

ELPOI / APA / DEC Meeting

Date: 2/1/23

ELPOI's version of the meeting minutes with ELPOI officers' comments.

Participants:

-Adirondack Park Agency: Chris Cooper, Kevin Prickett, Megan Phillips

-Dept. of Environmental Conservation: Rob Daley, Ben Thomas

-ELPOI: Chris Hyde, Rolf Tiedemann, Keith Park, Cole Hickland, Ed Leahy, Jack Mulcahy

Topic: Future of the Eagle Lake Boat Launch

Agenda

-Introductions

- APA, DEC, ELPOI participants introduce themselves

UMP Overview by Rob Daley

- Covering what would qualify as a waterway access site
 - o Not designed for launching of boats
 - o Received significant comments and took a deeper look and determined to study the area before decision and had questions on the UMP process

They initially started.

Three Alternatives for the “non-conforming” Boat Launch listed by Megan Phillips:

- Alternative 1: No action. “Float on/float off” trailered launching of motorized watercraft from the water’s edge in a Wild Forest area would be allowed which would not address the issue of conformance of the state land master plan
- Alternative 2: Convert the site to a waterway access site. It would enable users to hand launch canoes and kayaks. There is no “float on/float off” option.
- Alternative 3: Proceed with a study to collect data to help inform whether a re-classification of the site would be appropriate. Ben Thomas: Post UMP survey carried out in 2020 using the CSLAP boater survey information was collected about boats on the lake and how many boats were there and the parking lot at the boat launch and now full it was and how many boats were there. Requested a consultation with the APA and whether this data would be sufficient to make a decision and that’s when he heard back from the APA on that request. Megan Phillips: As data collected between the 2020 – 2022 boating season using the CSLAP boating protocol the agency reviewed the data that was collected and made recommendation that DEC proceed with implementing the

UMP alternative 2, converting the site to a waterway access site rather than a trailered boat launch. That recommended action would bring the site into conformance with the SLMP guidelines for wild forest areas and manage the site as a waterway access site moving forward. The difference between a waterway access site and an improved trailered boat launch is that a waterway access site does not accommodate the float-on float-off launching of trailered vessels. This alternative will enable users to hand launch smaller vessels and also to still launch motor boats but those boats must be rolled over the low bar they cannot be floated on or off of a trailer from the water's edge.

Kevin Prickett: provided some insight into the question what informed the APA staff response to the department (re-iteration of the definition of boat launching site and the definition of large lake of 1000 acres or more in area, Eagle Lake is approx. 410 acres.) Eagle lake is not of an adequate size for a boat launching site for a boat launching site that provides for the trailered launching. Fishing and waterway access sites can be provided on a waterbody of any size where public access is warranted, the fishing and waterway access sites facilitate the hand launching of boats they do not accommodate the trailered launching of boats. Limiting opportunities to hand launching at NYS access points on waterbodies provides opportunities to enjoy the waterbodies without large motorboats, provides a more conducive opportunity for some users like swimmers and canoeists and reduces shoreline erosion with wake action and limits the impact to wildlife for example Loons that are sensitive to motorboat wakes. Managing pre-existing non-conforming boat launches has been addressed in several approved UMP's in the past, these UMP's have addressed the non-conforming boat launches that is a trailered launch with the installation of a low lying barrier. Alternative two that is proposed in the UMP is the only master plan conforming option and consistent with previous management actions in other places in the forest preserve.

Rolf Tiedemann comments:

The issue is back in 1988 and prior to there was a campground that I know in the state land master plan there was an exception and I think that's where Eagle Lake was originally afforded a boat launch because there was a campground. Latest research shows that the 1988 master plan has been scrubbed from the DEC's website. This goes to the fact that there was a campground and now its disappearing. Numerous residents on the lake that require a boat launch to access their property and are not going to be accessing a piece of property with a row boat with a motor on it that you can pick up and throw over a barrier.

Discussion with Bob Stegmann in the past was mentioned, the barrier put up on other lakes and that the barrier put up was 5 to 8 feet away from the water. It doesn't roll and people will show up this spring with a 16-18 foot boat expecting to get materials out to their cottages and there going to be locked up.

Rolf further mentioned that were going to have a fire department that's going to need to show up for a forest fire of which several have been reported on in the past and they will be locked out, utility services like National Grid and propane services and how will we tell them that

“sorry you can’t use your property anymore in the way it’s been afforded to you in the last 100 plus years?” because the boat launch does not associate with the campground as it was originally established back in the 30’s and 40’s and 50’s.

Megan Phillips chimes in that she would like to speak to your questions and there is one final agenda item that will help to paint a fuller picture of what is being proposed and the timeline to which its being proposed. Megan mentioned that there are primitive tent sites that are associated with the facility but that is not to be confused with an intensive use or more developed campground and that the 1988 UMP was taken off the website because the 2019 UMP amendment was a full re-write of the UMP so that original UMP from 1988 no longer provides management direction for this unit.

Rolf Tiedemann mentions that our residents are quite familiar with what a barrier will present to them as far as an obstacle or impediment to their property.

Rob Daley then discussed the timeline for the management:

Our intention is to develop a workplan to convert the site to a water access site and install the barrier. Our intention is this spring to develop a work plan and to post an environmental use notice bulletin that would be available for public review and that this spring signage would be installed at the site to inform people that a change is coming but the intent of the work plan would be that the installation of a barrier would be at the end of the 2024 boating season.

Megan mentions that this timeline would be to give as much heads-up and leeway as possible so folks would have adequate time to prepare and understand what the change would mean to them and the use of the site. At this juncture that is all the information that the DEC and APA is prepared to share with us and would be happy to take questions and share answers as they are able and if there are any questions that they are not able to answer at this time she would jot it down, capture it in the notes and get back to all of us as soon as she possibly can.

Rolf Tiedemann thanks everyone for their time and talked with Ben Thomas about boat launch information but finds this much like when the 2019 UMP was initially proposed information to the public was very very limited in coming and that the public notification was put in a newspaper that was significantly out of the UMP’s jurisdiction and very very limited distribution. Rolf also mentioned that he asked Bob Stegemann and everybody else in the APA to be involved in the decision making process that went forward and feels chastised that Megan reached out to summon him to the meeting without prior input from ELPOI, a 100+ member strong association that has been in existence since the early 1900’s, one of the oldest lake associations in NYS and yet there is no attempt to ask us to help you in making decisions and steering decisions and that the membership now has to be informed that you have 2 years to sell your boats because you will not be able to get anything in the lake or you will have to beg and barter with your neighbor putting neighbor against neighbor to be able to launch a boat in the lake. There are not any other private boat launches to use on the lake. Not to mention the fact that there was no way early residents had to know that there would one day be no public access to the lake and make other alternatives when that was possible back then and that now

we have to go to our residents and say “sorry folks”, but the way you have been enjoying the lake for the past 100 years can no longer be taking place because you can’t get your pontoon boat on the lake. Rolf also mentioned how the causeway has limited people but that was a fact of life and you had to buy a boat that was a certain size but we were afforded a boat launch and from what was told the boat launch was afforded because of the campground. Rolf spoke of how the forest ranger did maintain the campground in the past and that when things needed to be done or replaced after his property was sold that ELPOI was willing to maintain it on behalf of the state. In 1988 the UMP still identified that there still were amenities down there and provisioned it as a campground and when the 1988 was re-written without our input it was like the campground never existed and that it was “primitive camping”. Rolf continued in stating that to deliberately lock people out of their places by not allowing them to put a boat into the lake is in his opinion akin to conversion of property. Rolf welcomed being involved with the APA and their staff to figure out how we can accommodate APA needs or what the SLMP says but to accommodate the residents that have been on this lake for significant amounts of time.

Megan Phillips offered to respond to Rolf statements:

Megan offered empathy for property owners and has encountered other similar circumstances in wild forest areas on small lakes in the past thru the UMP process and we need to implement the provisions of the SLMP in a way that is consistent and fair to everybody and that’s what we’re seeking to do here with converting the site to a waterway access site and that access is still preserved with smaller vessels some of which could have motors as long as users can lift and roll over that low barrier and they have done this in numerous other locations.

Rolf Tiedeman responded with the invitation for her to come down to help somebody with a 17 or 18 foot boat and carry it over this barrier, I understand what the SLMP says and I understand what the exception was and I have looked at the maps of what the APA put forth back in the 70’s and 80’s and there is a small piece of land that is distinctively drawn out of the wild forest or whatever the specific designation is around the boat launch as if somebody at that point was going to paint in there that it was an intensive use and it didn’t get put in. Again, I come back to what was originally in the 20’s – 70’s a viable active quintessential campground boat launch at one end of the lake campground at the other end of the lake and it isn’t my fault that back in the day it wasn’t a Putts Pond where the campground and the boat launch were intrinsically joined by a piece of ground that was right next to each other. The state, up until 1988 or whenever it came to be maintained a public campground, what happened in the process that allowed that to fall apart. Did the state not have money to continue the campground and wanted to divorce it and which now you get into a situation where there is no campground there is no active float-on float-off boat launch.

Megan cut in and responded that that wasn’t the connection they are making and wanted to make clear that the size of the lake does not warrant a trailer launching opportunity per the guideline of the SLMP.

Rolf responded that this means that the lake doesn't warrant a campground either and that it's just a piece of other wild forest land that is on the lake. I'm asking that you re-classify or re-develop the campground so that it can be associated with it a true boat launch, if that's not possible we have other discussions that need to take place.

Kevin Prickett responded: How do you define, when you say campground for my information how do you define campground?

Rold responded: In 1988 the UMP identified 6 campsites, 6 fire rings, a pit privy, a couple picnic tables and a lean-to. There aren't many lean-to's that are associated with a piece of state land. There is another piece of state land identified in the UMP as being rather rocky and inaccessible But there is no lean-to there and there is no camping there so at some point in time somebody within the DEC or the conservation commission at the time and put this little select piece of half acre out of 300 acres of state land that is in that Crown Point Bay area and said it was a campground and maintained it, the forest ranger used to live within a half a mile of a land access heading further east on the Courderoy Rd. and whether he developed it on his own or it was something he was directed to do or how that came to be, no idea, but if you go back to all of the UMP's it does identify Crown Point bay as designated "campground" not unlike it defines the one at Putts Pond or the one that's at Paradox or Lincoln pond or any of the other ones as a campground it was just boat access only as opposed as being able to drive in, pull your tent out of your car, and have your overnight camping.

Kevin Prickett responded that there are state signs on that campground that tell you where to camp

Rob Daley from DEC responded: we do provide primitive camping opportunities in the forest preserve but they are different than an intensive use campground so I'm not aware that there was ever technically but they are different than an intensive use campground and that what Rolf was referring to was an intensive use area with a formal boat launch that with the SLMP you can trailer a boat into the water but I'm not aware that there was ever actually a campground here but we do manage campsites across the forest preserve some of them its anticipated that they could be used primarily accessed from water bodies but that does not indicate that it would be motorized access. There are various campsites we have, various campsites that were clustered over time historically in the forest preserve but that some of these were campground as you say on Paradox lake, sharps bridge etc. historic campgrounds and other areas in the back country that we identified area for the public to camp so I'm not aware that on Eagle Lake that it was anything different than the latter of those two and I'm glad to hear that the forest ranger did diligently maintain those over time for the public to enjoy. That's something we've tried to do over time but I guess from the standpoint of the nomenclature that doesn't shift us to an intensive use management scenario.

Chris Hyde chimed in asking what data was used to not change the boat launch itself into an intensive use area? What conclusions were not met that would have made that happen?

Kevin Prickett responded that the qualifications for the trailered boat launching were that the lake be 1000 acres or more

Chris Hyde responded that that's not what means intensive use and that I thought the point of the study was to determine if the need was there to, based on the current use of the boat launch to see if that could be re-classified as intensive use.

Kevin Prickett responded that information that was used that was provided to the agency from the department and we examined that and along with the requirements of the master plan and required us to uphold the master plan requirement of 1000 acres or more.

Megan Phillips responded that the only master plan conforming alternative that was presented by the SLMP was alternative two.

Chris Hyde stated that if there was an alternative three that was supposed to say that we would study it and the land could be re-classified as intensive use then it could maintain a boat launch. I'm asking what the threshold was to find out, did we need to have 100 boats a day? 50? What was the threshold?

Megan responded that the issue with non-conformity with the master plan will stand because of the acreage issue. There was some data collected DEC made a good faith effort to examine that use through the 2020 – 2022 boating season but the unfortunate reality is that the size of this water body does not enable us to reclassify the site to intensive use.

Cole Hickland responded: I thought Rob said that you did a study and got significant public input in order to make this decision and I think he then said there was a boat survey to assess the use of the lake that was going to inform to help make this decision but now you saying that no, it's simply the size of the lake and that these studies were just a charade.

Rolf Tiedemann added: I was going to say the same thing and Option ...

Megan returned saying: The public input that was being referred to here was thru the UMP planning process so when we're developing a UMP for a unit we present a draft to the board and to the public and gives us a chance to weigh in on the management actions that are proposed so that's the public input that the DEC was referring to earlier in the call and I think you know and been in contact with the DEC throughout the 5 year allotted study period and only 3 years of that have elapsed and we've arrived at our management decision the agency is directing the DEC to undertake this management action and allowing those two remaining years of this study period to have the boat launch exist as it does today and residents can continue using it as they have been and prepare for the upcoming change.

Cole Hickland responded by asking "what was the purpose of the survey of the boat use if, I thought you said you did this work to make the decision but now your saying its just based on 1000 acres, I'm not following, why did you do the survey"?

Megan stated: It was the preferred alternative that was articulated in the management plan at the time and DEC made a good faith effort to collect information to give to the agency to help inform our decision, and our decision, our determination when reviewing the data that was provided and the guidelines set forth in the SLMP is that we need to proceed with alternative number two. So it wasn't a waste of time that the DEC collected that data it was helpful for us to understand these issues that's going on at that lake and to have that in hand but we did make the determination that alternative number 2 is the only master plan conforming option.

Cole Hickland asked for a copy of that survey information?

Kevin Prickett responded that they could get that information to us.

Rolf Tiedemann then stated: I was the one that put forth a red-line document or a document that pokes holes thru the red line document that was put forth to the APA for their decision to review this thing. Unfortunately, in the re-write or the revision process of the 2019 UMP there were numerous resident comments that were selectively edited out, either on the part of the DEC or the APA. There were numerous resident comments that I have documentation of having been received at the APA that were never included in the comments section. There were numerous paragraphs that were in that document that was presented to the staff of the APA that were changed but never noted in the red line document. I unfortunately didn't, I felt terrible about Corrie Magee when she got up and presented that morning and the first thing out of her mouth was an apology for the way that the red-line document was put together, that things were indeed edited incorrectly, included incorrectly, as Cole just mentioned, is this a charade? I talked with Bob Stegemann and asked him if he would be around at the time that this would come to our meeting of today and he responded that somebody would take care of it almost as if we'll give you a stay of execution for a couple years and then here, we sit back to where we are. I am totally disappointed in how this all got to here, we were not involved and here we are told, again, two years from now, sorry boat owners you have to sell your boat because you cannot get it on the lake anymore or you were going to come down and help them put their boats in the water, is there any way to amend the master plan? Or is there any way, again, as I come back to because I understand an amendment to the master plan requires a referendum to the entire state for a half-acre of property or we include the campground and we go back and say, hey, there is a suitable campground there that is linked to this boat launch and we kind of move things the way they need to be moved.

Megan responded by saying that she understood that Rolf was upset and she just wanted to make it clear that Rolf conversation with former region 5 director Bob Stegemann, that was outside the scope of his purview whether or not it could be a done deal that the reclassification could happen, the classification of state land and the re-classification of land falls squarely under the jurisdiction of the Adirondack Park Agency. So it was our determination, you know, we are telling the department that we need to proceed with this management action it would have been impossible for Bob to foresee what we would have decided here on our end at this juncture so I just want to make sure everybody understands that about the SLMP we are not

able to amend the SLMP and change the management guidelines for what's required to have a trailered boat launching opportunity this is something that affects numerous water bodies across the park and I'm sure you can understand that we need to apply those consistently and fairly.

Rolf Tiedemann asked:

Then ban all boats on the lake, And don't be selective that its somebody that can carry a boat in or carry a boat out and don't put it under the auspices of "were going to prevent the spread of invasives" and that invasives are going to be spread by the kid that carries a pail of water from one lake to another, its going to be lock everybody, don't allow a selective segment of our population, do not discriminate against the power boater versus a Kayaker and say "oh, you're the golden people, you're the bad people you can't come in"

Megan then asked if there was anyone else that would like to ask a question or add feedback?

Jack Mulcahy then stated: The bottom line is that this plan was adopted way back when the APA started, 1972 and they had a broad brush that said any lake smaller than 1000 acres was going to be, only lakes of 1000 acres would have a boat launch, again this does not take into consideration of how these lakes are used and the process needs to be updated to look at these lakes, each one, and I'm talking Eagle Lake because there's a lot of boats on it that we use, and to just come out with a blanket statement that says 1000 acres or more get a boat launch, that's it! This isn't correct, it needs to be addressed, and if I remember correctly somebody from the APA board mentioned that at the meeting that Corrie got chastised. The thing is, you keep talking about input but nobody seems to listen, because we've been trying to work with you for years and it hasn't happened, it's a one-way street, it's your way or no way. I guess we need to find out how we can address it and work through this and identify if we have to change the master plan, change it, there are laws that are wrong that need to be changed and updated. You keep saying that you did this survey and I haven't seen anybody. It's frustrating.

Rolf chimed in: If the state master plan said in 72 lakes over 1000 acres then in 72 the barrier would have been put up and things would have been different from 72 and those people that were involved with the property owners and the state and everybody else back in 72 would have had the fight. It lingered for 50 some odd years till now, there had to have been a reason back in 72 that they didn't immediately put up a barrier and it was a result, and I come back to once again, a campground, be it undefined or otherwise. There are way too many little pieces that indicate that you can, reclassify the property but you do have to keep the campground as part of it. That is the exception that is in the SLMP. That is the reason Putts Pond has a boat launch, if it weren't for the campground that were there developed prior to post 72 no idea, same thing with Paradox, under 1000 acres has a boat launch, has a campground, Lincoln Pond has a boat launch, has a campground, as I said before the two were intrinsically joined, you could step between one to the other over a little piece of land. We need to revisit that issue and figure it out so that we can leave it the way that it is.

Megan responded: I want to make it clear, that the presence of these non-conforming facilities

in wild forest units has been addressed as UMP's are adopted for these different units that's why in 1972 that was not immediately dealt with.

Rolf stated: I'm sure it was dealt with on a lot of other lakes or the statement would not have been with the exception of those that have a campground there had to be a reason that Eagle Lake for the last 50 some odd years has continued to have a boat launch.

Megan responded: I think there is an issue here over conflating permanent tent sites with a developed intensive use campground and those are different things.

Chris Hyde stated: I'm going to ask the question if, option 3 was the preferred plan back in the 2019 UMP based on changing the use to intensive use of the boat launch. I haven't heard what data was or was not collected that didn't let that happen.

Megan responded and Chris Cooper jumps in stating: There may be a mis-conception that alternative 3 was to do a study and then re-classify to intensive use. Alternative 3 was do a study and then based on that study determine what the appropriate path forward is and that could either be changing the water access site as we are now pursuing or reclassifying for intensive use, there was no promise at that time that alternative 3 would lead to intensive use. I think that's the goal that the agency and department were trying to achieve with that third alternative is that we wouldn't cut things off at that point without further input or further study. There was understanding at that time that intensive use, re-classification to intensive use may not be possible but we wanted to insure that we explore options and that we got all information that we could so that there was nothing that would change that decision one way or the other, we got that input, we did the studies, the DEC did the studies, we got that information and we did not find anything in there that would change the interpretation that the agency has made that this can't be reclassified to intensive use. So, it wasn't a question what intent to try to do an unimportant study it was an attempt by the agency and the department to make sure that we were covering all the bases and has as much information as possible.

Chris Hyde responded: was there a number, that, 20 boats a day 50 boats a day, what was the number that lead you to say that there's not enough to show us that this is being used in a certain way to lead us to want to change it.

Chris Cooper responded: There was no threshold, there was no threshold in the UMP, it was an attempt to make sure we had all the information that we could prior to making the decision.

Keith Park added: There's got to be a threshold somewhere that says this gets re-classified or this doesn't. What would have been necessary to re-classify it as intensive use? We've got residents on that part of the lake that cannot get to their camp without a boat launch as we have now, they are completely marooned, as Rolf has stated, you can't get your supplies over there in a kayak or a rowboat. What would we have had to gotten thru to be re-classified as intensive use other than the campsite which Rolf has been talking about?

Megan responded: The lake would have had to be more than twice the size that it is and there is nothing that anybody could do to effectuate that.

Keith Park went on to say: 50 plus years ago, there have to be exceptions to that, society and use has evolved tremendously in the past 50 years. There are avenues for which to get things, But why does a 900 acre lake not qualify and a 1100 acre lake qualify, when I go to our residents and tell them the decision that was made by the APA this is what they are going to be asking me, why are they coming in, we had a boat launch, were not asking you to install one, and it's been used for 100+ years, why are they coming in and making it more difficult for us to use the lake, for the public to use the lake, is there any reason that its detrimental to the lake and I haven't heard anything yet that really says that it is. This is a difficult thing when I go to the residents to try and get them to understand.

Megan responded: I think that Kevin articulated it earlier in some of the discussions some of the reasons that we provide these trailered float-on float-off launching opportunities only on lakes of a larger size and their various environments will considerations at play there including things like shoreline erosion and impact to species that are sensitive to boat wakes and the like.

Keith Park responded: We don't have these problems on Eagle Lake, there has never been anybody that I know of that has said we have a shoreline erosion problem other than if the lake level gets too high, many invasives are already in the lake and as Rolf has stated, trailered boats are not the only way they get in there, so it doesn't appear that we have these problems on the lake that has been stated for a reason that we shouldn't have a regular trailered float on float boat launch.

Chris Hyde adds: So, lakes over 1000 acres they don't erode, they don't have loons in them, what is the issue that Eagle Lake is so special that it's the only lake that's going to have these issues if we allow a boat in there?

Cole Hickland also added: The logic here just isn't very sound because what your saying is that if the size of the lake is the only thing that you guys are judging then every lake in the Adirondacks that is under 1000 acres will have their boat launch closed, but your just targeting Eagle Lake.

Megan Responded: we are certainly not trying to target Eagle Lake were trying to treat Eagle Lake the same way we are treating other small lakes in wild forest areas that have a non-conforming boat launch.

Cole Hickland continued to add: I'm still a little confused, Chris just said that option 3 in the UMP your gathering data in order to make a decision, we'd ask what the threshold would be to make the decision to allow the boat launch and Megan is saying, no, it's less than 1000 acres the lake would have to be twice as big to have a boat launch, who's right here? Was it Chris that were gathering information to make a decision or Megan was it simply the size of the lake?

Chris cooper responds with: I wasn't saying that we'd discount or somehow override the SLMP's requirement and threshold of a 1000-acre lake but understanding the sensitivity of a closure like this or a change like this we wanted to make sure we had covered all bases. We didn't find anything that would change the interpretation though of the SLMP. There's not a conflict between what Megan or I are saying but we do have to follow the SLMP and the SLMP has that threshold in it and that's what we're following.

Rolf Responds with:

The SLMP has the exception if there is a campground, the lean-to did not get put there by dumb luck, it didn't just fall out of space, if there is no campground or official intensive use campground take the lean-to out, scrub the property of all the fire rings, turn it back into whatever wild forest it is and we'll deal with the closure of the boat launch. If there's going to be a primitive campground there than use it to fit the letter of the law, the SLMP, of the exception. Develop the campground back to what it was, the proud thing where people could come and have a quintessential camping experience on a remote lake and enjoy that for the public. Please, let's do what is right and that's make the campground what it should be, let's not ignore that Grandma ever existed.

Chris Hyde responds:

There was a lot of mention in the UMP about the need for camping on Eagle Lake and the number of sites and the desire to be camping on Eagle Lake so the demand is there.

Megan came back saying:

Right, and again, the presence of primitive tent sites or a lean-to does not automatically mean that is an intensive use developed campground facility like some of the others that you have mentioned. I just want to make sure that that distinction is clear.

Rolf responds: Can we develop it to that point? What is involved with doing such? We are willing to help you do so

Megan responds:

The UMP does not contemplate having that type of facility.

Rolf comes back:

Then let's write Option 4 into the UMP and go, lets figure out what we need to do to redevelop, define and redevelop and to improve this undeveloped or uninitiated campground that's been let flounder for, since 72, when all the sudden somebody didn't have the money, the time, the interest or whatever. It very well could have been a very viable intense use campground if it weren't for the fact that the two were somewhat divorced from each other and it made getting

from one to the other rather difficult. How did Paradox Lake, and Putts Pond and Lincoln Pond I come back to those again, remain developed because the campground and the boat launch were right next to each other, they were very easy for the state to keep together, somewhere along the line in the 30's – 90's, that connection fell apart on the part of the DEC. We're asking can we go back and re-develop this nice quintessential little piece of tranquility on Eagle Lake to have some people come and camp on weekends and weekdays. Let's make the park what it should be, a destination as opposed to exclusionary, Oh... you can go to this campground anymore, primitive or otherwise, people are not going to jump in their Kayak regularly and paddle 2 ½ miles down the lake with their tent, their cookstove, their this or that, their kids their dogs to go camping for a weekend, they want to get into a little motor boat, maybe they want to paddle? It's up to them but we should not be excluding or discriminating against people that want to use that little piece of 5/10 of an acre at the crown point beach area because it doesn't fit. I'm not saying that we need to change the SLMP and go before the entire state of NY for a vote on this thing. Let's develop the campground or at least acknowledge that it is there and it exists. Can we figure out a way to do that? So that way the boat launch kind of stays the way it is, primitive, not real well graded... Thank you by the way Ben this summer for grading it, people say they enjoy it, but at the same token people were just happy the way it was because they could get their boat in the water.

Kevin Prickett speaks next:

Just so that your aware, a campground that's a higher developed facility and it's got a greater level of development its totally different classification of land within the Adirondacks so this land at this campsite on Eagle Lake was never classified as an intensive use area campground and those intensive use are campgrounds are seasonally open, are manned, there is staff that work there the sites are well developed, laid out, and it's a different type of experience and the hundreds and hundreds of similar tent sites we have all around even in wilderness areas that have higher levels of protection in the lands we manage, lean-to's as well, lean-to's are allowed for in wilderness areas, Pharaoh lake wilderness for example which is right over the hill, so I just wanted to make that distinction again because it seems like the lines were getting blurred there.

Rolf Tiedemann chimes back in:

At some point in history the camp ground at Eagle Lake or Crown Point Bay indeed had the forest ranger living, intrinsically joined properties. The person that owns it now backs up to the state land and has been chastised for years about taking his ATV or whatever he has across that state land on occasion be it true or not, no idea, but the forest ranger lived at one end of the state property and took care of it, he was managing the campground. He moved, passed away, not sure of the connection there but I know he's not there anymore but at that point it was manned. Again, was it a result of the state not having the money from some point going forward and that person when they moved on, how did the campground's, Paradox get developed? Allows them to get staffed and manned today all the way through, when Eagle

Lake's crown point didn't fit the mold at that time? There was a piece of history there that is being scrubbed from the record, and nobody's willing to look at that.

Megan cuts in saying:

Rolf, I will take another glance at that, but I don't believe that what your saying is entirely factually accurate but I just want to take a moment and thank everybody for their time and their input here and were certainly committed to working with you to make the appropriate notifications as we move forward with implementing this management plan with the department and again, I understand where you're coming from, I empathize with that, but we've made a determination here and have instructed the DEC to proceed accordingly and that was the purpose of the call today to make sure residents are informed and we will continue to work with you to make the appropriate notifications, I will type up minutes from this meeting and circulate them as you asked and if you have any other questions please feel to reach out to me directly.

Rolf added: Megan, last comment on my part, I hope that you are sincere with working with us and I will get a preview of the notifications that you will be putting up prior to them being nailed onto a tree or set on a post. I hope I will be getting a timeline from you as you just stated prior to it being, were going to be down there tomorrow with a shovel. I hope the notification is greater than 20 days or 10 days so please do be sincere to your willingness to work with us, OK?

Megan responds: Yes Rolf, we want folks to have as much time as possible to be ready to understand the implications of what we're telling you now so there are two full boating seasons between the notification and when the management action is going to occur and we can commit to you that that is the timeline were working on.

Rolf then said: I'm also willing to work with you on changes to the SLMP if we need to go before the entire state of NY and say, there is an exception in NYS that this particular boat launch much like a couple years ago where there was a land swap for some telephone pole land up in the upper Adirondack region somewhere I'm willing and I'm in. OK?

Megans responds with:

Thank you for that offer, were not looking to pursue an amendment to the master plan at this time.

Rolf: Well, if that's what we need to do then I'm in and I will propose it. OK? Thank you for your time Meeting adjourned.

Conclusion

- APA and DEC have decided to convert the boat launch without the proper public input or support
 - o ELPOI, Chilson Fire, Town of Ti, Town of Crown Point all support leaving the boat launch as is
- APA and DEC reference multiple studies and public input in support
 - o Studies conducted were of no value
 - o “Attempt by the agency to make sure they covered all their bases”
 - o Size of the lake is the only issue

Follow Up

- APA to send meeting minutes
- DEC to send Boat & launch traffic survey

KP, EL 3/21/23