

Charlene Dindo

From: Rachel Cogbill <rwcogbill@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 3:13 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake boats

[External]

To the Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules

I am very distressed to learn of the height of a wake boat wave: 5 feet? That is indeed an intolerable imposition by one person craving unique recreational experiences on the rest of the lake inhabitants: human and animal alike, as well as upon the shoreline. Were there more than one such boat on the lake, or one such boat on multiple days, the effect would be cumulative! Please do not follow the proposed Agency of Natural Resources guidelines.

Rachel Cogbill
82 Walker Lane
Plainfield, VT 05667

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Hale Irwin <hale.irwin@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 5:19 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake Boats have no place in Vermont.

[External]

I urge the Committee to reject totally any request from ANR to allow wake boats on any Vermont waters. The Agency is known for cow- towing to the majority to please a small minority as they have done with trapping and hounding.

Do not let our lakes be destroyed.

Thank you,

Hale Irwin
Middlesex VT
802-917-4132

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Pamela <pamelakentish@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 5:24 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake surf boats

[External]

1/25/23

I am writing in opposition to the proposal from the Agency of Natural Resources to allow wake boats on public waters within 500 feet of shore.

These boats are environmentally damaging and dangerous to paddlers of all kinds as well as swimmers.

Please do not allow the use of wake boats on our precious waters.

Pamela Kentish
Calais , VT.

Sent from my iPhone

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: gail o'keefe <gailokeefe@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 5:24 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake Boats

[External]

Hello,

Please take into consideration my concerns, and that of thousands of Vermonters who care about our state's natural resources. Considering the wildlife and bird life along the shores, not to mention human life in kayaks, canoes, shoreline walks, fishing, and swimming, this is an unnecessary introduction of wakes, and a far-reaching environmental problem.

The number of wake boats is small, and the restriction of a few for the common good is where the government can be most beneficial. Please restrict wake boats from 1000 ft of the shoreline.

Gail O'Keefe
139 Bent Hill Rd
Waitsfield

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: John Dillon <jadillon1065@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 5:35 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] John Dillon comment to LCAR with attachment
Attachments: Approval Memo Wakeboat Rule Modifications from Comments for LCAR.pdf

[External]

Hi Charlene,

Please accept these comments for LCAR to consider as it reviews the wake boat rule. If possible, I would like to appear before the committee and summarize my comments in person. I have also attached an ANR memo I reference in my comments.

Thank-you,

John

Comment from John Dillon, independent angler.

I live in Middlesex. I don't own lakefront property but I do spend a lot of time on the water, usually in a kayak or row boat with a fishing rod in hand.

I'd like to call LCAR's attention to ANR's own record on this issue. For background, I have attached a memo prepared last fall by the state lakes and ponds program manager and the associate general counsel of the Agency of Natural Resources.

This memo urges the ANR secretary to revise the rule to limit wake boats to 600 feet from shore, not 500 feet. ANR Secretary Julie Moore ultimately rejected this proposal. But the memo and other ANR documents are worthy of LCAR's attention. I believe these records show that the rule the agency ultimately put forward is arbitrary and capricious and ignores overwhelming public comment in support of a stronger rule. LCAR should reject the proposed rule on these grounds.

Why is the proposed rule "arbitrary and capricious?"

First, the proposed rule defines wake boats as a "normal" use of public waters and thus should be accommodated along with other pre-1993 "normal" uses such as canoeing, fishing or swimming. This is clearly not the case, as both the record and real-world reality make clear.

(A quick aside: The word "normal" in this context has both an obvious, plain English meaning as well as a legal definition. That's because the Use of Public

Waters (UPW) rule – under which this wake boat rule is promulgated – says the state can “establish a number of general management rules to protect *normal* uses on all lakes, ponds and reservoirs.” [Emphasis added.] The UPW defines normal use as those in existence before 1993. That is obviously several decades before wake boats were invented.)

The ANR now says a motor boat that can generate five-foot high waves is a “normal,” pre-1993 use of public waters. That defies logic and is the exact opposite of what ANR declared when it put the rule out for public comment. Back in May 2023, ANR said: “Wakeboats produce wakes that are significantly larger than conventional boats **and are not a ‘normal use’ of public waters as defined in the rules.** (Emphasis added.)

This key language disappeared from the rule the agency filed on Jan. 5 of this year. The fact the ANR first said wake boats were not a “normal” use and now says they are is evidence that the rule, as revised and filed, is arbitrary and capricious.

Second, the rule as filed is “arbitrary and capricious” because it ignores public comment. As the attached ANR memo shows, 82.5% of the comments favored a stronger rule – with limits greater than 500 feet from shore. In fact, 41.9% of the comments were for a 1,000 feet from shore limit while 40.6 percent called for a total ban. Just 10.1% supported the ANR’s 500 feet from shore limit.

Third, the proposed rule is “arbitrary and capricious” and should be rejected because it ignores the Agency’s own staff’s recommendations.

As the attached memo shows, the Agency staff, after reviewing the science and the public comments, recommended a limit of 600 feet from shore. I quote from this memo:

“Using the precautionary principle, and taking into consideration the possibility for wake boat engines to get larger than the ones used in the 2022 study and the possibility for multiple wakeboats to be in use on one water body at the same time thereby compounding the total wave power, energy, and height figures, DEC staff believe that it is both justified and in line with the various sections of the UPW Rules mentioned above to extend the minimum distance from shore required for use of wakeboats from 500 to 600 feet.”

The “precautionary principle” is the idea that even though you don’t know precisely how much harm will result from a particular pollutant or action, it’s better to err on the side of caution to protect the environment.

In the case of wake boats, we know that their downward-thrusting propellers can stir up lake sediment to a depth of 20 feet, releasing phosphorus into the lake from the stirred up organic matter. The same phosphorus release occurs when large, crashing waves erode shorelines.

The state now spends hundreds of millions of dollars to reduce phosphorus pollution and the toxic algae blooms they fuel. The state should follow the precautionary principle and not exacerbate a pollution problem we are trying hard to fix.

Finally, the proposed rule violates the fundamental equity embodied in the public trust doctrine, which holds that the waters of the state are held in trust for all to use and enjoy.

The state estimates about 100 wake boats are in use in Vermont. By contrast, tens of thousands of people enjoy quiet water pursuits.

Yet the kayaker seeking a peaceful paddle across a lake is likely to turn back in the face of a mini tsunami. A mom teaching her kid to sail will have to find a breeze close to shore. With a 500-foot limit, the rule effectively creates an “exclusion zone” by confining the vast majority of lake users to shoreline areas, where the best angling, sailing or paddling may not be found.

The public’s use of public waters will be severely constrained by this rule.

Thank-you.

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Melinda Kogut <melindakogut@gmavt.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 5:40 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Regarding wake boat regs

[External]

I am a town of Charlotte homeowner with a property directly on lake Champlain. I have friends and family who own and operate wake boats. Our family own multiple I/O power boats as well as sail boats, paddle boards and kayaks.

I am IN FAVOR of restricting wake boats to 500 ft from shore. I understand that this may limit their use to only a few large lakes in the state.

I have seen the disruption to smaller lakes like Iroquois and I believe that the greater good will be served by this restriction. I also believe that the small number of owners of these boats have the financial means to transport them to the larger lakes.

Melinda from Charlotte
Sent from my iPhone

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Jon Sairs <sairsaj@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:07 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake boating rules

[External]

Please consider the rights of the majority here and ban these folks from 1000 feet from shorelines.

Best, Jon and Ann Sairs
Woodbury vt

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Larry Bush <cambs.larry@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:12 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] No wake boats!

[External]

To: the Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules

It is appalling that legalizing the use of wake boats on Vermont's lakes is being considered. I beg you not to approve the ANR's proposed rule. They should be banned, period.

These boats produce a chain of waves that create an unnatural water disturbance that endangers other motor boaters, kayakers, canoeists, paddleboarders, row boats, swimmers, and fishing boats and sail boats. The chain of waves creates unsafe conditions for many hundreds of feet on either side of the wake. Their use basically means other popular recreation on these lakes will be severely affected and limited, all to satisfy a very small number of enthusiasts!

There are other negative impacts of wake boating, including:

- Damage to shorelines from wave-induced erosion
- Danger to shoreline wildlife and birds, including loon nesting
- Disruption of floor of the lake
- Disruption of quiet solitude from loud over-amped sound systems on these boats
- Disturbance of user expectations at remote campsites

Even one wake-surf boat can dominate a lake causing degradation of normal recreational experiences which include "... fishing, swimming, boating, waterskiing, fish and wildlife habitat, wildlife observation, enjoyment of aesthetic values, quiet solitude of the water body, and other water-based activities." (4.1.3 Uses considered: UPW Rule 2.3, 10 V.S.A 1421-1424)

Please keep these behemoths off of our lakes and ponds. Just because someone is rich enough and insensitive enough to demand the right to endanger every other person using the same lake or pond, as well as to wreck havoc on the plant and animal inhabitants of those bodies of water, does not mean they should be allowed to do it!

Sincerely,

Larry Bush
267 Bliss Pond Road
Calais, VT. 05648

Sent from my iPhone

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Kelly Collar <kcollar@madriver.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:13 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Stronger regulations for wake-surf boats at Waterbury Reservoir

[External]

Hi Charlene,

I understand there is a hearing coming up regarding the regulation of wake-surf boats. I wanted to offer my opinion. I live in Waterbury and frequent the Waterbury Reservoir at all times of the year. I have tried to kayak and paddle-board on the reservoir, but the presence of speeding motorboats is a true hindrance. It seems almost unbelievable that these boats can operate in such a small setting. I've been dumped off my paddleboard by the wake of the boats, and a friend and I were separated for 45 minutes by boats driving in between us. When the "dust settled," I had no idea where she was and she was in the same situation. Very dangerous for both of us.

Wake-surfing boats should be limited to operating 1,000 feet from shorelines to allow ALL residents to enjoy Vermont's lakes. It is unsafe for the VAST MAJORITY of recreation park users to allow these boats to operate 500 feet from shore. They should stay off smaller bodies of water, including the Waterbury Reservoir.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to give my opinion, and I appreciate your adding it to the public comment for the hearing.

Kelly Cochrane-Collar
48 High Street
Waterbury VT

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: H K <igroutit@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:16 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake-surf boat opposition

[External]

Dear LCAR

I am writing in regards to wake-surf boats on ponds, lakes, rivers, & reservoirs. They should be restricted to areas that are at least 1000' from shore. I am all for fun but these boats are too much for most areas. I don't think they should be allowed in Waterbury reservoir due to the size of the wake they will create. It poses a danger to small boats, canoe, kayaks, SUP's. and Swimmers. As well as causing serious erosion.

There is enough evidence of erosion from just standard boat traffic

Thank you

Dale H King

Sent from my iPhone

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Phineas Potter <phineaspotter7@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:16 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake surfing on Waterbury reservoir

[External]

Hi,

Concerned resident of Waterbury here writing to ask that you continue to allow wake surfing on the reservoir. While I do not wake surf myself, I frequently swim and boat at the reservoir and the boats and wake surfers do not bother me. I don't think the state should be using its authority to keep people from the activities they love just because a vocal minority has a problem with it.

Thanks for your consideration,
Phineas Potter

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: vtyankeelady@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:35 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External]

[External]

I'm certainly against wakeboarding on the small lakes in Vermont it is dangerous to us motorless boaters? It is also changing our environment that we're seeking of peace and quiet and wildlife. Please keep our adventures into our Vermont water ways the same for today and the future.

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Callie Willis <cwillis@gmavt.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:20 PM
To: Charlene Dindo; Kari Dolan; Ann Cummings; Andrew Perchlik; Dara Torre
Subject: [External] Wake Boats.....

[External]

Just writing to (strongly) urge you all to reject the 500ft. operating limit set forth by the ANR around wake boats. We should definitely hold out for a rule that would afford true protection of normal, sensible lake use. This really should be a no-brainer and it's quite disappointing that the ANR chose to reject the requests from 100's of Vermonters who have the vision and common sense to protect our lakes and ponds from the degradation that wake boats create. Thank -you for doing the right thing on this. Sincerely, Callie

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Cynthia Gardner-Morse <cgardnermorse@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 7:01 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake boat opposition!

[External]

Good Morning,

I am writing in opposition to all wake boat use in Vermont.

Though I am in my 60's, I have always enjoyed distance swimming in Vermont ponds and lakes. I often choose to swim across a bay, or even across an entire lake. The boats you are proposing to allow will pose a danger for me and my fellow swimmers.

Even in my canoe, I will be at risk from these waves.

Please don't take away the rights of individuals who swim or enjoy Vermont's lakes, ponds and waterways with small crafts! Please do not allow wake boat operators to spoil our quiet fun! Wake boat operation endangers "regular" Vermonters.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Gardner-Morse, Voter
8197 County Road
Calais, VT 05648
Washington County

802-223-5738 landline

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Priscilla White <buildresilience2@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 8:21 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake Boats

[External]

Please consider this email a request for LCAR to reject the proposal from the Agency of Natural Resources and request a stronger rule that would afford true protection of normal lake use!

Please help protect Vermont waterways.

Thank you,

Priscilla White

East Montpelier VT

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Meg Dawkins <meg.dawkins@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 8:29 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] wakeboats

[External]

To the Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules,

As a resident of Calais VT, I want the LCAR to reject the current wakeboat proposal from the Agency of Natural Resources. There should be a much stronger ruling that would afford true protection of normal lake use.

Wakeboats:

1. Damage shorelines from wave-induced erosion
2. Endanger shoreline wildlife and birds, including loon nesting
3. Disrupt floor of the lake
4. Disrupt quiet solitude from loud over-amped sound systems on these boats
5. Distrupt experience at remote campsites
6. Endanger swimmers, paddling vessels especially if unaware of impact of wakeboats on wave production
7. Transport invasive species in tanks from lake to lake
8. Are just obnoxious

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Meg

Dawkins
PO Box 86, 135 Dragonfly Lane
Calais, VT 05648
802 224 6553

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Barb Kennedy <barbkennedy2@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 9:27 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Waterbury Reservoir - wake-surfing

[External]

To Whom it May Concern,

Please do not allow wake-surfing within 1,000 feet of the shoreline. My grandchildren and I love to visit the beach and reservoir. We do not want these visits disrupted by large wakes and loud boats nearby. We must keep this beautiful resource as calm and quiet as possible.

Thank you,

Barb Kennedy
Waterbury Center

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Dvora Jonas <dvorajonas@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 9:28 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] wake boats

[External]

Wake boats should be limited to 1000 feet from shore. We need to protect our shorelines from erosion. The boats are also hazardous to swimmers and small craft.

Dvora Jonas, Montpelier

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Susan Hoyt <sthoyt7@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 10:30 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] PLEASE! Stop Wake Boats & Wake Surfing

[External]

Please ELIMINATE these disruptive, Destructive and noisy boats. The negative impacts they have are multiple!
At the very minimum there should be 1000 foot distance rule. It would be better to eliminate these boats altogether.

THERE already ARE MYRIAD WAYS & CHOICES TO ENJOY OUR BEAUTIFUL LAKES. IT'S NOT NECESSARY TO HAVE THESE EXTREMELY DISRUPTIVE BOATS.

Thank you!

Susan Hoyt
Waitsfield & South Hero, Vt

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Nancy Farrell <nnfarrell49@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 6:25 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake boats

[External]

I have been following the wake boat issue since it's beginning and have attended, in person, a few of the public hearings. My husband and I are kayakers and appreciate nothing more than a quiet paddle on some of our lakes and reservoirs in Central Vermont and beyond. I am appalled that Vermont Natural Resources, whose responsibility it is to PROTECT Vermont's natural resources, has decided to put our precious lakes at risk for harm as well as many Vermonters who enjoy boating, fishing in our lakes. The 500 foot rule will not be protective. How is it that a small community of wake boats hold more weight than hundreds of years of Vermonters enjoyment of our waters. The State of Vermont must protect our waters and habitat going forward. Once decided, you can't turn back. Do the right thing and require the 1000 foot rule and keep wake boats on Vermont's larger lakes where their impact will be less severe.

Nancy Farrell
Middlesex, VT

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Sandra Shenk <sandra.shenk@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 6:38 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake surf boats

[External]

Charlene,

I have been reading about wake surf boats with interest. I am an avid kayaker and as such am kayaking on many of the lakes and ponds in VT. I love the solitude and ability to check out the wildlife and shorelines. I can also understand how people could love the thrill of being able to surf a 5' wave. However it seems logical to me that those boats should be used on only the largest lakes (Champlain and Memphremagog, for example), where the impacts of their waves will impact those with smaller craft (kayaks, canoes, SUP, small sailboats) the least. I agree with those who have asked for a total ban on smaller lakes or the 1000' operating from shore limits that have been suggested so as to curtail the number of smaller lakes affected. I am not knowledgeable about which of those would work best to prevent the problems wake surf boats can cause, so would support the 1000' restriction if that works. I suggest listing those lakes that qualify.

Thank you.

Sandra Shenk

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Gordon Bass <gordon@gordonbass.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 8:23 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Cc: Trevor Squirrel; Mark MacDonald; Christopher Bray; Virginia Lyons; David Weeks; Seth Bongartz; Mark Higley; Carol Ode
Subject: [External] In support of a 1,000-foot minimum operating distance for wake sports

[External]

Hi,

My name is Gordon Bass. I'm a resident of Stowe. And I strongly support a 1,000-foot minimum operating distance from shore for wake sports.

I'm a boat owner and keep a 26-foot motorboat on Lake Champlain. I'm also a regular visitor at the Waterbury Reservoir.

Even though I own a motorboat, I believe Vermont's bodies of water need to be kept safe, protected, and available for a variety of uses. A boat like mine is fine on Lake Champlain, but it would be too big (and too disruptive) on a smaller body of water like the Waterbury Reservoir.

Wake boats are by their nature incredibly disruptive. Allowing them on a small body of water like the Waterbury Reservoir would be like letting people drive trucks and motorcycles around town parks. These boats are designed to create significant waves that don't just make detract from the ability to enjoy time on the water; they're also damaging to shorelines.

I urge you to spend time at the Waterbury Reservoir when it gets warmer. It's a beautiful asset to the community. People swim, picnic, camp, fish and kayak. Little kids play on the shore. There are a few motorboats, but the majority of activity is geared toward spending quiet time in a natural environment.

Allowing wake boats close to shore would be a significant disruption and would greatly reduce the appeal of this wonderful place.

To be clear, I'd prefer to see the Waterbury Reservoir completely off-limits to wake boats. But short of that, I strongly support a 1,000-foot minimum operating distance from shore for wake sports.

Thank you,

Gordon

Gordon Bass
Stowe, Vermont

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Lisa Healy <lhealy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 8:34 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] I Oppose Wake Boats

[External]

Please: reject the proposal from ANR and afford true protection of normal lake use. We spent time on a lake in another state last summer and were horrified by the noise - not to mention the waves - produced by wake boats. We were unable to use the kayaks at our rental because they were swamped and in fact, we left early because of the noise pollution. Not to mention the smell! PLEASE at the very least adopt a minimum Lake size for use of these boats, and specific hours. Let the wake boarders go to New Hampshire. And the rest of us can rent Lake homes in Vermont. Not to mention the shore birds and homeowners or day visitors who will be able to SUP, kayak, canoe etc in peace. My son saved money to buy a kayak and fishes with it on Berlin Pond and Blueberry Lake all summer. Please leave wake boarding to other noisier and already polluted states. Thank you!

Lisa Healy
Waitsfield, VT

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Lynn Grady <Img3555@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 8:54 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake in Waterbury Reservoir

[External]

Just a quick note to tell you at times I have felt very unsafe on the Waterbury Reservoir when in my kayak. I am in favor of anything that could help with the huge boats and wakes. Sadly I avoid the lake when there are too many motor boats.

A few years ago I was kayaking and I heard a very fast boat nearing. I hugged the shore as I typically do. As the boat neared I heard someone say, "let's swamp the old lady. "

Thank you for taking on this important issue.

Lynn

Sent from my iPhone

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Alan Rexford <arexford@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 6:56 PM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wakeboat rules

[External]

Good afternoon, Charlene.,

Please reconsider the proposed 500 foot rule for wakeboats. This small minority of recreational boaters will have disproportionate and damaging effects on the much larger number of paddle and fishing enthusiasts, as well as the natural shoreline habitat if that regulation is adopted. A minimum of 1,000 feet is more appropriate and a reasonable compromise. Thank you.

Alan Rexford

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Ann Smith <asmithinv@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 9:26 AM
To: Mark MacDonald; Christopher Bray; Virginia Lyons; David Weeks; Seth Bongartz; Mark Higley; Carol Ode; Charlene Dindo; Trevor Squirrel
Subject: [External] Wake Boat Regulations

[External]

I urge LCAR to reject ANR's proposed regulations for wake boats. The proposed reg should be returned to ANR and amended to a 1000 foot limit. The 500 foot limit is far too low to prevent serious disruption to other on-water users, both motorized and non-motorized, as well as shoreline property owners and recreational users. In addition, there is well documented evidence that these boats cause significant environmental damage. Lastly, these boats are extremely expensive. Opening more of our public waters to them will only benefit the wealthy. To allow them, flies in the face of the idea that our natural resources should be enjoyed by all Vermonters and visitors.

Ann Smith
Waterbury, VT

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Doug Greason <dgreason@bainbridge.net>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 9:48 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Subject: [External] Wake surf boats on Waterbury Reservoir

[External]

I am writing to express my opposition to the operation of wake surfing boats on the Waterbury Reservoir.

I am a resident of Waterbury, and visit the reservoir frequently from my home on Blush Hill Road. I am also a professional engineer in the field of naval architecture and marine engineering. The energy contained in the wake generated by these wake boats is destructive to shorelines and dangerous to small boats and swimmers. There will be little increased dissipation of this wake if an operational limit from shore is increased to 1,000' from 500'; however if these boats are allowed on the reservoir a greater limit is preferable.

I believe that there is no appropriate way for these boats to operate on the Waterbury Reservoir. The size of the reservoir and the small boat traffic from the Waterbury launch sites both argue for banning these boats from the Waterbury Reservoir.

Sincerely

Doug Greason

Sent from my iPad

This message has originated from an External Source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Charlene Dindo

From: Pete Ludlow <PJLudlow@gmavt.net>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 9:51 AM
To: Charlene Dindo
Cc: Jen Hammond; Amanda Ludlow
Subject: [External] Wake Boats

[External]

Charlene

I am opposed to general use of wake boats in Vermont. Perhaps Champlain could accommodate use by day permitting with restrictions on location and distance from shore and licensing of the operator and wake boat. Motor boats can create significant shore line damage if operating at a high speed close to shore but wake boats are more damaging not only due to the energy in the wave impact on the shore line but due to the under-current erosion of the lake bottom when the volume of water returns/reflected from the shore.

Imagine placing Vermont lakes along the ocean shoreline & exposing them to the erosion of waves and resulting back flow (undercurrent).

Should (after an engineering study) Champlain be selected to permit wake boats the wake height must be no higher than the storm surge (waves) presented in summer storms.

Wake boat use should be restricted on the smaller lakes to protect users of small power boats (limit wake size & horsepower), fishing, row boats, paddlers and swimmers.

Finally the energy to produce the wake consumes power, most likely from fossil fuel.

Is such a waste of energy really necessary? Or is this use rationalized and promoted by lobbyists?

I recommend

1) a engineering study addressing the energy consumed to create the wake, time of daily use (total power delivered to the lake) and

2) a licensed civil/hydraulic engineering assessment of the proposed lake and resulting damage assessment.

Peter Ludlow
Fayston

ndSent from [Mail](#) for Windows

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.