



"Huff, Roger S"
<roger.s.huff@lmco.com>

01/03/2011 12:40 PM

To "comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us"
<comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject Comments Regarding the Proposed Sumter Forest Plan and DEIS

January 03, 2011

Francis Marion and Sumter National Forests

Chattooga Planning Team

4931 Broad River Road

Columbia, SC 29212

Email: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us

Dear Chattooga Planning Team,

I wish to comment on the proposed Sumter Forest Plan. After careful consideration I believe the Forest Service should modify the original Alternative I (the proposed Forest Plan) to allow boating on the Chattooga headwaters as described in Alternative E of Appendix H of the DEIS.

Several years of analysis and study have been conducted via the Forestry Service. The results have been unable to identify a scientific basis for restricting boating on the Chattooga Headwaters. I am inclined to restate my comments based on the original alternatives as explained below.

Only Alternative E in Appendix H allows boaters the same "sense of place" afforded to other existing user groups in this management area. The strong emotional attachment, deep feeling of belonging and powerful connection that I feel for the Chattooga River never seems to be given the same consideration by the Agency as that of other users. The Chattooga's headwaters are an important whitewater resource and I should have the ability to legally enjoy this beautiful place.

The Agency's studies support the fact that year round boating above Hwy 28 makes sense. Appendix H shows:

- 1) Boating is self regulating based on precipitation and water levels.
- 2) There are very few days of available river use each year so boating use would be minimal.
- 3) No negative ecological or biological impacts.
- 4) No significant capital expenditures for improvements is required.
- 5) Slightly impacts only one user group (non-back country anglers) and that impact is stated in the document "that angler solitude from interaction would not be as much of a concern" and any interaction would be best measured in seconds.

Other studies also show that back country anglers are less prone to fish at the higher flows that I would prefer as a boater. Furthermore all river safety/rescue books and manuals state "wading in water above ankle height, can lead to foot entrapment and death." River levels above 2.0 feet at the Hwy 76 Bridge gauge would indicate those deadly conditions existed for wading in the river above Hwy 28.

In addition to allowing boating in the Chattooga headwaters I believe these other key points are important in the final Forest Plan:

- 1) Shuttle permits on the Chattooga must be strictly limited to two with strict number limitations and safety concerns met.
- 2) Any new bridges over the river should be worthy of a National Wild and Scenic river of the Chattooga's caliber.
- 3) Increases in Wilderness and Wilderness study areas, greatly expanded riparian corridors, watershed restoration, more management for old growth, wild and scenic area designations for eligible streams and less timber harvest.
- 4) Increases in road less areas, focus on improved water quality in the watershed, especially in the Stekoa Creek drainage.
- 5) Increased protection of rare plant communities and specific forest habitats.
- 6) Promote black bear management areas as described in Alternative B.

American Whitewater has done a good job in stating the case for boating access in the Chattooga Headwaters in their official comments to the Forest Service and I urge you to carefully consider their analysis and open the river above highway 28. It is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,
Roger Huff
2070 Cherokee Ridge Trail
Kennesaw, GA 30144
Cell phone: (678)314-1514
Email: rogerhuff@bellsouth.net



"McHenry, David G."
<david.mchenry@ncwildlife.org>

01/06/2011 10:29 AM

To "Francis Marion and Sumter
(comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us)"
<comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>
cc "Wheeler, A. Powell" <powell.wheeler@ncwildlife.org>

bcc

Subject Additional info request on Upper Chattooga Recreation

Please accept the attached commenst from the NC Wildlife Resources Commission .

Thank You

Dave McHenry 828/452-0422 x24

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.



USFS_Upper Chattooga_new information request response_FINALT_NCWRC comments.doc



"Robin D. Saylor"
<robindsayler@yahoo.com>

01/08/2011 06:13 PM

To <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject

As a long-time boater of 40 years, I have had the distinct privilege and responsibility of kayaking the Upper Chattooga many times.

I continue to be an advocate for paddling the Upper Chattooga, and I submit that there is already a 'separation' plan in effect to prevent user conflicts. The conditions which paddlers prefer are the same conditions other users wish to avoid, high flow and/or rain.

Thanks for re-opening this process, and I appreciate your work on the river's behalf.

Sincerely,

Mr. Robin D. Saylor

Atlanta, Georgia

robindsayler@yahoo.com

Mr. Robin D. Saylor

robindsayler@yahoo.com



Larry Ray
<clemson70@gmail.com>

01/12/2011 09:20 PM

To comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us

cc

bcc

Subject Upper Chattooga

Please keep the boaters off the upper Chattooga. It is the only pristine area left to hike, backpack, and fish left on the once great Chattooga.



"Jan Slama"
<janslama@comcast.net>
01/13/2011 10:07 PM

To <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>
cc
bcc

Subject Land Rights

Chattooga Wild & Scenic River Comment Questionnaire

Comments For The Record -U.S. Forest Service - Chattooga W & S River Management Plan

To: U.S. Forest Service, Chattooga W & S River Management Planning Process

Below are my concerns and comments regarding the Chattooga W & S River.

These are my comments regarding the Chattooga W & S River. Please include them in the official record of the Chattooga W & S River Management Plan. Please consider a photocopy as valid as the original.

Signature ____Jan Slama_____

Print Your Name ____Jan Slama_____

Dear Forest Service,

A rogue access lobby has been pressuring the Forest Service to ignore property rights and ownership boundaries when setting recreational policy for the Wild and Scenic Chattooga River. If land management agencies can ignore property boundaries and land rights in order to placate special-interest-lobbies along the Chattooga, they can easily ignore MY rights!

Whether public trespass or nuisance, land management agencies cannot and MUST NOT simply establish a public recreational policy that will have a detrimental impact on private landowners; these indirect impacts must be transparently documented under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely,

Jan Slama

-----Please circle or otherwise mark your answer and return by e-mail, fax or by US Mail. Your personal comments make this document more valuable. So be sure to fill in using your own words the blank space below where the Agree-Disagree statements are listed below. You can borrow from the statements to write in your own statements.

1) The Forest Service should document the direct and indirect affects that unlimited recreation would have on both public and private lands along the Chattooga River as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). USFS policy should not encourage trespassing.

* I Agree

2) The Forest Service should recognize the boundaries between private and public lands, especially those already documented to Congress during the Wild and Scenic Designation process.

* I Agree

3) The Forest Service should work with Landowner when setting management policy; they should not simply ignore private property rights. Vague references to private lands are insufficient.

* I Agree

4) The USFS should either avoid including private lands within designated Forests, and Wild and Scenic Rivers, or clarify that designation does not affect property rights. Special land designation that imply public use of private lands are unconstitutional.

* I Agree

5) Ask the USFS to avoid being pressured by self-serving special interest lobbies seeking to turn private lands into their own playgrounds at the expense of taxpaying landowners.

* I Agree

Signature_____Jan Slama_____

Name_____Jan Slama_____

E-Mail__slamajama2@gmail.com_____ Fax __none_____

Phone _____509-922-3412_____

Address__12422 E,. Mansfield Ave, #79 __ Town____Spokane Valley____ State_WA__

Zip__99216__



"Brenda@reidprint.com"
<brenda@reidprint.com>

01/14/2011 11:20 AM

To <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject My concerns and comments regarding the Chattooga W & S River.



Land Rights Letter.pdf



Bill Reeves
<billreeves@uandiswitchgear.com>

01/14/2011 12:50 PM

To comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us

cc

bcc

Subject Comments on property rights

Following are my comments regarding Property rights along the Chattanooga River:

1) The Forest Service should document the direct and indirect affects that unlimited recreation would have on both public and private lands along the Chattanooga River as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). USFS policy should not encourage trespassing.

2) The Forest Service should recognize the boundaries between private and public lands, especially those already documented to Congress during the Wild and Scenic Designation process.

3) The Forest Service should work with Landowner when setting management policy; they should not simply ignore private property rights. Vague references to private lands are insufficient.

4) The USFS should either avoid including private lands within designated Forests, and Wild and Scenic Rivers, or clarify that designation does not affect property rights. Special land designation that imply public use of private lands are unconstitutional.

5) Ask the USFS to avoid being pressured by self-serving special interest lobbies seeking to turn private lands into their own playgrounds at the expense of taxpaying landowners.

Property rights should be honored and not trampled for all of our sakes.

I expect the Forest Service to protect the rights of the property owners.

Thank you for your attention,

Bill Reeves

--

Bill Reeves
U&I Switchgear Supply, LLC
3620 STRAWBERRY SUITE F
PASADENA, TX. 77504
(O) 713-382-9697
(C) 281-914-3430



SULLYRANCH@aol.com

01/14/2011 12:51 PM

To comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us

cc

bcc

Subject substantive comments

Substantive comment to keep government out of private lands.

If you continue to seek wild and scenic it is similar to wilderness, it needs no management just enforcement.

Then the recreational managers can become policeman.

You are setting yourself up for a lawsuit if you do not analyze the do nothing alternative and the reverse alternative of divesting in properties that are controversial -- remember the adjacent owners have first right of refusal.

You appear to be catering to pressure from one side and not opening it up for full public comment and disclosure.

Dan Sullivan
Hotchkiss, Colorado 81419
970-216-6925



Jack Hamm
<hammjch@hughes.net>
01/16/2011 09:21 PM

To comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us
cc
bcc

Subject Chattooga W & S River Management Planning Process

To: U.S. Forest Service, Chattooga W & S River Management Planning Process

Following are my comments regarding the Chattooga W & S River management. Please include them in the official record of the Chattooga W & S River Management Plan. Please consider this email as a valid original.

The Forest Service should document the direct and indirect consequences that unlimited recreation would have on both public and private lands along the Chattooga River. The USFS policy should not encourage trespassing.

The Forest Service should recognize the boundaries between private and public lands, especially those already documented to Congress during the Wild and Scenic Designation process.

The Forest Service should work with Landowners when setting management policy; they should not ignore private property rights.

The USFS should avoid including private lands within designated Forests and Wild and Scenic Rivers, and they should clarify that designation does not affect property rights.

The USFS must avoid being pressured by self-serving special interest lobbies seeking to turn private lands into their own playgrounds at the expense of taxpaying landowners.

Thank you,

Jack C. Hamm
hammjch@hughes.net
60892 ME Road
Collbran, CO 81624



<mradams@windstream.net>

01/17/2011 10:30 AM

To comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Chattooga River

To whom it may concern:

Please keep the Chattooga River boating ban in place. I believe removal of the ban will damage the river through increased traffic and litter. Please do not change the existing policy.

Mark Adams
PO Box 363
Carnesville GA 30521
706-491-7529



"John Mango"
<johnmango@bellsouth.net>

01/17/2011 01:22 PM

To <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject No boating on Chattooga above 28

To whom it may concern,

My main concerns about allowing boating on the Chattooga River above Russell Bridge is the negative impact it will have on the health of the river and the recreational activity of fishing and the money it generates to keep businesses and resources open.

The following is not a rant, it is a fact and a major problem.

I fish the river regularly and during the warmer months, I usually avoid the sections below the Russell Bridge. When I do fish there, however, I am consistently run off by boaters and floaters. 95% of the time they float and paddle right in front of me with no respect for me or the space I am occupying. If I am in their only passage, I keep a look out for them and move to give them the right of way. Most of the time, they can simply detour around me but choose not too. I have been run over and clipped with objects floaters decide to drag with them, i.e., large branches and beer coolers. This not only creates an unfavorable fishing situation, it creates a dangerous situation. This may not be the normal behavior nationwide but it is undoubtedly the case on the Chattooga River. The more fishers that get run off, the less fishing will be done which means less business for local fishing shops and lesser or no need for the hatcheries or fishing licenses. I am confident that the fishing economy will suffer greatly. The Chattooga River is the most revered and popular fishing destination in the states of South Carolina and Georgia and for countless visitors to the area. If boating is allowed in the upper section, then I guess I, and many others, will have to find another river to fish, probably in another state. I am not trying to paint a bad picture of boaters and floaters because many just don't know that they are doing something wrong. When I politely explain this, I am usually ignored or responded to in a negative manner. I don't want to deal with this stress when I am trying to enjoy something I love in a place I love. I think I can speak for the vast majority when I say fishers have no problem sharing the majority of the river with whomever wants to enjoy it. We only ask to keep the one, relatively small section closed to boating and floating so we can have a place to fish safely and the fishing economy can survive.

Fishing is only one recreation that will suffer. The upper section, specifically around Burrells Ford, is very popular with hikers, campers, scout, church, and various youth groups. More crowding in this area will limit their opportunities for recreation, education, fellowship, wholesome life lessons and developing an appreciation and respect for the land, all of which are especially crucial for our young boys and girls.

What about launch sites? They will most likely need to be created, which means clearing and grading land that will cause heavy silt runoff and less riparian-two things to ensure a downfall in the river's health and ability to sustain a quality population of fish and wildlife. Could the attached pictures be an example of what we have to look forward too?

Besides the issue of boating interfering with fishing, there is an issue of law.

**OFFICIAL CODE OF GEORGIA ANNOTATED TITLE 27. GAME AND FISH CHAPTER 3.
WILDLIFE GENERALLY ARTICLE 6. INTERFERENCE WITH LAWFUL TAKING 27-3-151.**

Activity prohibited

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to:

(1) Interfere with the lawful taking of wildlife by another person by intentionally preventing or

attempting to prevent such person from such lawful taking of wildlife;
(2) Disturb or engage in activity tending to disturb wildlife for the purpose of intentionally preventing or attempting to prevent the lawful taking of such wildlife

...

(b) A person who engages in conduct in violation of Code Section 27-3-151 shall be civilly liable to any other person who is adversely affected by such conduct, and any award for damages may include punitive damages. In addition to any other items of special damage, the measure of damages may include expenditures of the affected person for license and permit fees, travel, guides, and special equipment and supplies to the extent that such expenditures were rendered futile by preventing the lawful taking of wildlife.

HISTORY: Code 1981, § 27-3-152, enacted by Ga. L. 1986, p. 1460, § 1; Ga. L. 1987, p. 3, § 27.

So, please, do not allow boating and floating on the Chattooga River above Russell Bridge. Let's protect this resource that is so valuable to thousands of people.

Sincerely,

John Mango



tc1.jpg tc3.jpg



"Alex C. Johnson, Jr."
<AlexJohnson@techlaw.com>

01/17/2011 03:10 PM

To <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject Opposition to Wild and Scenic Chattooga River designation

Sirs: I am writing to express my opposition to the over breadth of the Wild and Scenic Chattooga River designation encompassing the use of private lands. While I might otherwise favor such a designation for a truly wild river area, I oppose extending the reach of such a designation so as to impinge on private land rights adjacent the designated river.

Alex Johnson
Portland Oregon

Alex C. Johnson, Jr.
Patent and Trademark Lawyer



Marger Johnson
& McCollom PC

Marger Johnson & McCollom, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204 USA
Phone: (503) 222-3613
Fax: (503) 274-4622
www.techlaw.com

This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free since e-mail messages can be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version.



"Adam D. Smith"
<asmith@suncoast-group.com>
>

01/18/2011 07:32 AM

To <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>

cc

bcc

Subject Chattooga River Boating Proposals

To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding boats being allowed on the Chattooga River, it is my position that this would have a specifically negative effect on the river.

The Chattooga is a small waterway and the addition of boating would quickly degrade its pristine quality.

You do not have to look very far to see the impact of boating on a local river. The tubers on the upper Chattahoochee in Helen literally number in the thousands. Not only do they litter, but also damage the river banks, and contribute to higher water temperatures and "pollution" in the river.

On the Chattahoochee tailwater below Buford Dam, there are many boaters that come to enjoy the beauty of the river. Some are fishermen, most are just floaters. Among the floaters, there are both private individuals and those who have contracted with a concessioner to rent a boat or tube and be dropped off and picked up. Both the concessioners and their customers have had an ENORMOUS negative impact on the access points and the river. The patrons leave untold tons of garbage in the river and at the access points. The concessioners cause tremendous congestion at the access points, actually blocking in other cars parked in the lots. As I understand from the officials that I have spoken with, these businesses pay a nominal fee and have no responsibility for the additional garbage. I do recognize that the issue currently on the table is to allow private individuals to access the river for boating. But, where will it lead once the door is opened?

I purchase a fishing license with a trout stamp, hunting license, and a WMA stamp, along with the day use fees for parking and such. Not only because it is the law, but because I feel that by doing so I am paying my way. All users should be required to pay for their access.

Moreover, it is your responsibility to be a good steward of the resource on my behalf and for future generations. No argument could possibly be made to show that allowing boating could have ANY positive impact on the Chattooga River. Certainly not that would outweigh the negative.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments.

Best regards,

Adam D. Smith
Business Development
404-434-9736