à la viabilité économique, environnementale et sociale de cet immense bassin hydrographique que constituent le lac et le fleuve. C’est donc avec enthousiasme que j’appuie cette nouvelle démarche en vue de la régularisation des niveaux d’eau dans le fleuve Saint-Laurent et le lac Ontario. Je vous remercie de tenir compte du témoignage de ma position dans ce dossier. Cordialement,

**Linda McGrath** 7th August 2013 18:41:27  
NY, Rochester,  
I am strongly opposed to this Plan not only as a resident of Rochester, NY, but also as a summer resident of Sodus Point, NY and part of a boating family. This Plan will totally destroy the chores of Lake Ontario on the American side which will effect properties, boating, and many lake side businesses and communities.

**Melinda Stubbee** 7th August 2013 14:11:33  
NC, Durham,  
I support Plan 2014. It’s right for the 21st century.

**David Mallette** 7th August 2013 11:32:18  
NY, Thousand Island Park,  
Plan 2014. It's time. Do it!

**Alastair Hibberd** 7th August 2013 07:08:40  
Ontario, Whitby,  
I support Plan 2014, and I look forward to the changes you will make to preserve the ecosystem of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River.

**Tracy Panchuk** 7th August 2013 06:40:48  
ON, Windsor,  
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by
returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Tracy Panchuk

Daniela Rodelo 7th August 2013 05:21:53
ON, Maple,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Daniela Rodelo

C. Richards 7th August 2013 03:53:19
Ontario, Peterborough,
Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence river need to be protected from any invasive activity. Please follow the rules of this plan and protect these two very special areas.

Caleigh Farrell 7th August 2013 03:05:44
Ontario, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Caleigh Farrell

Dr. Daniel Barletta 6th August 2013 16:17:03
NY, Rochester,
As published in Buffalo News August 2, 2013 Lake Ontario Plan 2014...A Man-Made Disaster waiting to happen! In response to Mr. Jim Howe of the Nature Conservancy, if the International Joint Commission’s (IJC) Plan 2014 is implemented, history might very well look back at both the plan and the current IJC Commissioners as source of more “man-made” property and economic damage to NY State than from any other disaster in its history. Most of the time, the damages will not be dramatic or sudden but a silent grinding away of public and private property until the time when entire parcels are devalued or taken off the tax rolls. As an example, 30% of the assessed
value of the five shoreline towns in Wayne County is waterfront property. If the County loses these properties to the lake, and the County wants to maintain the current level of services, somebody will have to make up that difference. The six south shore counties that will experience the most damage from this plan happen to be in the top 18 counties nation-wide that pay the most property taxes. At other times, man-made extreme high levels will mean that the damages will be catastrophic with millions of dollars in damage occurring in a single day. Further in his essay, he cites dollar values that seem to say that this aberrant plan would provide millions of dollars in benefits. What he fails to state is the low water periods would be devastating to the $94 million dollar per year sports fishing industry along the south shore, or that the estimates for property damage along this shore have been shown to be 2-3 times greater that the plan states. Most private property damage is undervalued and damages to public lands and infrastructure was not even evaluated. Water intakes, sewer systems, roads, bridges, power lines and other sensitive infrastructure might be at risk from drastic man-made level changes on both the high and low side. An example of the failure of the Commission to properly evaluate the potential economic losses is in the Town of Somerset, New York. This town has over $400 million dollars in public assets that were not included in the damage estimates in the original Study by the IJC. This plan was created behind closed doors with the environmental interests and no other interest allowed in. We commend the elected representatives of the Province of Quebec for standing up to the IJC and stating that they would not accept any more damages than what occurs to their part of system under the current plan, but we are dismayed that the New York State representatives would allow this damage to occur to its citizens! The IJC needs to return to the drawing board and come back with a more represented plan! Dr. Dan Barletta on behalf of the Lake Ontario Riparian Alliance

Ashley 6th August 2013 07:54:07
ON, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Ashley

Cathy Contant 6th August 2013 04:02:55
NY, Sodus Point,
A simple analysis of the water level issue in our area shows that high water has the potential to erode sensitive waterfront, bluffs and sandbars, damage public and private property and replenish wetlands that filter harmful pollutants out of the water and provide habitat to many species. Low water can rebuild beaches and shoreline and inhibit the length and quality of boating season, which impacts local business. All important pros and cons. In the 55 years the current plan has been in effect, I remember one instance of significant flooding in Sodus Point. Many lesser storms each year erode the shoreline, as has occurred for thousands of years. The Sandbar/Crescent Beach on Sodus Bay has shifted constantly for longer than anyone can remember. Did building structures on Crescent Beach add to or detract from the long-term stability of the bar? What about the effects of septic management, or lack thereof? What about the cottages on Lake Bluff, many of which eroded right off the edge of the bluff over the years? Did building on or manipulating the edge of a drumlin that's constantly and profoundly reshaped by weather change the rate of erosion? While those answers may help prevent future missteps, right now we have to figure out the best way to manage the levels of the lake, as far as we have
control. There's no perfect answer for everyone. The dam has been built, buildings erected and livelihoods established - all dependant upon on a plan considered to be an excellent way to manage Lake Ontario's levels. With 55 years' experience it has come to be understood the plan needs adjustment. What's the biggest priority? What's next? For us along the southern shore, prevention of massive erosion might be the highest order. Allowing the beaches to replenish might be a close second. We need to stop prioritizing remuneration for private property damage when such a huge area is at risk, with much further-reaching aftereffects. We chose to buy property right here, even with thousands of years' worth of proof of change. I understand there are many, more subversive objectives in the new proposal. The bottom line for all of us is that no matter the objectives or how it's sold, our best projection of the effects of Plan 2014 are what matter to us. Our only options today are to direct our representatives to either support or fight Plan 2014 with the best analysis and consideration of the effects in mind - despite the goals or intentions of the marketing plan. We have to ask ourselves what plan could be implemented that would satisfactorily handle most of our priorities. It may well not be Plan 2014, but is maintaining the current plan the right path? Plan 2014 is not the only option.

Constance Gélinas-Roy 6th August 2013 02:56:28
Québec, Roxton Pond,
À la CMI, Je souhaite par la présente vous exprimer mon appui au Plan 2014 de restauration des débits et des écosystèmes du fleuve Saint-Laurent et du lac Ontario, symboles de notre prospérité et que nous devons protéger afin de nous assurer à nous, à nos enfants et à notre environnement, un avenir durable. Je souhaite que les gouvernements responsables adoptent le Plan 2014 que vous proposez et en favorisent l'application le plus rapidement possible.

Belinda Cole 5th August 2013 07:10:43
Ontario, Toronto,
Greetings, I want to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full, quick adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for these waters - by returning them to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Many thanks for all of your hard work. Sincerely, Belinda Cole

Bob Toppe 5th August 2013 05:08:43
New York, Pulaski,
Comment Attached
Attachment

Douglas Klock 5th August 2013 04:56:58
New York, Hilton (Beach),
Comment attached
Attachment

Laurie A Hayden 5th August 2013 04:35:01
NY, Sodus Point,
I am opposed to the implementation of Plan 2014. The IJC has not taken into consideration the real issues facing communities along the south shore of Lake Ontario and has deferred to big
business hydropower interests at the expense of these poor people. The NY Power Authority stands to gain millions of dollars with this plan, yet the economic impact to the poor communities of NY State who live along the shores and look to it for their livelihood has been grossly underestimated. Please restudy these issues and do not implement a plan that will destroy the southern shores of Lake Ontario.

Dr. Daniel Barletta 5th August 2013 00:27:22
NY, Rochester,
The following letter was posted on behalf of Old Fort Niagara. Plan will endanger Lake Ontario shore As executive director of Old Fort Niagara, I am very concerned with the International Joint Commission’s proposal to regulate water levels in Lake Ontario in such a manner that will result in higher water, especially during the season of heavy storms. The shoreline of Lake Ontario is very vulnerable to erosion from storms, especially the more violent ones that occur in winter and early spring. This past spring, we experienced significant damage to the high bank just east of the fort’s protective seawall. Erosion in this area was substantial. The damage was sudden and unprecedented and it is beginning to undermine the protective seawall that protects the entire historic site. Common sense tells us that if the lake level had been higher, we would have experienced even more damage. To raise our breakwater to a level to withstand a higher water level would cost New York State and our taxpayers millions of dollars. Fort Niagara is almost 300 years old. It is a priceless property with buildings dating back to the early 18th century. The oldest structure, the 1726 French Castle, stands within just a few feet of the Lake Ontario shore. This historic treasure is the oldest building in the entire Great Lakes Basin. It is owned by the people of New York State, yet people from all over the world visit it every year. In 2012, almost 100,000 people visited the site. It is ironic that the fort has withstood battles and the ravages of time but now faces its most menacing force from the commission’s water level proposal. The idea that raising and lowering lake levels to higher highs and lower lows will theoretically enhance Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River marshland is interesting but totally impractical because it endangers almost the entire length of Lake Ontario shoreline. Not only priceless artifacts like Fort Niagara, but millions of dollars of private, municipal and state properties will be put in danger. I sincerely urge the abandonment of this plan. Robert L. Emerson Executive Director Old Fort Niagara Youngstown

Richard Roach 4th August 2013 16:02:05
NY, Youngstown,
As a member of the Board of Directors of the Old Fort Niagara Association I am concerned that we will lose one of the jewels of America, Fort Niagara, due to erosion from higher lake levels which are proposed by the IJC. Mr. Robert Emerson, Executive Director of Fort Niagara, recently posted an article in the “Buffalo News” outlining his concerns. Although the idea of increasing muskrat habitat is interesting the reality is that Fort Niagara is more important than that. For almost 300 years the fort has withstood wars and storms. Now the IJC has become the Fort’s greatest enemy. The proposal to raise and lower the lake levels is not a natural proposal. It is not what nature would do. It is artificial. Common sense tells us that we cannot afford to risk the loss of places like Fort Niagara. We have no right to deny access to jewels like the Fort to future generations. Stop the IJC proposal. It is ludicrous.

Kay Kin 4th August 2013 09:53:41
ny, Cleveland,
I support Plan 2014. I live north of Oneida Lake and have witnessed what decades old wrong decisions have done to this lake and the cost to make those amends. A change in the natural flow of water from Fish Creek altered the nature of the lake and subsequently created problems we deal with today. The ebb & flow of nature, previously viewed as an inconvenience to man's progress and the altering of nature to fit general wisdom to 'make it better' has proved time and time again to be a huge mistake. We humans see the present only, we are sorely short sighted when it comes to the past, and darn near blind when it comes to the future, we bend and change.
nature to fit our needs. The results are like a domino effect gone wrong. Today we live with those changes, well intentioned dominoes that landed to cause more problems and more money to fix. The Great Lakes need to be restored on nature's terms, on nature's original path. Our future depends on it. Please restore Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence to their natural state, their purpose was to nurture my upstate area, to lay the ground work for a viable fertile land, for we residents to protect and enjoy.

Mark Phillips 2nd August 2013 10:30:31
NY, Rochester,
To all supporters of plan 2014- I urge you to watch the short video linked to below. It depicts a rather benign wind event along the south shore in the spring of 1993 when Lake Ontario was "only" at 247. The grey house in the video would normally have 75-100' feet of beach in front, but that protection has been washed away. Now imagine the lake over a foot higher and being driven by 50-60 mph winds out of the northeast, such as those experienced recently during Hurricanes Irene and Sandy. There would be utter devastation, costing millions of dollars all along the south shore. Only this would be a MAN MADE disaster, not an act of Mother Nature. I consider myself a friend of the environment. But the simple fact remains, you CANNOT raise the level of the lake to 248' at this point (even with "triggers") without destroying private property, businesses, parks and beaches, critical infrastructure such as sewer systems and water supplies, indeed entire communities such as Sodus Point. Please watch video as an illustration. Thank you. The http://youtu.be/7elzS9CroVo

Dianne Ritter 2nd August 2013 07:56:45
BC, Norht Vancouver,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Dianne Ritter

JACK STEINKAMP 31st July 2013 16:05:32
NY, Sodus Point,
How can anyone believe the IJC is an objective commission when their own web page posts only PRO 2014 News? This is your home page NEWS on 7/31/2013 "RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT/DEBATE." http://ijc.org/en_/losl/home News Greenlight Plan 2014 - July 25 (Watertown Daily Times) Residents like river level plan - July 19 (Cornwall Standard-Freeholder) You have nothing on your site detailing the hundreds and hundreds of people on the south shore that are against the plan. You have nothing on your site showing that nearly EVERY town, city and county on the south shore has political resolutions against the plan. These resolutions are from political entities that represent MILLIONS of people. Come On....We expect more from you guys. Play Fair!!!!

Erin 31st July 2013 15:41:49
YT - Yukon, Marsh Lake,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by
returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Erin Jamieson

Diane George 31st July 2013 13:50:13
NY, Rochester,
This plan is a thinly disguised gift to the utility companies and shippers masquerading as an environmental cause. With all the issues involving the Great Lakes’ health, THIS is their solution. Our beaches are unswimmable (see LAKE ONTARIO’S BEACHES IN ROCHESTER, NY), invasive species are threatening fish life, climate change is affecting levels naturally and THIS is their concern? What baloney! I want to know more about how much the utilities will benefit FINANCIALLY. People, don't be fooled!!

Congressman Bill Owens 31st July 2013 11:52:47
NY, Plattsburgh,
Dear Commissioner Pollack and Commissioners of the IJC: Thank you for providing my constituents with a forum to share their diverse views on water regulation, and for listening to their concerns throughout each stage of the Plan 2014 development process. Shoreline property owners, mariners and hydroelectric energy producers have a significant financial stake in this decision, and it is clear inaction will create further, possibly irreparable, damage to our environment. Plan 2014 is a pragmatic, comprehensive strategy that reasonably balances environmental and economic concerns. As this process continues, I am confident stakeholders and policymakers at the federal, state, and local level will work together to address additional challenges as they arise. The community deserves tremendous credit for its engagement in the development of Plan 2014. The public comment period has demonstrated that New Yorkers and Canadians living along Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River truly understand this issue and continue to live up to their reputation as passionate stewards of the environment. I am pleased to demonstrate my support for Plan 2014 and I commend your work to build consensus through public participation. Thank you for your dedication to finding solutions to this complex problem. I look forward to working with you in the next steps of this process. Very Truly Yours, Bill Owens
Member of Congress

Carley Termeer 31st July 2013 08:21:02
Alberta, Grande Prairie,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Carley Termeer
Riannon John 31st July 2013 00:46:34
Ontario, Toronto,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Riannon

Decroix 30th July 2013 17:32:26
Quebec, Verdun,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Heather Campbell

Heather Campbell 30th July 2013 13:18:43
NB, Bathurst,

International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Heather Campbell

Paula Huisman 30th July 2013 13:01:58
ON, Toronto,

I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy
wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Paul Huisman

Kailee P 30th July 2013 10:42:55
Ontario, Brantford,
Please allow this amazing opportunity to happen to restore our nations environment back to what mother nature intended!

Julie Lemieux 30th July 2013 10:29:05
Québec, Montréal,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments.

Astrid Turner 30th July 2013 10:07:49
Ontario, Oakville,
To the International Joint Commission: I am writing to you today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Last year we took our two young children to the Tadoussac region and we were sitting by the St. Lawrence River to watch whales. If we do not adopt this plan my children will not be able to do this with their children, we need to do something to preserve this special region in Quebec! Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Astrid Turner

Janice Tsang 30th July 2013 09:49:14
ON, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations
for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Janice Tsang

April 30th July 2013 09:39:38
ON, Ottawa,
International Joint Commission: As someone who grew up first able to swim in Lake Ontario, and then not able to do so, I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, April Duffy

Connor Saucier 30th July 2013 09:25:52
Ontario, Russell,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Connor Saucier

Andrea Sperling 30th July 2013 09:20:47
Alberta, Edmonton,
The Earth needs any and all help it can get. WE made the mess we're in. WE need to do everything in our power now, and for future generations, while we can.

Daniel Zielinski 29th July 2013 06:05:13
NY, Jefferson,
In reading some of the comments here, I have yet to see any proponent of plan 2014 address the concerns of property owners. One person talks about the risk of wildfires or living on the shores of the ocean. Yeah...that might have some comparable validity if the typical wildfire threatening home resulted from governmental controlled burns or the government had control of ocean water levels. When the forest service or other agencies conduct controlled burns, they do so with plenty of protection for any property owners. They don't take an attitude of we're doing this burn for the ecology and if you house goes up in flames...sucks to be you. Yes, sometimes nature starts fires near dwellings. The proper response for local/state/national government is to put the fire out. So here we have a case of a governmental entity attempting to promote the flooding of private
landowner property. They make several, very general, claims that the property damage won’t be all that significant, but provide no studies that offer any proof. They also make claims that there will be environmental benefits by raising lake levels, but again, offer no proof, or offer any estimate of the significance of those benefits. What they do offer is an economic forecast that hydropower will profit and lake shore owners will suffer property damage. And they offer no plan to compensate property owners for the damage…thus substantiating the fact that plan 2014 constitutes a governmental taking / destroying of private property. In the spirit of cooperation, I would like to suggest that everyone do their part to improve their local ecology. Have your house and any other evidence of manmade structures or improvements removed and the land restored to pristine nature. Hey…it’s only fair. That’s what plan 2014 advocates are suggesting for lake shore property owners. Speaking of ecology, what are the anticipated effects of climate change on the Lake Ontario/St Lawrence ecosystem? How will the plan address those changes? What about invasive species? Invasives have arguably had a bigger impact on ecosystem integrity than lake levels. And others have mentioned water quality issues. How will water quality be improved by substantially higher erosion along the lake shore? I have a suggestion. Why don’t we change the name from “plan 2014” to “Hydropower future benefit plan”.

Daniel Robertson 26th July 2013 03:37:38
New York, Sodus Point,
Relevant to the four items the committee has identified of particular interest: 1. The appropriateness of conditions and criteria will not be known unless and until they are applied. If they are applied, this should only happen if at least annual review of their effects is part of the process. The adaptive management strategy should itself be adaptive. 2. The upstream/downstream interests are out of balance. The environmental benefits will occur in the upstream, while the economic benefits are concentrated downstream, resulting in gains for hydropower and shipping. These economic benefits are unsurprising, given the extended range of water levels, but amounts to a windfall for these interests. In contrast, the costs are primarily in coastal erosion along Lake Ontario. In fact, balancing these two gains and losses yields the overall positive $3.12M economic impact of the Plan. Gains in wildlife habitat are likely, but will be hard to quantify, and these gains should be monitored and documented. The proposal does not address what the effect will be on water quality, which is a major issue for all shoreline interests, both economic and environmental. A goal of the IJC should be the improvement of water quality.
3. The adaptive management strategies have good intentions, However, it is unclear how these strategies will be implemented, and in what time frame. 4. Public involvement needs to be increased, particularly when considering change in policies that have been in effect for 50 years. Given the size of this watershed, having input and representation in this process, particularly in the implementation of adaptive management, is needed. On the whole, it appears that this Regulation Plan is moving forward. Assuming the economic effects are a reasonable estimate, recovering some of the overall projected gains would be wise, to cover some of the costs incurred along the coastline. These funds could be used to defray the costs related to coastal effect in public areas, and potentially available to private landholders as well.

Samantha Dupre 26th July 2013 02:47:15
Ontario, Richmond Hill,
I am writing to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of “moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests.” Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I
strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Samantha Dupre

Tom Crumlish 25th July 2013 15:25:38
NY, Greece,
I have lived on the lake in Greece for over 25 years. I was outside cooking dinner July 20th and watching the waves in the attached picture in what wasn't even really a storm. This is the lake at 246.6 ft. I was thinking "who on earth could possibly think they can let the lake level rise to 248.3 ft without major shore damage and the loss of many houses and property. The IJC has to be out of their minds. At 246.6 water can easily crest over our break wall. We can handle this though as the breakwall is built for this, it is not built for 248 ft, many many houses on the south shore are the same way. It's insane to have a plan to let the waters go to anything over 247 ft. The rest of 2014 might be OK but the upper limit cannot go above 247 unless the IJC is prepared to wipe out thousands of properties!

Attachment

Lyrinda Sheppard 25th July 2013 10:16:29
ON, London,
To: International Joint Commission Secretary, Canadian Section 234 Laurier Avenue West, 22nd Floor Ottawa, ON K1P 6K6
Re: Proposal for Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River Regulation
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC's ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel Barletta 25th July 2013 09:09:10
NY, Rochester,
A long lost video of storms occurring in Spring of 1993 on south shore of Lake Ontario. Level of lake would NOT have triggered any emergency deviations under Plan 2014.

http://youtu.be/7eizS9CroVo

Richard 25th July 2013 08:41:56
NT, Yellowknife,
The waters of the Great Lakes are receding as they are all over the world. New York, Jamaica Bay, New York Harbour, New Jersey, Atlantic City shoreline, Great Slave Lake, Kingston Harbour, Jamaica, West Indies, Nassau Harbour, Bahamas. Southampton Harbour, UK. Sandwich Harbour, UK, Marseille Harbour, France, ST Michel, France.

Attachment

Caroline Kerr 25th July 2013 05:15:18
NY, Thousand Island Park,
I am a summer resident of Thousand Island Park and have been swimming in the St. Lawrence since before the current management plan was written. It is time for a new plan. Our understanding of natural systems and our dependence upon them has exploded since the current plan was written. Plan 2014 is a good plan intended to take care of the River's ecosystem
balanced with our human interests. Plan 2014 will take far better care of our wetlands which protect the shores in high water events, clean the river's water, shelter a wide variety of plants and animals and offer visual beauty as well. This will help support the various tourism industries so critical to our local economy. Plan 2014 will also free up more water for hydro power, doing our bit to restrain severe weather events by limiting carbon outputs. This will help the river community as well. Some say that 2014 is so dangerous to their investment in home and community as to be unthinkable. Many folks have homes and communities that face weather related dangers. The Outer Banks in the Carolinas and the canyons of southern California are two such places. There are things that people in such places can do to protect their investment while we consider if such places are right for development. Brush and other fuels can be removed from the yards of homes that face fire danger. Seawalls can protect from erosion. So can wetlands! Strengthening the natural systems of the lakes and river will in fact, make it easier for us in the aggregate to contend with the threats brought on by changing weather. Please support Plan 2014 to strengthen the ecosystems of the Great Lakes and St Lawrence. Then we can work together to help each other prepare for extreme weather events, which are getting more and more common. Caroline Kerr

Robert and Cheryl Stevens 24th July 2013 13:23:50
NY, Hilton,
Why have I called the teleconference today (July 24th) and am not privy to the conversation. I've been put on hold and not put on active listening or speaking. This Plan 2014 will cause flooding in our living room. We question why Montreal is protected but we on the South Shore are not. We have high waters right now and very rough waters today. I have a movie that I will include in an email to the Commission. We lost 1/2 our beach last night and the weather man reports that we will have the same conditions for 5 days more. We do not flood in our living room with the present plan. Please don't accept any plan without mitigation in place to help us with our dream home safety. How can anything be equated with ruining our home and our safety be negated by your proposal. Reject Plan 2014.

Jay Ross 24th July 2013 13:18:38
NY, Rochester,
OK - it is 7:23 on 7/24. I've called 3 times and been told I'd be automatically connected. Nothing - blank sound. My battery is dying. I am SOOO frustrated! I wish to support plan 2014! Jay Ross

Liz Hendriks 24th July 2013 09:58:26
Ontario, Toronto,
International Joint Commission: I write today to express my strong support for Plan 2014 and call for the full and speedy adoption of this new management approach for Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Plan 2014 will help ensure a healthy future for this iconic water system by returning to more natural levels and restoring the ecosystem for local communities and wildlife. The plan achieves the IJC’s ultimate goal of "moving toward more natural flows to benefit the environment, while respecting other interests." Healthy freshwater ecosystems are foundations for healthy communities, healthy wildlife, and sustainable economies. Improving the management of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River will enhance the quality of life for all citizens who live, work and recreate in the coastal zones of the lake and river. This new plan will also contribute to the economic, environmental, and social sustainability of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence system. Again, I strongly support this new approach to water level regulation in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely,

Edward Pavone 24th July 2013 05:06:58
NY, Astoria,
I strongly support plan 2014 for regulation of Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence river. The ecology of Lake Ontario will be enhanced, to the eventual benefit of this important ecosystem.
JACK STEINKAMP 24th July 2013 04:25:51
NY, Sodus Point,
The conditions and damages on Lake Ontario over the past 72 hours make me wonder if the IJC Commissioners have a true working knowledge of how things work in this part of the great lakes. On 7/22 & 7/23 we had moderate NE winds and waves and erosion at a level of app. 246.5ft. Today 7/24 we have moderate NW winds and waves and erosion at 245.5ft. If levels were even close to the July trigger of 248.13 there would be catastrophic damages for three days in a row. For the IJC to even consider a Plan like 2014 shows that they either do not understand the lake or don't care about people that live on the shoreline. By the way, all of the beaches are closed from Rochester to Sodus Point today 7/24 due to water quality issues, Putrid green algae has washed up on the beaches and is unhealthy to swim in. It smells so bad you must keep the windows closed. These water quality issues make me wonder if the IJC cares about the residents that would like to use the beaches. The IJC needs to get their priorities back in order, stop listening to environmental THEORY and start tackling water QUALITY issues rather than QUANTITY issues.

Jay Ross 24th July 2013 04:05:42
NY, Rochester,
I have been to so many hearings and informational meetings over the years regarding so many proposed plans. I'm tired. I know you have a lot of interests to balance. I know a lot of them have a lot of money and votes. But the wetlands have neither and yet they have the original claim, no? So please please get on with it. This isn't a perfect plan. But it is a good plan. Do it!

Daniel Zielinski 23rd July 2013 11:20:06
New York, Jefferson,
The saying, "follow the money", seems ever so appropriate here. So, how could anyone be surprised that shipping and power generating interests have attempted to use the fig leaf of environmental benefits to justify their money grab?!? Gee, if shipping and power generating were taking as big a hit as shoreline property owners...then maybe I could believe the claims that the meadow marsh will be improved. I see nothing in the documentation for the 2014 plan that substantiates how much improvement is expected. Significance is a statistical term. Collect enough data and the smallest change will be statistically significant, but the actual change will be miniscule. Everything we do affects the local ecology. If you want a pristine environment unaffected by man, the only way to get it is to remove man's presence. Is that plan 2014's ultimate goal? Wipe out those nasty lake shore owners so the IJC and Hydro Power can run Lake Ontario like a storage pool? Some say plan 2014 responded to concerns that Bv7 would harm shoreline owners. From the IJC Overview: "Plan 2014 includes a refinement of Regulation Plan Bv7 and provision for deviations to be made when Lake Ontario water levels are outside the range shown in Figure 1." Yeah, right...as if property damage only begins when water levels in Lake Ontario reach 248 ft. As President Obama said at one of the debates, "You can put lipstick on a pig. It's still a pig." Reviewing the spaghetti graphs, I noticed that with plan 2014, there will be a lot more erosion causing high water events, but precious little change to low water levels. I guess those nasty cattails are really not such a big deal...at least if the shipping interests are to be placated. Speaking of erosion, federal water quality rules generally forbid riparian property owners from doing anything that makes the water muddy. From the DEC's own website: Protection of Waters (ECL Article 15,Title 5) Basis for Permit Issuance: 1. The proposal must be reasonable and NECESSARY (i.e., it will resolve a problem). 2. It must not endanger the health, safety or welfare of the people of the State of New York. 3. It must not cause unreasonable, uncontrolled or unnecessary damage to the natural resources of the state, including soil, forests, water, fish, shellfish, crustaceans and the aquatic and land-related environment. So where, exactly, does plan 2014 address property damage and erosion issues??? If a private citizen wanted a permit to generate hydro power and submitted something like plan 2014 that creates extensive property damage and shoreline erosion, how far would they get? Plan 2014 significantly harms shoreline property owners while mainly benefiting
power interests. The environmental component of plan 2014 is nebulous, conjectural, and unscientific. As such, plan 2014 should be rejected.

Mark Phillips 23rd July 2013 10:33:52
NY, Rochester,
You CANNOT raise the lake level to 248'. There simply has been too much construction and infrastructure built in the last 60 years based around the current levels. Homes, communities, businesses, sewer systems, water treatment and pump stations, all in jeopardy. Has anyone supporting this plan ever lived thru or witnessed a storm with high lake levels? I sure have. But what of the wetlands? We hear over and over how they've been "Devastated". Where exactly and how? Where are the before and after pictures? The scientific evidence. I have observed Round Pond, Long Pond, Braddock Bay in Greece NY since the 50's and they look exactly the same. No devastation there- in fact I believe they are cleaner. And are not humans part of the environment? Am I less important than muskrats and cattails? Unlike Hurricane Sandy, a storm with the lake at 248' would be a MAN MADE disaster costing millions of dollars in damage. And all the supporters and the brainiacs who came up with this plan would look pretty stupid and foolish. Are the commissioners prepared to testify before a committee in Congress investigating the cause of such a disaster. Are they willing to face law suits?

Michael Riley 23rd July 2013 09:30:31
NY, Greece,
Your proposal for Lake Ontario, "will contribute to the economic health of communities throughout the basin while improving the long-term ecological health...". You go on to state that the existing plan, "...has provided substantial benefits to the region....". Yet, while attending the presentations and reading your publications, I hear that we have damaged the ecology of the region and therfore, must change the current plan. I have heard NO factual evidence presented. Yes, there has been change but I question the $1.35 million per year environmental benefit predicted. I hear the environmentalists calling for lower water levels yet, from your chart on pager 2 of your handout, Ontario levels would have been higher in all but '01,'07, and '12. The real benefit is to the HYDROPOWER industry. It appears to me that the environment is a "red herring". After all, how can one be against the environment? In fact, I am not against hydropower, shipping, boating, or any other interest. We certainly need the power and the shipping. However, as was said by a resident in Greece NY, "are we just the collateral damage"? Perhaps some of the hydropower money could be set aside for mitigation - I see nothing planned in the areas of very predictable damages. Your job truly requires the wisdom of a Solomon. Yes, we need to be vigilant and respond to changing requirements. However, I urge a more gradual response over time as proposed in your Adaptive Management Strategy. I urge a more incremental approach and not a rush to implement these significant changes. Thank you for your consideration, Michael F. Riley

Steve Taylor 23rd July 2013 08:34:04
New York, Thousand Island Park,
Natural Flows: Mists rise, clouds gather Rain falls to the earth Rivulets gather to fill ponds Nurturing life below and above Ponds spill, feeding streams That roll down to lakes Lakes flow into great rivers That roll on to the sea Mists rise, clouds gather Life teams below and above This is but one unlimited and continuous cycle of life - a simple system that humbles our understanding. It works beautifully until it is tampered with. When such a system is harnessed to generate power or wash away refuse the unlimited becomes limited. Its nurturing role compromised. We cannot undo our oversized role in this drama, but, as scientists have learned, we can adapt the roll and play it better. It is science that has informed the International Joint Commission’s (IJC) recommendation for a water management plan that will mimic natural lows in the vast Lake Ontario– St. Lawrence River watershed. With implementation of the IJC’s water management plan 2014, we have an opportunity to restore balance to the life systems of 64,000 acres of wetlands that nurture this watershed. Industry and business interests have joined with scientists and environmentalists in stating that Plan 2014 will improve the basin’s environmental
health, enhance its strength as a recreational and tourist region and improve the health and wellbeing of its citizens. We understand that, over many years, development in some low-lying shoreline areas has been encouraged to satisfy a demand and increase local tax bases. Plan 2014 addresses these concerns through its adaptive management plan with “triggers.” Support for 2014 is the responsible choice. Steve Taylor

Richard Boursier 23rd July 2013 01:34:40
Quebec, Léry,
Il est essentiel que le plan 2014 tienne vraiment compte des impacts environnementaux sur le fleuve Saint-Laurent. Les impacts des années 70 ont été catastrophiques pour les îles de la Paix situées dans le lac Saint-Louis. Richard Boursier, président Société d'aménagement du parc des Îles-de-la-Paix

Peter Widmann 22nd July 2013 08:42:16
NY, Sodus Point,
As a part time Sodus Point resident I oppose this plan for the following reasons. The existing plan has worked well for the past 50+ years. The current proposal would have no benefit to the south shore property owners. It would only increase the risk of flooding, property damage and property devaluation without compensation. Let's spend our time, money efforts on cleaning up the lake instead.

Cenie Cafarelli 21st July 2013 03:09:31
NY, Rochester,
I strongly support plan 2014 for regulation of Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence river. The ecology of Lake Ontario will be enhanced, to the eventual benefit of this important ecosystem.

Rick Hansinger 20th July 2013 05:48:49
NY, Auburn,
It is time for the commission to submit Plan 2014, which addressed some of the earlier concerns along the southeastern lakeshore. 1958-DD needs to be retired so we can come back to a more environmentally friendly world and not one so driven by commercial interests.

Carol Hinkelman 19th July 2013 10:59:10
NY, Rochester,
I support Plan 2014 as the best approach to water level regulation in the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario. It will benefit the environment, recreation, and shipping while providing some protection for property along the shorelines. We need to get back to a more natural situation with changing water levels that new scientific research shows to be important for habitats.

Royal Botanical Gardens 19th July 2013 09:28:14
Ontario, Burlington,
Royal Botanical Gardens supports Plan 2014, particularly for the improvements it will make to our nature reserves and to the visitor experience within these areas. We also support it as it will allow for the stabilization of the currently eroding steep shorelines by allowing riparian plants to re-establish and stabilize the base of the slope areas. We do note that some of our low-lying infrastructure will be more likely to be flooded in the extreme high levels and as a result we see a need to make modifications to adjust to the new regime in a number of locations

Attachment
**Holly Thomas** 19th July 2013 05:54:50
NY, Clayton,

As a fifth-generation resident of the Thousands Islands, I'd love to see plan Bv7 adopted to help restore the health of river and lake wetlands. In my time on the river, I've suffered through highs that threatened to float docks away, and lows that left boats stranded on the shoreline -- however, I'd rather occasionally see these extremes than lose the beauty and clarity of the river's water, as well as the many species that depend on its natural cycles. However, I also appreciate the concerns of lake-shore property owners, and I SUPPORT PLAN 2014 as a reasonable compromise to replace the existing management plan.

**Margaret Dochoda** 18th July 2013 22:15:43
Ontario, Wolfe Island,

When deciding on water level management, please keep in mind historical sacrifice in the St. Lawrence River basin, the benefits of which accrued to the entire Great Lakes region and beyond. In addition to environmental sacrifice, "lost villages" were permanently submerged by the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1958. Approximately 6,500 people were displaced by the project, 530 buildings moved, and countless other homes, schools, and businesses demolished. A portion of Ontario's Highway 2 was flooded. Balance today's concerns against the sacrifices of the lost villages as well as the environment, and approve the small giveback to the health of the St Lawrence River Ecosystem.

**JACK STEINKAMP** 18th July 2013 06:27:31
NY, Sodus Point,

I watched the online technical meeting in Oswego NY and also presented at the Rochester Tech meeting as Lake Ontario Riparian Alliance (LORA). It seems that many times in this debate both sides are right and wrong at the same time. I watched Dr. Doug Wilcox explain beach building and claim that the economic benefits of better beaches were not taken into consideration. While he is correct that lower water can mean (sometimes but not always) bigger protective beaches, The first high water storm removes them. They take months or years to build and hours or days to vanish. I then also found it interesting that Ducks Unlimited spoke to man-made intervention to restore wetlands as not being viable because the effects were short term and estimated them at 20 years. You will never build a protective beach that can last anywhere that long unless beach accretion technology is allowed to be permitted by NY State. NYSDEC and DOS will tell you it does not work and is bad for the environment. I have attached two pictures that show it can and does work and lasts many years through a wide range of levels. The IJC has also said that property owners were represented in the closed door meetings by the NYS DEC. Please understand that the NYDEC has historically been the enemy of shoreline interests and has very little expertise in the area of shore protection or beach building. My guess is that a whole bunch of money will be needed to either artificially restore wetlands or artificially build beaches. Solutions are available and the one that seems to be easier for NY STATE to allow is bulldozing wetlands rather than building protective, enjoyable, filtering, habitat protecting beaches.

**David Bell** 18th July 2013 04:07:08
N.Y., Rochester,

Presentation to the International Joint Commission July, 2013 David J. Bell 620 Edgemere Dr. Rochester, N.Y. 14612 dbell1946@aol.com The problem with this I.J.C. Water Level Plan is in the process. They have created some goals but haven't figured out how to deal with the increased risks and deal with the results of these damages. They seem eager to get something changed regardless of the consequences. It's "implementation fever" which has been reported in psychological studies done for N.A.S.A. after the Columbia disaster. They are exposing the shoreline and the environment to increased risk with no plan for dealing with this risk. They have no plan for dealing with future flooding and erosion, no plan for home reconstruction, no plan on
how to repair damaged infrastructure such as sewers, roads, bridges, parks, boat docks and water treatment facilities. They have no plan for dealing with loss of real estate value and no plan for dealing with increased cost of flood insurance. That is why there is such a strong negative public reaction to this plan! They don't make all stakeholders feel comfortable and confident. They make Lake Community losses seem like unavoidable collateral damage. They imply that losses are trivial. They are threatening our greatest life investments, our family histories and futures and our communities. Go back to the drawing board and come up with a plan that will cause no further damage to anyone or just leave things as they are. Build confidence in the International Joint Commission and governments that represent us. We don't want mitigation for loss. We want preservation of our homes and communities. stopplan2014.com

Rob Caldwell 18th July 2013 03:02:50
ON, Cornwall,

Will there be a Webcast link for Friday's tech hearing in Cornwall/Akwesasne?

Kevin Cleary 18th July 2013 02:20:43
NY, Rochester,

I live on the lake shore in Rochester, NY. Over the last 30 years I have watched the beach get washed away and the ground under my patio disappear. The new plan will devastate the lake front properties and destroy property values. So when my property and all my neighbors houses and yards are destroyed, the Town of Greece will see tax revenue in my area tank. I can only hope to be able to sell the house before this happens.

Denise Washburn 17th July 2013 16:15:26
NY, Sodus Point,

I have heard the round robin discussions about water levels for several years now. The process is repetitive and non-productive. It also pits the people who care most about the lake against one and other. We ALL want a healthy lake that serves all constituents, including the environment. There are no convincing arguements to change the water levels. The benefits of doing to simply do not add up. So let's drop this for a while. I would suggest the same effort and money put in to the water level issue be dedicated to water quality. Let's clean up the water, the beaches and the shoreline...increase the wetlands, increase fish and other animals...... quality. Our lake is currently in terrible condition. It is our obligation to put it forward....clean.

JACK STEINKAMP 17th July 2013 10:01:09
NY, Sodus Point,

Several of my neighbors and I were discussing the Plan 2014 controversy today (after attending the Williamson meeting last night) and have decided that we would really rather have cleaner water than higher or lower levels of dirty, foul smelling pea green soup water from rotting algae. Today, 7/17/13 it is 94 degrees and we cannot swim in the lake due to the foul and polluted water. I have two black lab dogs that will not go into the water right now. They instinctively know there is something wrong. We would rather see the IJC start to focus on water QUALITY rather than QUANTITY. You have spent a lot of time and money trying to help the environment and we believe there is a bigger return for the environment from cleaner water. Levels hurt some, cleaner water hurts nobody.

David Bell 17th July 2013 09:43:57
N.Y., Rochester,

I got to address the Commission in Rochester and as the last speaker in Williamson. I am President of the Beattie Beach Assn. in Greece, N.Y. I just want to follow up to let you know that we can accept a new plan that allows water to be release starting when the Lake is at 246 ft. above sea level. This will save all our homes, marinas, water treatment facilities, sewers, septic systems and roads. Please come and see our Lake when the level is above 246 so that you can personally understand our position better. All commissioners are always welcome at our
residence and those of my fellow members. Please consider the personal loss to all of us. 
Sincerely, David Bell

Mark Costich 17th July 2013 08:32:23
NY, Sodus Point,
I very much would like to present my case in person, but I fear the meeting tonight in Williamson will be very well attended and there will not be enough time to speak. I would like to comment from a personal, as well as professional standpoint. Personal Standpoint I have included two photos of my home at 8634 Greig Street, Sodus Point, New York. I purchased the 100-year old structure in 2002 and planned a renovation and addition for 2007. Photo of before and after are enclosed. One of the most important issues for me was the height of the structure. I have been in and around Sodus point all my life and clearly remember the flooding in 1973 and many times after that. To do a proper renovation, I raised the existing structure 2.0’ from existing. This was based on the mean high water and 100-year flood plain. These are the benchmarks for good planning and design and your plans take those benchmarks and make them worthless. Even if my home doesn’t flood, your plan will result in destruction of infrastructure, and a dramatic decline in real estate value. The estimates of destruction are grossly underestimated. I strongly oppose any changes to the current plan. Professional Standpoint I am the President of Costich Engineering, a civil engineering and land surveying firm in Rochester, NY. Our firm has done dozens of waterfront projects on Lake Ontario, the Genesee River, Irondequoit Bay, Sodus Bay and Scriba, NY. All our work is based upon the mean high water and the 100-year flood plain. The proposed changes will affect most of these projects. Increased erosion of The Bluffs all along the south shore of the Lake will have dramatic environmental impacts at a time when water quality regulations have never been higher. The current plan should be left in place.

Attachment
Attachment

Dawn Z. 17th July 2013 07:06:51
NY, Tonawanda,
We have owned lake side property on Sunset Island in Wilson NY since 1989. At that date we had many feet of beach on the lake. Before we bought the property we were told there was a vineyard located where our beach was that was close in length to the end of where the Wilson pier is located. So before 1989 until now the lake erosion has been extensive to this area, We now have no beach depending on the lake conditions. Stairways to what is left of the beaches along this area have been replaced numerous times to adjust to the lake levels at the owners expense. The rise and lowering of the lake levels also destroys the docking available for boating at the owners expense, Any dredging in the harbor to allow some sailboats to be able to visit our harbor is inevitably passed on to the property owners. It seems the property owners and these expenses are not being considered with this new proposal.. If the boaters can't visit when the water is low and there are no beaches to enjoy when the water is high, the great lake side community of Wilson will continue to suffer economically with these proposals.

Dave Pierson 17th July 2013 06:03:12
ny, pulaski,
Plan 2014 is for shipping and hydro. It raises waters a foot or more for them, and prevents low water (and eco gain) from occurring because the low triggers are higher than the current 1958dd low limit (243’). Higher water than 1958dd for eco is unnecessary according to the bv7 scientist (Mr. Wilcox), but low water IS needed which 2014 will prevent. Seems some folks are sadists and want to destroy lake shorelines even if it does nothing for wetlands. Plan 2014 water also likely more Black Tern chicks because of higher water and waves. Terns are endangered in about 10 us states, makes one wonder why IJC is blaming Tern population reduction on 1958dd water levels since none or the other states shares that dilemma. The IJC deviation tab shows the whole story. Higher highs, and higher lows.
Michael C. Shults 17th July 2013 02:17:41
NY, Sodus Point,

Everyone is entitled to an opinion, even one apparently based on envy and misinformation. Isn’t it interesting that those who make bitter accusations of "greed" by "fools" are most often the ones advocating the arbitrary and uncompensated taking, or destruction, of the rightful property of others, and that on the basis of transparently wrong ideas. Increasing water level extremes is what will "prevent boaters" from using Lake Ontario. The existing plan has been in place for some 60 years: HOW exactly has it “destroy(ed) our ecosystem”??? What “mess”? Political correctness is adopting a plan on an environmental pretense, which is really crafted to serve hydropower and shipping interests downstream, at the exclusive expense of the south shore private interests.

Heather F White 16th July 2013 13:43:38
New York, Thousand Island Park,

It is time to make a responsible change! A change that will provide a healthier river level to support a wetlands and its Native population of species.Fish being critical to the local tourist industry. We need to be good Stewarts of this beautiful river for the next generation. My children are seventh generation on the river. They do not have the abundance of wildlife that I had as a child. I support Plan 2014 in the hope that with water levels at a more natural level the native fish and other wildlife can regain strength. Please help the seventh generation and all those to come, vote Plan 2014!

David Pierson 16th July 2013 10:10:20
ny, binghamton,

Plan 2014 limits lows (higher than the current plan) - go look yourself at deviations tab of ijc website (chart 1). Therefore with plan 2014 there will be no enviro gains. The higher highs are not necessary according to IJC's own scientist (Mr. Wilcox). This whole plan stinks of money trail to shipping and hydro. The higher highs will kill Tern chicks because of flimsy nests. Lake folks are spending 1000’s per year just trying to keep their places. Higher water for no reason, without the lower lows to help the wetland makes no sense. Go look at the facts, not just the rhetoric given by ijc, save the river, and Audubon.

Jeff Pennington 16th July 2013 09:54:36
PA, Philadelphia,

I am in favor of the new plan, which is a modern, evidence-based rebalancing of the water levels management plan. The plan will restore environmental damage that hurts fishermen and the businesses that depend on them. Thankfully, the 2014 plan also addresses the reasonable concerns of South Shore Ontario waterfront vacation homeowners.

Richard LaClair 16th July 2013 08:50:18
NY, Amherst,

To Whom it May Concern: I appreciate and support the efforts of the IJC to develop levels of Lake Ontario which maximize the health and wildlife propagation of wetlands. I noticed in news coverage of some of the IJC hearings that some speakers minimized the importance of this issue by referring to the saving of "muskrats." This is not an accurate reflection of the importance of enhancing wetlands. The improvement of water quality in wetlands promises a healthy environment to many species of wildlife. Wetlands have been called the "nurseries" of life. The ability of wetlands to filter and purify water is also connected to human health of people living near Lake Ontario and who enjoy its sports opportunities. I urge the IJC to continue and enable its plan to regulate Lake Ontario water levels to enhance wetland health. Thank you for opportunity to comment......Richard LaClair
Louisette Lanteigne 16th July 2013 07:16:48
Ontario, Waterloo,

We are going to lose the Great Lakes as a viable drinking water supply unless we take dramatic action to protect and prohibit development activities on top of critical primary recharge zones. Too many communities are being developed beyond their natural carrying capacity. (Waterloo Region one example!) Primary recharge is being covered with impervious surfaces from sprawl and wells are being closed due to road salts in these sensitive areas. Farm and urban pesticides as well as human effluents are already changing the sex and behaviour of fish along the Grand River. We must ban Atrazine and neonicotinoid pesticides to protect food and water security. 90% of South West Ontario’s Natural wetlands are now gone according to the MNR. These wetlands used to naturally remove 80-90% of phosphate and nitrate issues but now they are being destroyed and replaced with salt laced storm water management ponds. These urban man made ponds create a predator free habitat for geese and other water fowl resulting in high phosphate and nitrate loadings along tributaries feeding into the Great Lakes. The saline laced waters stimulate algae growth and contribute to the toxic blue green algae issues seen in Erie. Quarry pits in primary recharge zones augment water temperatures, flow and flow rates and water quality yet the Ontario MNR and MOE do not regard quarry pits as a water risk. They are exempt from Source Water Protection laws. Quarries are exempt from having to do toxicity risks for natural geological contaminates such as sour gas. The rinses of aggregates release high phosphate, nitrate and pesticide particulates, particularly where farmlands are dug for pits. Silt from water infiltration areas blocks up aquifers impairing recharge resulting in long term water budget losses. (Simcoe is dealing with this.)

Barbara Chura 16th July 2013 06:21:10
NY, Liverpool,

I agree with Mr. Lonneville. Please pass plan 2014 so the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario can return to being the natural wonders that they are. Maybe it's time people controlled their own behavior instead of trying to control everything God made for us. I've never been much of a tree-hugger, but over the last 20 years anybody can see the problems the old plan has caused.

William Winston 16th July 2013 06:19:45
Ontario, NJ, Elizabethtown, Ontario & Springfield, NJ,

It is time to make the waters right!! Thank you!

Steve Taylor 16th July 2013 06:09:25
NY, Thousand Island Park,

I want to address the concerns of the property owners along the South shore of Lake Ontario. In the past, local zoning and planning boards were encouraged to permit development along this erodible shoreline to create valuable waterfront homes that, in turn, generate tax revenue used to improves their schools, roads and other infrastructure. Now, a small, but influential, group of shoreline owners are justifiably concerned about the continued erosion of their shoreline. In hind site, allowing development this close to the shore was a mistake. The shoreline will continue to erode, as it has since time immemorial. Now, after long study and deep thought, the IJC, guided by the creative insights of their scientists, has proposed a water level management plan for the lake worthy of Solomon. Plan 2014, with its adaptive management strategy and its “triggers” to avoid extreme conditions, addresses the concerns of these South shore owners while retaining
most of the environment benefits that will restore ecological health to the entire Lake Ontario basin. We must not allow a mistake from the past to drive a mistake for the future. We all learned early on that two wrongs do not make a right. We have here an opportunity to make something right for all of nature and for all of us that love and depend on nature. Support for Plan 2014 is the responsible choice. Respectfully, Steve Taylor

Michael Brown 16th July 2013 05:48:06
NY, Chippewa Bay,

Please adopt Bv7 as soon as possible. There has now been enough study and we need to have a more natural and practical way to control water levels on the St. Lawrence River. I've been a summer resident since 2000 and my wife's family have been residents since the 1930s. I urge you to adopt this better plan soon.

Tys Theysmeyer 16th July 2013 04:18:08
Ontario, Hamilton,

I am pleased to see a plan based on water cycles and levels that reflect the natural weather patterns, rather than attempts to always average the water levels of a lake and river system that are the end point of the largest freshwater system in the world. Conditions are never average, leaving the current Plan 1958DD generally in conflict with existing conditions. I also appreciate the reasons for mitigating against the extreme high and low water levels in Plan 2014 (full range of levels on Lake Ontario would otherwise be ~2.1m (7ft)), and the effects on shoreline infrastructure that would otherwise be quite difficult to manage.

Valerie Gilbert 16th July 2013 02:57:50
New York, New York,

PLEASE Restore our coastal ecosystems and improve the health of our River and Lake Ontario ecosystem with SAVE THE RIVER'S PLAN 2014!

Steven M. Ortner 16th July 2013 01:11:27
New York, Lewiston,

So your plan is to Attempt to "CONTROL" what Nature has been doing for Millennium by it's self? So that you can decide who get's water and who doesn't! At the expense of those of us who built our home and businesses here in the 1st place. Government needs to stay out of natures way! I do not support this type of eco-terrorism.

Ron Lonneville 15th July 2013 14:32:44
NY, Marion,

I would like plan Bv7, but plan 2014 is a good start. I am 72 yrs. old and have lived in Marion, NY all of my life and have been a summer resident on the St. Lawrence river since 1995. I watched all the greed and stupidity play out as people built homes/cottages along the Lake Ontario south shore and Sodus Pt. when the water level was low. Now these same fools want us to destroy our ecosystem and prevent boaters and responsible users of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river to feel their pain. It took greedy land owners, realators, builders and politicians to create this mess. Now let the owners build break walls or what ever it takes to protect their homes/cottages when the water levels are at a reasonable level. Stop all the politically correct BS and pass the 2014 plan immediately.

Andrew Zona 15th July 2013 13:15:25
Ny, Red Creek,

I am AGAINST raising the water levels. This will destroy my property. I am for the enviroment as much as any person but who is going to comp the homeowners who have 100's of thousands of dollars invested that will not be covered by insurance. What is the DEC doing to save our bays and lakefront homes from high water levels? all so we can get some cattails and hydropower and
bigger ships can come through the St Lawrence. I will do everything in my power to stop this from happening and I think you should as well.

Patrick Klinck 15th July 2013 06:28:40
NY, East Aurora,
I am 100 percent in favor of the commission's plan to restore a more natural pattern of lake water levels to the Lake Ontario ecosystem. The public benefit of restoring wetlands and a healthier biosphere for all far outweighs any private costs that may, or may not, be incurred by a few property owners.

Dick. LaLonde 15th July 2013 05:43:05
NEW YORK, WATERTOWN/HENDERSON,
Circa 1955, my family purchased land and built a cottage at BOULDER COVE. SINCE THE seaway was not complete we studied and built back far enough so that there was no damage. Since then we have gained 150 feet of lawn where there once was LAKE ONTARIO. If municipalities would have done their homework and continue to do so. Homeowners need not fear standardized water levels. I am in favor of keeping the Lake at a constant level such as it is now. Also, the public should be informed when gates are damaged and excess water is let out in CANADA.

Dr. Daniel Barletta 15th July 2013 00:09:48
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 20
Attachment

Greg Daigler 14th July 2013 23:15:23
NY, Olcott Beach,
Can you please tell me what specific species (animal / plant) that your plan for altering water level helps? And to what extent? The targeted environments have had fifty years to adapt, has that not happened at all? Are all the adaptations negative? Or will we be just swapping one alteration for another? If this change in flow is intended to help...what negative environmental concerns have been considered? Which species will suffer due to the new change? Very often, when we alter an environment we create as much negative impact (unintentionally) as the positives created. Invasive species, new pollution, etc. Why can't we just allow nature to continue to adapt to the change it has had a fifty year start on resolving for itself?

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 14:02:23
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 1
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 14:01:38
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 2
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 14:00:54
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 3
Attachment
Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 12:39:43
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 14
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 12:38:54
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 15
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 12:37:10
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 16
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 12:34:33
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 17
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 12:33:16
NY, Rochester,
LEVELER 18
Attachment

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 03:59:02
NY, Rochester,

Part 3 of 3 parts due to word count restriction: Frank, The way I see this is the IJC can take action in this manner. Flood insurance rates just like any other insurance is based on risk. As an example, I have two boys under 25. According to insurance companies, they carry a higher risk than other drivers even though they are good drivers. However due to their age, I still have to pay more for their car insurance. Plan 2014 increases the risk of higher levels in the March-May time frame when the south shore is prone to more severe storms, when compared to the current plan. If the risk increases so will the premium. I asked during the LOSL Study and never got an answer. It is time for an answer. In regards the flood plain delineation, two years ago the USACE redrew the flood maps and took most of Edgemere Drive out of the high risk zone and put the homes in the "X" zone which is a lower risk zone based on the current plan. Premiums were reduced and even some banks dropped the requirement for flood ins. So there are actually 3 questions now 1. What effect will Plan 2014 have on flood plain mapping? 2. In light of Biggert-Waters and Plan 2014's higher risk of spring floods, what will the effect on flood insurance premiums? 3. Why is the IJC still dodging this question after 10 years? This is another economic value that was never calculated as a cost of changing plans. It needs to be addressed. Dan
Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 03:56:27
NY, Rochester,
Part 2 of 3 parts due to maximum word count restriction: Dan, We are aware of the Great Lakes Coastal Flood Study, which will result in a new methodology for calculating flood risk and new Flood Insurance Rate Maps. http://www.greatlakescoast.org/ We do not know whether Plan 2014 would also change the delineation of the regulatory flood plain. We have informed FEMA of the importance of this question to the IJC and sought their answer. We are also aware of Biggert-Waters and subsequent bills related to its implementation. You may provide comments to the IJC on any matter that you wish. I would encourage you to direct your comments at matters on which the IJC can take action. Thank you, Frank Bevacqua

Dr. Daniel Barletta 14th July 2013 03:55:00
NY, Rochester,
Part One of Three parts due to 500 count restriction Frank I am not sure if you want to have me send this is a comment for Plan 2014 or not. Friday, I met with my town's Flood plain manager. It seems with the remapping two years ago the base flood plane was lowered from 251 ft to 250. For the most part most of my street most homes, with the exception of my house, were taken out of the higher risk AE zone and put into the X zone which has lowered the homeowner's flood ins cost. I went to find out why my house did not change. First I learned that there is some error in the measurements they used and that I need to have a surveyor come and help me do a Letter of Map Revision LOMA to get my property out of this higher rick zone. I do not have problem doing this eventhough it is not cheap! What I learned as part of this discussion was very disturbing. During the LOSLR study, I asked and have since then asked what effect of a change in regulation plan would have on flood ins rates. Never got an answer and still have not had an answer. What I did learn today was due to the 2012 Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform act was that flood insurance rates will be increasing between 100% to 1000% over the next 5 years. On a $250,000.00 home, in five years the cost for Flood ins will be over $9000.00 per year. That is based on current risk and the risk is based on current plan of operation. With the risk of high water more that 5-fold as we project with Plan 2014 compared to current plan what effect will this have on premiums? Additionally, at this time only homes with mortgages require flood ins, however as part of this bill, if there is a declared disaster in the town and the homeowner does not have any flood insurance in effect they would not be able to get any help from the government in recovery for the disaster. The town's flood manager stated that he has hear thru contacts that the IJC would be covering the increases in cost of flood insurance between the current plan and any new plan that increases cost. If this is the case, will the IJC also pay for retrofitting protective structure? Dan

LANGEVIN JACQUES 14th July 2013 02:13:22
 QUÉBEC, ST-ANDRÉ D’ARGENTEUIL ,
Aimerais que le niveau de l’eau soit plus régulier sur le lac des DEUX MONTAGNES ,pour permettre une bonne navigation ,et contrôler les inondations

Lisa Dunn 12th July 2013 06:49:03
NY, Pittsford,
I have loved the 1000 Islands and the St. Lawerence for 50 years. I strongly support Plan 2014.

John M. Waud 12th July 2013 03:11:51
NY, Pittsford,
Dear Commissioners, Over the the last several years I have followed and to some extent participated in the hearings related to the various plans put forth but not enacted. Having carefully read Plan 2014 I find it to be scientifically sound and fair to all stakeholders. I would strongly urge to you approve and implement this plan.
Sandra Deneault 11th July 2013 15:40:13
quebec, rawdon,

When implemented it will begin to reverse the damage caused by 50 years of destructive regulation, and allow the River and Lake ecosystem to once again thrive. When will we stop selling pesticides. Deadly products for bugs. When will we stop dumping garbage everywhere in the country. When will we stop killing animals when we know that meat is number one polluter. When will big companies STOP PAYING TO POLLUTE.

John Dunham 11th July 2013 03:06:44
New York, Hilton,

There are a number of individuals out there who would like everyone to believe that the major issues with the lake levels are related to ecology, conservation, saving cattails and muskrats when in fact it’s about money. Billions of dollars are at stake between the Shipping and Power interests. In my opinion, it’s not a matter of if it’s just a matter of when the South Shore will become devastated. This will be a man made disaster and shame to all those who support the latest 2014 proposal or anything close to it. Especial if it’s passed without Major Funding for restitution to homeowners and businesses.

Daniel M. Engert - Somerset Town Supervisor 10th July 2013 14:17:10
New York, Barker,

I have a number of concerns regarding this new proposed plan 2014 and on behalf of my constituents who are vehemently opposed, I am also in opposition. This revised plan remains a significant departure to decades of water level management. Plan 2014 is projected to result in “higher highs” (property erosion, sanitary infrastructure issues) and lower lows (loss of safe harbor, visitor access and harbor economies – a $30 Million impact on NIAGARA COUNTY alone! – and over $6 Million on Wilson Harbor). This issue affects the entire community, not just boaters. Harbor activities generate sales tax revenue that supports the local economy. Even those without a direct stake in harbor activities still realize benefit through services supported from the $6 Million generated in Wilson Harbor alone. Passion for boating and recreation aside, the core concern is economic impact. A good sample size (n=151) responded to a 2010 Niagara University angler survey, indicating personal expenditures in excess of $1,000 each. When applying standard statistical models for tourism, the aggregate impact of sport fishing is over $30 Million dollars in Niagara County – and the impact is significantly greater when scaled to include a five county south shore region. In 2010, an audit documented nearly 500 Wilson Harbor residential boats among 4 marinas and 3 yacht clubs. The data was entered into Michigan State’s (2008) boating economic impact calculator which estimated $4.3M in sales, 60 FTE jobs, and $1.3M labor. The $6 Million aggregate impact does not include the 500+ international visitors, and 2,000 average boat launches/season at Tuscarora State Park. Nor does this include an average of 30 slips inaccessible at Sunset Marina due to silting at the mouth of the creek. Please reject this plan and immediately enact a moratorium on the development of any future proposals to modify the range of water levels on Lake Ontario until the completion of a thorough, objective and all inclusive analysis of the potential economic damages on tourism, recreation, business and residences along the south shore of Lake Ontario (including properties located along harbors, rivers and streams) with a specific section dedicated to the thorough evaluation of damages in Niagara County and the Town of Somerset further recommends the Commission also assess the amount of civil work and financial assistance required to mitigate the damage of any future plans, and identify funding sources available to offset said actions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

David J. Bell 10th July 2013 07:59:16
N.Y., Rochester,

Presentation to the International Joint Commission David J. Bell 620 Edgemere Dr. Rochester, N.Y. 14612 dbell1946@aol.com July 16th, 2013 My parents taught me the expression, “Don’t do anything that you wouldn’t want seen on the front page of the newspaper. However, the
International Joint Commission is choosing to go with this headline: I.J.C. Causes more Frequent and More Severe Risk of Flooding and Erosion on the shores of Lake Ontario! With Global Warming supposedly causing more dramatic and severe weather changes, why would they want to do such an irresponsible thing! What if another hurricane like Sandy hits when the Lake is at a new proposed higher level than when Agnes hit in 1972? Our Parks, boat docks, and even our drinking water supply for 600,000 people in our area would be at greater risk since the Monroe County Pure Waters Pumping Station is more likely to be flooded. Where is the integrity in this new plan? Secondly, there are many stakeholders in the Lake Level Plan – hydro power, shipping, the environment, and people living in communities near the Lake. We Lake dwellers are expected to sacrifice the most with a greater risk of losing our homes, our property, its value, storm and sanitary sewers, roads and bridges along the Lake. Where is the fairness in this new plan? The new plan is supposed to allow the Lake to fluctuate at levels more like those that existed before the St. Lawrence Seaway was completed. Some environmentalist content that this would help restore endangered species and eliminate some invasive species. But where is the scientific evidence? Years of toxic runoff and invasive species have changed the ecosystem. But there is no evidence that higher and lower Lake levels proposed in this plan are enough to make a difference! However, it will make a difference to us humans who live along the Lake. Where is the environmental concern for human life! Finally, I understand that there is not one member of the I.J.C. that lives on the shore of Lake Ontario. Where are our representatives in this process! stopplan2014.com http://loranet.org/

Margaret Manring 10th July 2013 05:48:06
NY, Skaneateles,
I strongly support plan 2014. We are all stewards of the land and water in our towns, counties and states. There are a lot of things we must do to resuscitate sick water and spoiled surrounding lands. Our survival depends on this effort. Nature itself seems to have no rights in some places. It's only right that human beings step up and right the wrongs and preserve and conserve in the future, now that we see what we are capable of allowing to happen.

Doris King 9th July 2013 02:26:03
New York, Fayetteville,
As a long time summer resident and property owner in the Cape Vincent area, I write to express my concern for the health and preservation of the Saint Lawrence River. In regulation, we should make the best possible choices that restore and maintain the health of the beautiful river that we all enjoy. I believe that Plan 2014 is the plan best suiting that endeavor. Please vote for Plan 2014.

Dennis Ethier 9th July 2013 00:43:30
NY, Rochester,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. Plan 2014 is a modern plan that benefits all interests and will help to restore the ecosystem of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Anna Roblin 8th July 2013 12:35:13
md, mt. ranier,
support plan 2014!

Scarlett Rebman 8th July 2013 12:25:15
New York, Syracuse,
Dear International Joint Commission: I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. This is a vital opportunity to update the water level management of the St. Lawrence River. By bringing this process into the 21st century, the unique opportunity exists to restore damage that has been done to the ecosystem. This will restore habitats, bring back fish populations vital to the tourist industry, and reverse the erosion damage that has occurred. As a resident of New York, I am requesting that you adopt this plan immediately. Best regards, Scarlett Rebman
Margaret Diamond 8th July 2013 11:45:39
NY, Williamsville,
I strongly support the implementation of Plan 2014. It provides a balanced approach, protecting everyone's interest, and supports restoration of the Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River ecosystems.

John Keevert 3rd July 2013 14:30:11
New York, Rochester,
I participated in the forum on lake regulation last year in Rochester, and think the committee has achieved a reasonable balance between protecting property owners and allowing a variation in water level that will revitalize the wetlands and associated wildlife. By intelligent shifting of when minima and maxima occur, and duration, the effect on property owners is minimized. Erosion is a natural occurrence and will take place regardless. Plan 2014 should be implemented, no further discussion needed.

Jim Jerome 2nd July 2013 04:35:08
NY, Syracuse,
We continue to be told by the IJC that lake levels and erosion would be much worse without regulation. My question is why are 150 yr. old trees washing into the lake annually? How did these majestic old oak trees survive for all of those years without the IJC's helpful regulation? This Plan 2014 is all about shipping and hydro. Please don't try and con the folks. Muskrats don't fund our towns and schools. We do.

Thomas R. Sawran 1st July 2013 08:34:45
New York, Lyndonville,
At a public meeting last year I learned that this proposal would positively impact electrical utilities, shipping companies and those located in the lower St. Lawrence valley while eroding the south shore of Lake Ontario. As a south shore property owner, I object to this project, but I do offer a proposal that would make it acceptable to me. The Commission should be required to contract to have the entire south shore of Lake Ontario bulkheaded to prevent this erosion. This bulkhead should stretch from the Niagara River to the St. Lawrence, excluding areas that are intended to be restored. The bulkhead and its maintenance should be paid for by assessing a tax on every kilowatt of electricity generated, every commercial ship that traverses Lake Ontario in either direction and all property owners in the lower St. Lawrence River valley benefitting from the project. This is a serious proposal. The technology is available and a fair funding stream has been identified. Washing away the property belonging to certain people without compensation while enriching and protecting others is unacceptable. While it was entertaining to see flood projections for the next 50,000 years, I sure the presenters knew that if they were wrong, they could not be held accountable by anyone in the audience. Thank you for permitting this comment.

Jim 29th June 2013 04:49:58
NY, Syracuse,
This is simple. The 248 level will NOT work for Lake Ontario property owners. This level coupled with storm surges will devastate properties. There is no shore protection available at any price that will save our structures. For the IJC to even offer this up proves just how totally out of touch they are with the folks. Has the IJC learned nothing from history? It appears so.

Michael Fleszar 26th June 2013 18:59:24
New York, Sandy Creek,
The main propose of regulation in 1958 was to protect land owners from high water. Read the first paragraph of the 1958DD regulation treaty. Yet from 1960 to 2012 the lake averages 2 inches higher year round. Between 1918 and 2012 per the Army Corp measurements, we have had 32 of the 50 highest Spring levels after 1958DD regulation. And yet you want to take the
Lake even higher. The beaches on the Eastern are disappearing and plan 2014 will take more sand away and deposit it the bays during high water. I do not have the $200K to save my house with large stone break walls. You want my house, give me market value and I'll move on.......I sick of fighting special interest groups buying government.

Laurey Costich Ritchie 25th June 2013 09:29:41
NY, Wolcott,
Please explain to me who will be "invited" to the technical meetings? Why are there only two meetings in NY and three in Canada when the south shore of the lake in NY will be suffer greater negative impact? How long does it take for a trigger to lower water levels? I will be flooded and my property lost at elevation 247, without major winds and waves. How can environmental groups propose protecting barrier islands and support their destruction through this plan? Without Crescent Beech-Sodus Bay will become the south shore of Lake Ontario. This plan cannot be supported by New Yorkers.

Dr. Daniel Barletta 21st June 2013 01:18:45
NY, Rochester,
LOSL Minority Report that is still pertinent and has never has been answered to
Attachment

Donna 20th June 2013 08:35:48
FL, Crystal River,
I understand the improvement for wildlife...however, at what price, to current communities & property owners? It's not right to wipe out the lives of people who have worked long and hard to have a piece of the "American Dream". Are you looking to work on a balance or are you looking to impose a biased objective?

Dr. Daniel Barletta 19th June 2013 11:35:25
NY, Rochester,
This comment was forwarded to me by Mr. Jim Jerome of Mexico Bay: Awful ! The canals are closed due to high water here and most interesting that the beaches are too due to high bacteria more than likely coming from septic tanks. Do they expect something different on Lake Ontario with high waters? My septic tank ,which used to be behind my cottage before the 1972 move, is now in front and will be the first thing to go. I am too old,too tired and will no longer throw good monies after bad trying to keep save my places. I will document the erosion and send photos to newspapers when my septic tank becomes exposed. Jail me,fine me,arrest me...I do not care as this is theft by government. I will seek an attorney to put the government on notice that if Plan 2014 is enacted and my place is lost to a knowingly pre-planned IJC scheme I will expect compensation. This is eminent domain theft under the guise of an environmental improvement plan. Flat out pissed if you couldn't tell..JJ

Dr. Daniel Barletta 18th June 2013 16:27:18
NY, Rochester,
In reviewing the proposed Plan 2014 Orders of approval and the exceedence table you sent me, I find it impossible to see how the IJC could propose a plan that would allow water levels above 246.3 ft during the months of March- May. It is unconceivable that they would allow levels above 247 ft during these months. Even if you disregard the underestimated damages that will occur to state in the face of data on water levels that the LOSL study has shown will happen and suggest that it is okay to have levels above this borders on the criminal. Even with today current plan and it upper limit of 247.3 ft, on occasion this level gets surpassed. If the level is set as listed in the proposed orders is used there will be times when it will be surpassed also.
Ken Lendeck 14th June 2013 03:25:30
New York, Hilton,

I have lived on the South Shore of Lake Ontario for 16 years. I have invested $37,000 for a substantial break wall as have my neighbors, so we really have been attempting to protect our investments. I have followed and participated in most of the discussions over the last 15 years the efforts to control the lake level to meet all “stake holders”, so I do understand the situation well. I am very concerned about the proposed regulation Bv 7 allowing the maximum level to move to 248.13 for this level with wave heights of more than 2 feet will destroy the South shore. I am also a member of Brockport Yacht Club and since joining in 1982 the 100 member club has maintained our club, its jetties and basin with our own money without any assistance from anyone or any government funds. Our club will also suffer from high water damage where our basin and seawall will be battered, causing us more money then we can afford. We have spent over $200,000 trying to protect our beautiful club and to Protect Sandy Creek for the enjoyment of all who use it (State Boat Launch, Charter Marinas etc). Allowing the level to move to 248.13 will destroy our efforts as well as the lake front home owners property. Please revise Bv7