

**John C Cleeves**  
09/11/2007 12:42 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: (no subject)

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:42 PM -----



**Sis2211@aol.com**  
09/08/2007 06:26 PM

To jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
cc  
Subject (no subject)

Dear Sir:

Regarding the options for the Upper Chattooga River use, my husband and I heartily endorse option number one, leaving a ban in place.

We would hope the Forestry Service would keep this river in it's wild and scenic state for all time.

Sincerely,

Beth & Tom Sistrunk  
Plant City, FL  
Cashiers, NC

ps. Tried sending e-mails to Senators Dole, Burr and Representative Shuler, but current addresses don't seem to work.

---

See what's new at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com) and [Make AOL Your Homepage](#).

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 12:43 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Maintain the Chattooga River's wild and scenic status

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:43 PM -----



<queenwoodrown@bellsouth.net>

09/08/2007 04:46 PM

To <jcleeves@fs.fed.us>

cc

Subject: Maintain the Chattooga River's wild and scenic status

I am against opening the headwaters of the Chattooga to boaters.

I have owned property on the headwaters of the Chattooga for many decades and have been prevented from developing my property because of the Chattooga's wild and scenic designation that I agree with. If I am prevented from spoiling the river then the public should also be prevented.

In the early 80's the Jackson County end of Whiteside Cove Road was paved and opened the Chattooga to the public. It hasn't been the same since. The trail head to the trail that follows beside the Chattooga had to be moved and the parking area enlarged to accommodate the growing public. The Macon County end of the road is being paved now. When the paving is completed there will be paved road access to the Chattooga from Highlands and Cashiers. It won't be the same again.

I have to listen to the noise from the public driving up and down the road and the hikers hollering (some shooting) up and down the trail. This place is not as wild anymore and because of all the trash they throw down it's not as scenic either. The public has already spoiled this place and now they want to bring their boats. I'm still prevented from enlarging my septic tank because it might run into the Chattooga. When the boaters are floating down the Chattooga and they get the urge, do you think they will go in their boats?

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 12:44 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Broad concerns over the boating ban on the Chattooga R.

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:43 PM -----



"Rob Koloshuk"  
<rkoloshuk@iamgroup.ca>  
09/07/2007 04:03 PM

To <jcleeves@fs.fed.us>, <chuckadams\_@bellsouth.net>, <arms7213@bellsouth.net>, <fishfeathers18@bellsouth.net>, <troutdaddy@charter.net>, <simwelter@charter.net>, <mark6691@bellsouth.net>, <bgallagher@dixon-hughes.com>, <samstoner@charter.net>

cc

Subject: Broad concerns over the boating ban on the Chattooga R.

Dear Mr.Cleeves and the executives of the Mountain Bridge Chapter of Trout Unlimited,

My name is Robert Koloshuk. I am a member of the Greg Clark chapter of Trout Unlimited in Ontario, Canada.

Recently, news of the assessment on the boating ban above the Hwy 28 Bridge on the upper Chattooga River reached me here in Toronto.

I felt it was vitally important to contact you, and make you aware that the perceived conflict between boaters and fishermen on the upper Chattooga could pose a serious threat to the valuable relationship that the two groups have in their desire to protect wild rivers across North America.

Here in Canada, one of the greatest threats to wild trout populations comes from impounding or damming rivers. As you are probably aware, impoundments and dams can have many deleterious affects on trout habitat. Impoundments may raise water temperatures above acceptable levels for wild trout, increase sedimentation, reduce gradient and therefore oxygenation, and most importantly, dams create impassable barriers to migratory species. These are some of the greatest threats to wild trout in North America.

Initiatives across the continent to protect free flowing rivers from dams and impoundments have had the support of both whitewater kayakers and fly fishermen. Recently the North Shore Steelhead Association, in conjunction with Trout Unlimited Canada and local kayakers, was successful in protecting the Steel River in Marathon Ontario from a proposed hydroelectric facility. The Steel River has been identified as prime coaster brook trout habitat, and it is an important nursery river for rebuilding populations of this critically endangered native fish.

Our experience in Canada has been that kayakers very rarely conflict with fly fishermen since they

pursue their sport predominantly when rivers are running too high and/or stained for any sensible person to consider fishing. Indeed, Ontario's Grand River, regarded as one of North America's Blue Ribbon Trout Streams, is shared happily by fly fishermen and kayakers throughout the year.

When reviewing your policies on the upper Chattooga, please keep in mind that the prevailing attitudes of the Mountain Bridge Chapter of Trout Unlimited may be seen as elitist and closed-minded to a group of outdoor enthusiasts whose support is invaluable in protecting wild and free-flowing rivers. It is a very unfortunate affair that the inability to share a pristine river threatens our capacity to bond together to save rivers from total destruction.

Please be considerate of broader environmental initiatives when making your decision on the upper Chattooga, and approach the issue from an objective and unbiased perspective that is fair to all parties. Even in the rare instances when kayakers and fly fishermen are enjoying the river at the same time, kayakers pass through the pools very quickly and infrequently, and my personal experience is that they seem to put the fish down for less time than a poorly presented #22 Blue Winged Olive. Kayakers also prefer to paddle closer to midday, as opposed to the prime fishing hours at sunrise and sunset.

It would seem that many people opposed making small allowances for whitewater kayakers on the Chattooga have blown this issue out of proportion at a heavy cost to fly fishermen everywhere.  
Best Regards,

Rob.

**Robert V. Koloshuk**  
Senior Strategist



tel. 416 862-2376  
email:  
[rkoloshuk@iamgroup.ca](mailto:rkoloshuk@iamgroup.ca)  
70 University Avenue  
Suite 1200 Toronto, Ontario Canada  
M5J 2M4  
[www.imfc.ca](http://www.imfc.ca)

This e-mail is confidential and is intended for the sole use of the recipient or authorized representative of the recipient. Any person who receives this e-mail by mistake shall immediately notify the sender and destroy it. Any other use of the information therein is strictly prohibited. The integrity of the transmitted information in this e-mail is not guaranteed by Integrated Asset Management Corp. which accepts no liability for any damage caused by its fraudulent alteration.

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 12:45 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Upper Chattooga River

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:45 PM -----



"Sandy & Lee Holland"  
<l-s.holland@comcast.net>  
09/07/2007 10:48 AM

To <jcleeves@fs.fed.us>  
cc  
Subject Upper Chattooga River

Below is a request sent to the Honorable Elizabeth Dole and we also ask for your help and assistance in continuing the boating ban on the Upper Chattooga River.

My wife and I have enjoyed hiking & visiting the Chattooga River at the Old Iron Bridge area in North Carolina for several years. A lobby group has initiated a request to open the Chattooga River to boating from Grimshawes all the way past Old Iron Bridge to Route 28 in Georgia. This area is currently banned from use by boaters by the Forest Service.

This is to request your help in maintaining this ban. It will preserve this area for family use (picnicking, family-friendly swimming, etc.) and impact the safety and the environment. The lower 36 miles of the Chattooga are open to boaters as are many other whitewater streams and creeks in the area. Enough is enough! Families need areas too! The Forest Service ban should remain in affect to maintain the wild nature of the Upper Chattooga.

Please ask the Forest Service for additional detail on the environmental impact of this area for all purposed uses and do not allow a lobby group to dictate the use of a precious natural resource.

This is an easily accessible area for families to introduce their children to nature and we have enjoyed visiting the Chattooga and the Old Iron Bridge with our grandchildren. Help us to continue to be able to continue this tradition.

Thank you.

**John C Cleeves**  
09/11/2007 12:46 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Upper Chattooga River

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:46 PM -----



**John Viani**  
<John\_Viani@ntrs.com>  
09/07/2007 09:27 AM

To: jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
cc  
Subject: Upper Chattooga River

Attached is a letter for your attention:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is confidential, may be privileged and is meant only for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender ASAP and delete



this message from your system. Forest Svc 0907.doc

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 12:47 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Maintain upper chattooga

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:47 PM -----



"s&a"  
<sbartus1@comcast.net>  
09/06/2007 11:38 PM

To <jcleeves@fs.fed.us>  
cc  
Subject Maintain upper chattooga

Dear Sir,

I strongly urge you to maintain the upper chattooga as is, and NOT allow watercraft on the river. This is a beautiful, serene river with differing depths, water speeds, areas of intense quiet and crashing cascades. We will never get this back or recreate it if we allow craft on the river. Please maintain this outstanding natural sanctuary.

Scott Bartusch  
Highlands, NC



"Killeen, Brian G"  
<bk3994@att.com>

09/11/2007 12:45 PM

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

Alternative #1: Maintain current management. Foot travel only. No boating above the Highway 28 Bridge.

I support Alternative #1. I enjoy hiking, backcountry camping and flyfishing. I would not want to see boaters above Hwy 28.

Thanks for taking my comment.

Brian Killeen

Atlanta GA

\*\*\*\*\*

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers. GA622

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 12:47 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Chattooga River

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 12:47 PM -----



Janice Berglund  
<janiceberglund@yahoo.com  
>  
09/06/2007 04:58 PM

To comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Subject Chattooga River

This letter is written to express my family's vote **against** opening the headwaters of the wild and scenic Chattooga River to boating from Slide Rock to the route 28 in Georgia. We are not against boaters in general, but we feel strongly that the boaters have ample access to the river below that point. Those of us in the Highlands Cashiers area who have an enjoyment of the river feel that this area should be protected. We agree that it should be available for hikers, fishermen swimmers, nature lovers and others, but boating creates an entirely different impact on the river.

Thank you for listening to ordinary citizens that live in the area and not just come to the area to use it and leave. National Lobby Groups do not make a community. These two communities have extraordinary commitments to the preservation of this area and should be allowed to help make decisions that impact the environment that is so loved and protected.

Please be very careful with changing the way in which this river is used.

Thank you.

Janice S. Berglund  
P. O. Box 447  
Cashiers, NC 28717  
828-743-6946

cc via fax: Honorable Elizabeth Dole, Honorable Richard Burr, Honorable Heath Shuler



Rob Dussler  
<robduessler@yahoo.co  
m>

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc: outdooreducation@mac.com  
Subject: Chattooga

09/11/2007 12:51 PM

I am a fly fisherman, a backpacker, a rock climber, a nature enthusiast, a professor of outdoor education at a small college in north Georgia.....and a whitewater canoeist and kayaker. I think it is detrimental to exclude anyone group from accessing the headwaters of the Chattooga - with the exception of groups who use motorized vehicles- as this would certainly compromise wilderness integrity and experience. I am a member of Trout Unlimited and a member of American Whitewater. Each group could make a case against the other regarding impact on the river and preventing the other from truly enjoying their pursuit and the area. To get into a debate over which group has more rights than the other is complete folly. The issue is open access to users, while having accountability for land/ river practices and guidelines which preserve the experience for each group or user. If having multiple users seems an impossibility, then perhaps certain days would be set aside for one activity and certain days for others.

This issue is representative of the larger issue which is that people need wild places to go and they are becoming compromised or disappearing all together. Those types of losses stem from poor policy and leadership in the various governmental offices.

The issue is not which group has more of a right to use an area. To proceed in that manner sets a detrimental precedence in the future freedoms and needs of outdoor enthusiasts.

Open access / clear guidelines / shared accountability  
/ Preservation should be the goals.

robduessler@yahoo.com

---

Be a better Heartthrob. Get better relationship answers from someone who knows. Yahoo! Answers - Check it out.  
<http://answers.yahoo.com/dir/?link=list&sid=396545433>



Gordon Fowler  
<gordonfowler@bellsouth.net>

09/11/2007 12:53 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Chattooga Study

Dear Sirs:

Please accept my comments as one who has fished, hiked, and camped in the area under study for over thirty years. The Wild and Scenic area is a crown jewel for the Southeast and deserves our utmost respect and dedication to preserving it for future generations.

It disturbs me that the arguments for and against boating access have been couched in the term "user group" as the term connotes people and not activities, and it is activities that the Forest Service is managing, and it is the impact of activities that must be weighed in deciding which activities to allow and which to prohibit.

Boating is only one activity to be weighed - so is horseback riding, bicycling, and many others that are currently prohibited in this area. Please make clear in your decision, whatever it is, that no person is excluded, no one is discriminated against, all people are welcome to come into the area and enjoy it so long as they do so in proper conduct and by participating in a permitted activity.

For me the great and overriding appeal of this area is the opportunity to enjoy the river corridor with some solitude and remoteness. It is extremely important to me to be able to enjoy "my space" there without undue interference from someone else. In that regard, I fear that permitting boating will greatly degrade my enjoyment of the river and probably be the impetus for me to go elsewhere.

Unfortunately, "elsewheres" are extremely hard to find and none like the Chattooga Wild and Scenic area are available within close proximity to where I live.

I do not know how boating would affect the animals and plants of the area, but I do believe that adding more activities of any kind can only be detrimental to the currently available experience and the current status of protection this unique environment enjoys.

No doubt, no matter what decision is made, there will be more users in the area in the future, but no doubt, adding activities to the list of permitted activities will accelerate the increase in users beyond what would otherwise occur. Adding another activity would therefore increase by edict the impact of man upon this wild environment and that is wrong.

Much has been said about the conflict of use between boaters and fishermen, but I don't believe anyone has truly addressed the underlying issue and why in such an encounter it is the fisherman who has the most to lose. The fundamental issue is not that fishermen and boaters want to use the same water, the issue is that the water the fisherman needs to use is chosen by the trout and the trout chooses the same water that the boater chooses - the rapids, riffles, and runs.

For the boater, an encounter with a fisherman is brief as he floats by and on to new water, enjoying the next moment. However, for the fisherman, it is lingering for he is left there in now disturbed water

and must either wait for the effects of the disturbance on the trout to subside or move to another piece of water. Multiply this by a succession of boats and the fisherman's day is ruined.

I also fish the Nantahala River in NC and the Hiwassee River in TN, both of which have substantial boat traffic. I have been run over by rafts, I have watched boaters float over rising fish that I had been casting to, I have politely answered the relentless inquiries about "how's the fishing" even though it is tiresome and intrusive, and I now plan my fishing trips to those waters when it is most unlikely that boaters will be present. They have displaced me to a certain extent, but I would rather forgo the opportunity to fish there than suffer the experience of trying to fish along side boating traffic.

One of the biggest issues facing all of our natural areas is the increase in use. The correct decision is one that does not accelerate the increase by adding activities that encourage even more users, and one that does not create conflicts between users where none currently exist.

Please cast my vote for Alternative #3.

Regards -  
Gordon Fowler

--

Gordon E. Fowler, L.L.C.  
Attorney at Law  
C: 404-316-8494

6265 Windsor Trace Dr.  
Norcross, GA 30092  
770-447-1108

89 Falcon Street  
Clayton, GA 30525  
706-782-7500

Notice: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you have received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, retransmit, disseminate, or otherwise use the information. Also, please indicate to the sender that you have received this communication in error, and delete the copy you received. IRS CIRCULAR 230 Disclosure: Under U.S. Treasury regulations, we are required to inform you that any advice contained in this email or any attachment hereto is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, to avoid penalties imposed under the Internal Revenue Code.



"Donald J Biddle"  
<djbidd01@louisville.edu  
u>

To: <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: Chattooga Management Plan Comments...

09/11/2007 12:54 PM

Mr. Cleeves,

My name is Donald Biddle. I am an outdoorsman from Kentucky who makes frequent trips to the Appalachians to enjoy the area's outstanding scenery and recreation. I am a whitewater kayaker and fisherman (the two are not antithetical). I am writing to express my opinions and concerns regarding the ongoing reassessment of the Management of the Upper Chattooga River watershed. I have been keeping up with the dialogue and progress of the evaluation, including the six alternatives to the current management plan for the Chattooga Headwaters. After reviewing these alternatives, I wholeheartedly oppose Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 that maintain a total ban on boating above the Highway 28 bridge. Over the remaining alternatives, I support #6. I feel that of the six alternatives, #6 sets standards for management that most equitably and effectively manage the finite resource of the Chattooga Headwaters for the user groups in question.

I would also like to respond to the four questions that the USFS has asked the public:

1. Should there be new standards limiting trail heads, trails and/or campsites?

YES, there should be new standards limiting these activities that lead to negative impacts on the land and river system.

2. Should there be new standards limiting group sizes, encounters between user groups and/or access?

Only if it can be proven that the carrying capacity of the Chattooga Headwaters is being met. If that were proven, action should be taken to ensure that use by ALL user groups is reduced to sustainable levels.

3. Should there be new boating opportunities on the Chattooga River?

Boating opportunities that once existed in the Chattooga River watershed should be RESTORED, new opportunities needn't be created. Boating should be permitted just as hiking, fishing and other human-powered low impact activities have been permitted.

4. Should there be new standards limiting group sizes, encounters between user groups and/or access if new boating opportunities are allowed?

See response to question 2. It is asking the same thing. Boating has nothing to do with it.

Thank you for the providing opportunity to voice my opinion concerning how my lands are managed, and what activities I may partake in upon my lands. I eagerly await your the Forest Service's decision on this matter.

Sincerely,  
Donald J Biddle

Donald J. Biddle

GIS Support Specialist  
University of Louisville, Center for GIS  
220 Lutz Hall  
Louisville, KY 40292  
Ph: 502-852-2702



"Money, Al"  
<amoney@forsyth.k12.g  
a.us>

09/11/2007 01:03 PM

To: <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: Upper Chattooga - Send Your Comments by Sept. 13

My personal preferences are for the first alternative. No boating upstream from Hwy 28 bridge and foot path travel only.

***Al Money***

Coordinator of Technical Services  
Forsyth County School System  
1120 Dahlonega Hwy.  
Cumming GA. 30040  
770-887-2461 - ext 202230  
[amoney@forsyth.k12.ga.us](mailto:amoney@forsyth.k12.ga.us)



"Jimmy Carter"  
<jcarter@mcsdga.net>

09/11/2007 01:05 PM

To: <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: Upper Chattooga

Gentlemen:

As a conservation- minded fisherman, hiker, and camper, I do not feel it would be in the best interest of the river itself to open the Chattooga above the highway 28 Ben Russell bridge to boaters, kayakers, pontooners, tubers, or any other types of watercraft.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jimmy Carter



"robert mingus"  
<robertmingus@comcast.net>

09/11/2007 01:11 PM

To: <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: Boating Access to Upper Chattooga River

Dear Sirs,

I have been an avid canoeist for over 20 years and I want to express my desire to allow boating opportunities on the upper Chattooga above the 28 bridge. In dealing with canoeists and kayakers over the years I have found the vast majority to be environmentally conscientious and respectful of other outdoor users. The environmental impact of this group on the Chattooga would be small and as a group I believe we have every bit as much right to use the Chattooga as any other use group. Furthermore we will act as good stewards of this unique natural resource.

Sincerely,

Robert Mingus M.D.  
737 Black Creek Drive  
Chattanooga T.N. 37419  
robertmingus@comcast.net



Cody Harris  
<brookiesrule1@yahoo.  
com>

09/11/2007 01:19 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Chattooga River Manangement

Mr. Cleeves,

I am writing you to tell you that the upper Chattooga is an extremely valuable resource because it is not only one of the last great undamed rivers in the country, it is also one of the last remaining wilderness rivers. The upper Chattooga is a very special place for me as I have been fishing there since I was 7 years old ( I am now 24). I know first hand about the conflict over the upper Chattooga and ask that you please maintain the current management of the river and keep it closed to boating above the highway 28 bridge. I know of the deaths and casualties that have occurred on the lower Chattooga and do not want there to be more. the Chattooga is a Wild and Scenic River and I believe that it should be kept that way by not allowing boaters into the section above highway 28. There is more than enough water open to boating currently. Please keep that Chattooga as it has been not for my children, but my grandchildren and their children. National forest land is being used like never before. At the current rate, the Chattooga will be the last little piece of unspoiled wilderness.

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,  
Cody Harris

---

Got a little couch potato?  
Check out fun [summer activities for kids.](#)



"Erwin Ford"  
<ehford2@msn.com>  
09/11/2007 01:19 PM

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

I am strongly in favor of banning all forms of boating on the Chattooga North Fork permanently. Please preserve this area as is for as long as possible. Once we allow change/deterioration, we will never regain its pristine quality.

Dr. Erwin Ford

Americus, GA



"Justin Cullars"  
<jcullars@hotmail.com>

09/11/2007 01:21 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Chattooga headwater user comment

Dr. John Cleeves  
U.S. Forest Service  
4931 Broad River Road  
Columbia, SC 29212  
comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us

RE: Chattooga Scoping Document

Dear Mr. Cleeves,

Though I've been a Southeastern kayaker for 23 years I am from the missing generation that has never been allowed to legally float the Headwaters. However I have paddled many rivers that are used by anglers, boaters and hikers. I have never had any kind of confrontation with any other users mainly because we use the river at different times and flows. The few times there has been contact it has been amicable and amounted to a wave and a smile. I'm simply amazed at the anger and half truths that the anglers spew on line and at the meetings. Who gave the use of this public land to them and not boaters? Nobody.....

The key concept that must be the basis of any new regulations is that we are only rightfully restoring legal boating to the Headwaters. Boaters were there before the ban, during the ban, and will be there in the future. All that is needed is to treat all users equally and the history of "conflict" will fade to distant memory. Many of the key opponents to paddling were active fishermen during the years I regularly paddled the Headwaters. I never met them (on the river) until we started attending the meetings to discuss our "conflict" and during the boater trials where we were bussed to the same point at the same time.

The Chattooga Headwaters have a capacity for use. The capacity will vary by location and historical use patterns. Highway 28 Bridge, Burrell's Ford, Bull Pen Bridge, and Grimshaws Bridge have always been high use "Frontcountry" areas and visitors expect to have many encounters. The addition of a delayed harvest reach created by stocking "Put and Catch" exotic trout has pushed the high use area upstream from Highway 28 an additional 2.3 miles. The remainder of the river is remote and has a more "Backcountry" feel and creates an expectation of fewer encounters with others.

The mission of the Forest Service as directed by the Chief was to assess the capacity of the Headwaters.

"No capacity analysis is provided to support restrictions or a ban on recreation use or any type of recreation user. While there are multiple references in the record to resource impacts and decreasing solitude, these concerns apply to all users and do not provide the basis for excluding boaters without any limits on other users." (Manning, 4/05)

And if capacity was found to be an issue then to:

"If it becomes necessary to limit use, "ensure that all potential users have

a fair and equitable chance to obtain access to the river." (Manning, 4/05)

However, in reading the Integrated Report and all its support documents no measure of capacity is ever estimated. The Integrated Report is a case of "Mission NOT Accomplished" and provides no foundation on which to build the scoping alternatives.

The alternatives proposed are a random mix of ideas and restrictions. As they currently are written none of the alternatives are acceptable. Alternative 6 presents the best starting point but it is seriously flawed due to a lack of key resource protection ideas discussed in other alternatives. No encounter standard is included in this alternative, a campsite density is assumed without analysis, and most importantly no requirement is suggested to monitor capacity. The entire focus of this project has been to determine a capacity (e.g., encounter standard) or other biophysical measure but only one alternative (Alternative Two) proposed any capacity analysis and this alternative is seriously flawed due to a lack of treating users equally.

I participated in the User Trials and only encountered other users in the "Frontcountry" areas (except Big Bend Falls where FS personnel hiked in to monitor). This lack of encounters was in spite of the Forest Service encouraging the fishing expert panel to hike to the Rock Gorge, Chattooga Cliffs, and Upper Ellicott Rock areas. While I understand, based on fishermen comments I heard in the pre-trial meeting, it was too dangerous, or there were no trails, for the fishermen to go to these reaches at high water, the lack of any encounter should have been an indicator no capacity was exceeded. If encounters do not occur during a "forced" event the actual encounters expected are likely to also be low.

The capacity can't be zero unless the Forest Service proposes to ban all access to the Headwaters to be consistent with the Chiefs decision. Assuming a capacity of some number, some number of people must be determined to be appropriate in each section of the corridor. Boaters and other user groups naturally complement and avoid each other. Boaters generally paddle in the winter when sufficient water is present, or after tropical storms. This use is typically limited to short one to two day periods of rapidly rising or falling water. The natural separation of users provided by the nature of the river protects both the biophysical environment: boaters float on the water when the ground is muddy and fishermen hike during drier weather; protecting the resource and restricting encounters.

The hydrology report states that the river exceeds 828 cfs 25 percent of the time (i.e., 91 days per year). This level is similar to the lower level for "optimal" boating. What is more fair than a natural division of use with boaters having opportunity 25 percent of the time and other users knowing they will not have encounters with boaters 75 percent of the time? Any system that does not allow these natural indirect controls to regulate use will violate the Chiefs directive from the Forest Service Manual.

"Agency policy for wilderness echoes law and policy relative to maximizing visitor freedom, directing that "direct controls and restrictions" be minimized, and that controls are to be applied only as necessary to protect the wilderness resource after indirect measures have failed (FSM 2323.12)"

No evidence exists to show why boaters should be singled out for special treatment. They are a returning user group, their impact is equal if not less than other users, and their time of use generally does not match other user's preferences. The biophysical report highlights that biophysical impacts were only noted on Section IV at hiking and fishing access

locations. NO biophysical impacts were noted in the inaccessible reaches only accessible by boat. A similar result can be expected in the Headwaters.

I propose the following alternatives be analyzed:

- Self registration required by all users
- Capacity standards are established for each unique reach of river. The standard should be based on user preferences and biophysical limits. A common wilderness standard in the sparsely populated west is seven encounters per day.
- ALL users are treated equally.
- If capacity is exceeded (allowing for isolated events), the user group primarily causing the exceedances is subjected to use permitting during times of likely capacity shortfall
- Parking areas (except handicapped) when feasible, are moved back from the river to reduce the impact of car camping.
- Self registration imposes conditions for camping and formalizes camp spacing limits and duration of stay.
- Self registration imposes conditions on boaters as has already been established on Section IV of the lower river.
- Group size is limited to 12 people for all groups.
- Woody debris is neither "enhanced" nor removed.
- Designated and user created trails are brought to a consistent standard then designated. Trails that cannot be restored are closed or rerouted.
- Boating is allowed by the Forest Service inside the Wild and Scenic corridor.
- Helicopter stocking is limited to Frontcountry areas.

Remember, the task is to  
PROTECT THE CHATTOOGA, NOT THE STATUS QUO

Regards,  
Justin Cullars  
4603 Beaver Ridge Rd  
Knoxville, TN 37931

---

Get a FREE small business Web site and more from Microsoft® Office Live!  
<http://clk.atdmt.com/MRT/go/aub0930003811mrt/direct/01/>



"M RODEGHIERO"  
<wowmaria@hotmail.co  
m>

09/11/2007 01:37 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: COMMENTS

*PLEASE LEAVE AS IS! PLEASE DO NOT LET THE BOATERS DESTROY OUT LAST BIT OF  
"HEAVEN ON EARTH"!*

*THANKS,*

*MARIA RODEGHIERO*

*FOR ALL YOUR INSURANCE & REAL ESTATE WANTS & NEEDS CALL ME!*

*MARIA RODEGHIERO (706) OR (800) 782-1846 (706) 490-1090 (CELL)*

*P.O.B. 1846 CLAYTON, GA 30525-0047*

*NORTHEAST GEORGIA INSURANCE*

*&*

*CRAIG REALTY GMAC REAL ESTATE*

*HAVE A BLESSED & HAPPY DAY!*



Jeff Wilson  
<j2owilson@yahoo.com  
>

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Boating above Hwy 28 on Chattooga

09/11/2007 01:56 PM

This letter is addressed to Mr. John Cleeves, USFS Project Manager.

Hello Mr. Cleeves, my name is Jeff Wilson. I am writing you today to let you know that I support removing the ban on kayaking above Hwy 28 on the Chattooga River.

First off, I think the ban is unjust in that it eliminates one user group from that section of the river. No one should have exclusive rights to that part of the Chattooga.

Furthermore, I have read comments recently from other users groups such as Friends of the Upper Chattooga and Trout Unlimited that indicate kayaking as being destructive toward the environment which is simply untrue. In fact, it could not be anymore untrue. Kayakers put on the river and seldom set foot on the surrounding lands except in the case of an emergency, etc., whereas trout fishermen, tubers, and hikers have a greater impact on the habitat surrounding the river. Kayakers are very nature-minded people and we try and "leave no trace" as much as possible.

As for user conflicts, this is simply a non-issue. Tubers and fisherman will not and honestly should not be on the river at the levels required for creek boating on this section of river. Again, these are just excuses drummed up by the trout-fishing community to try and exclude us from being able to enjoy the same natural resources as they do.

I encourage the USFS to do the right thing and lift the unjust and unfair ban on kayaking above the Hwy 28 bridge.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeff Wilson  
Columbia, SC

---

Don't let your dream ride pass you by. [Make it a reality](#) with Yahoo! Autos.

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 02:31 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Proposal to open the headwaters of the Chattooga to boating

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jccleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 02:31 PM -----



"Al Norman"  
<almarnorman@mindspring.com>  
09/11/2007 02:09 PM

To: <jccleeves@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: Proposal to open the headwaters of the Chattooga to boating

Messrs. Thomas and Cleeves,

We are astounded and dismayed that this proposal is even being considered. It is outrageous to contend that the unique, pristine upper Chattooga should become a raceway for water sports. The impact of such use on much less remote and protected streams such as the Tuckasegee is persuasive evidence of the harm to the character of mountain streams caused by such uses. There is adequate opportunity for canoeing and kayaking on the lower stretches of the Chattooga, as well as other streams in the area.. It is overreaching, thoughtless, and indeed selfish, to seek to appropriate the headwaters of this wild and scenic river as another venue for such water sports.

We earnestly hope that you will use your best efforts to continue the ban on boating on the Upper Chattooga.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. and Mrs. Albert G. Norman, Jr.  
85 Bullpen Road  
Cashiers, N.C. 28717

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 02:32 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: Chattooga North Fork

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jcleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 02:31 PM -----



"Charlie Trettel"  
<cwttrettel@bellsouth.net>  
09/11/2007 01:58 PM

Please respond to  
cwttrettel@bellsouth.net

To jcleeves@fs.fed.us (John Cleeves), knc615@windstrnet  
(David Adams),  
comments-southern-fransismarion-sumpter@fs.fed.us  
cc

Subject Chattooga North Fork

As a angler,geologist and naturalist I feel obligated to submit my opinions on the Alternatives (6) being considered on the above river section. As I see it, this is essentially a zoning change consideration to the present, remarkably and unique character of Alternative 1, which encompass the asthetic and social expeirences for which it is intended. Why dilute such an exceptional treasure?

In viewing the (6) Alternatives , I strongly support Alternative 1, however, Alternative 2 is acceptable.

Alternatives (4-6) All contain some form of woody debris removal which I strongly oppose:

A. Any removal of woody debris obviously can have a harmful impact on habitat by restricting protective cover and the degradation of a stratigic food source.

B. Large fallen trees transpire from soil bank erosion as the stream endeavors to acheive a mature condition. Any unnatural removal of such trees will result in distortion of the channel and a quick sedementation problem downstream. Leave the stream or river react to natural not unnatural conditions.

Thank you for your time. Choose wisely

Charlie Trettel  
5764 Ben Lee Rd.  
Murrayville, GA.  
770 983 1968

John C Cleeves  
09/11/2007 02:32 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES  
cc:  
Subject: Fw: North Fork - Chattooga

See below

\*\*\*\*\*

John Cleeves  
Forest Planner  
Francis Marion & Sumter National Forests  
Email:jccleeves@fs.fed.us  
Phone: (803) 561-4058  
Fax:(803) 561-4004

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded by John C Cleeves/R8/USDAFS on 09/11/2007 02:32 PM -----

David W Jensen/R8/USDAFS

09/11/2007 12:51 PM

To "Jeff Durniak" <Jeff\_Durniak@dnr.state.ga.us>, Paul  
Bradley/R8/USDAFS@FSNOTES  
cc "Lee Keefer" <Lee\_Keefer@dnr.state.ga.us>, "Mike Crane"  
<mcrane@fs.fed.us>, "Dan Rankin"  
<rankinD@scdnr.state.sc.us>, John C  
Cleeves/R8/USDAFS@FSNOTES  
Subject Re: Fwd: North Fork - Chattooga 📎

Thanks Jeff, forwarded a copy to John C, appreciate your time yesterday as well, continues good working relationships we have had for some time  
"Jeff Durniak" <Jeff\_Durniak@dnr.state.ga.us>



"Jeff Durniak"  
<Jeff\_Durniak@dnr.state.ga.us>  
s>

09/11/2007 08:52 AM

To "Dave Jensen" <dwjensen@fs.fed.us>, "Mike Crane"  
<mcrane@fs.fed.us>  
cc "Lee Keefer" <Lee\_Keefer@dnr.state.ga.us>, "Dan Rankin"  
<rankinD@scdnr.state.sc.us>  
Subject Fwd: North Fork - Chattooga

tyi. Passing on my cc.

Thanks for open and productive meeting yesterday. Hope PM fire duty wasn't too bad.

----- Message from Satilla RiverkeeperR <riverkeeper@satillariverkeeper.org> on Mon, 10 Sep 2007 13:51:06 -0400 -----

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

<edadams1@alltel.net>, "Gina Rogers" <grogers@glynn.k12.ga.us>,  
<ginaleigh@btconline.net>, "Claire Cox" <drc Cox@cox.net>, "Sam Rogers"  
<sandhrogers@friendlycity.net>, "Holly Markwalter" <hmarkwalter@yahoo.com>, "Ted  
Wright" <tedrw@comcast.net>, "John Lumsden" <gmskylake@alltel.net>, "david  
govus" <dgovus@ellijay.com>, "Brad Stroud" <jbs@coastalhealthmgmt.com>, "wayne  
jenkins" <wjenkins@gafw.org>, "Jeff Durniak" <Jeff\_Durniak@dnr.state.ga.us>

**Subject:** North Fork - Chattooga

Madams, Sirs:

Our family owns property in Rabun County, Georgia, and frequently uses the Chattooga upstream of SR 28 for fishing, hiking, and camping . . . up through Burrell's Ford to above Iron Bridge (Bull Pen). Some of us have enjoyed paddling and intend to enjoy more paddling, tubing, and perhaps rafting on the open sections of the river system. Some of us have fished the West Fork and the Overflow/Three Forks headwaters. Most of us are day and/or overnight hiker/campers. These use patterns will continue well into the foreseeable future as we bring along a younger generation, presently ranging from 9 to 17 years old. We have used the Chattooga resource, almost continuously, since the early 1970s.

We like the "split" of use opportunities as it is NOW. Please settle on Alternative #1 as the management policy for this resource. Please do not open the portion of the corridor above SR 28 to anything other than foot traffic. There are multiple and ample opportunities for those seeking "extreme" paddling experiences (e.g. high water in the North Fork) in other locales in the Southern Appalachians. The Outstandingly Remarkable Values of the North Fork will suffer if boat/floating traffic is allowed, due simply to increased human traffic, but also to the inevitable changes in habitat features that will occur as boaters seek to clear their path of woody debris. This will become an increasingly important issue as the hemlocks that are now dying in large numbers, all along all branches of the Chattooga, begin to fall.

We have nothing against the paddling community . . . we are part of it, in spades, owning and having owned paddling boats and equipment since the 1970s. We are simply stating that the present resource-allocation strategy is appropriate, adequate, fair,

and protective of the resource. Exactly like a well-balanced investment portfolio, the current status is appropriate for the long-term husbandry of the resource that constitutes the Chattooga River Wild and Scenic River Corridor.

This resource is important to the economy and culture of NE Georgia, NW South Carolina, and Western North Carolina. As the populations of the large metro areas of the piedmont and the mountains themselves become increasingly dense, the pressures, on all fronts, on the North Fork will become more intense. In this case “change” is not the right management strategy. Hold the line.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and for your attention to this important allocation decision.

Gordon Rogers

**Gordon Rogers**

Executive Director &  
Satilla RIVERKEEPER®

Satilla RIVERKEEPER®  
P. O. Box 159  
Waynesville, GA 31566

912-778-3126  
866-472-8452 toll free  
912-778-4593 facsimile  
912-223-6761 cell

[riverkeeper@satillariverkeeper.org](mailto:riverkeeper@satillariverkeeper.org)  
[www.satillariverkeeper.org](http://www.satillariverkeeper.org)

Satilla RIVERKEEPER® is a fully licensed member of the WATERKEEPER® ALLIANCE, and is an activity of the Satilla Riverwatch Alliance, Inc., a Georgia Corporation approved under the federal tax code as a 501(c)3 non-profit entity



Evelyn Hopkins  
<ehopkins100@yahoo.com>

09/11/2007 02:33 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: boating on Upper Chattooga

USFS

Re: Chattooga River Access

Please adopt alternative 6 to allow whitewater boating on all of the Chattooga. Potential conflicts among users have been greatly exaggerated as boaters will not be using the river at the same time as most swimmers and fishermen. All non-motorized users should have equal access. If the area becomes too crowded then all uses will need to be rationed. The greatest degradation to the area would not be from boaters, but trash in areas that have easy access by car, usually near campsites. Fishermen also litter with worm boxes. Most boaters, fly fishermen, and hikers love the wilderness and will care for it. We should all be able to cooperation in the use and access to this public resource.

Evelyn Hopkins  
1752 Timberbluf Drive,  
Clayton, GA  
30525  
ehopkins100@yahoo.com

---

Need a vacation? Get great deals  
to amazing places on Yahoo! Travel.  
<http://travel.yahoo.com/>



Tsunemi Yamashita  
<tyamashita@atu.edu>

09/11/2007 02:45 PM

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: River use comments

Sir:

I endorse option #6 as it opens the upper Chatooga river and does not limit the number of boating groups through the wilderness area. Although a limit to boating groups may be a good option, the small number listed virtually eliminates all but the luckiest few who have obtained permits for a date that the river could contain flow enough for paddlers. Wilderness area rivers in Arkansas have not been negatively impacted by paddlers— in fact, paddlers are among the most vocal proponents of river protection. The Arkansas Canoe club has a strong group of conservation minded paddlers who have been in the forefront of legislation to keep rivers clean and open for public use. I would argue that the upper Chatooga river corridor would benefit from an expanded group of users that include paddlers. Also, much of the activity that seemly overlaps between paddlers and fishermen would not occur as paddlers tend to seek access during periods of higher flow, usually when fishermen are not seen on the river. Thanks for your time in listing and reviewing the options for this remarkable river.

--

T Yamashita

Russellville, AR 72801



wbdenton@bellsouth.net

09/11/2007 02:44 PM

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

cc:

Subject: Please adopt alternatives 1, 2, or 3

USDA Forest Service Officials:

You are faced with making current decisions that will have a direct effect for many years to come. The current stewardship zoning of the Chattooga above the 28 Bridge has been in place for over thirty years and the "Alternative" to be chosen now may well be in place for many generations to come if not forever.

I believe it is important to consider what will be lost if either of the Alternatives 4, 5, or 6 becomes the new norm. Future visitors will lose the aesthetic values such as the solitude, remoteness, wildness and backcountry setting because the activities of a few boaters will change the environment forever. That precious resource is way too valuable to sacrifice for the fun of a small minority of users.

This unique natural resource is more valuable to the community (towns, counties, and states as well as citizens) now and in the future if the stewardship is under Alternatives 1, 2, or 3. These alternatives, especially # 3, will protect the rights of the vast majority of current and future users of the North Fork such as anglers, backpackers, hikers, bird watchers, photographers, swimmers, wildlife lovers and others.

There are more than adequate boating opportunities for a life time in the upstate, across South Carolina, and within the United States. Contrast that with the fact that there is only one section (21 miles) of the Wild and Scenic Chattooga River that is limited to foot travel. Where is the fairness in letting boaters change and destroy the only segment of a backcountry Forest Service stream in the southeast zoned for foot travel only? There is no fairness nor has there been any respect by the boaters' and the Whitewater Assoc. in their approach and demands -- only a limited self interest to enjoy their personal thrills.

Please adopt one of the three alternatives (1, 2, or 3) to protect the aesthetic values of this unique natural resource of wilderness for present and future generations.

Thank you for your consideration,

William B. Denton  
119 River Oaks Road  
Greer, South Carolina, 29650  
wbdenton@bellsouth.net



Crystal Williamosn  
<roskoe\_1@yahoo.com  
>

To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Boating

09/11/2007 02:52 PM

**Do not allow boating above the 28 bridge. The management plan made over 30 years ago was perfect.**

**Crystal**

---

Tonight's top picks. What will you watch tonight? [Preview the hottest shows](#) on Yahoo! TV.



"JMCA"  
<JMCA@dnet.net>  
09/11/2007 02:56 PM

To: <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: Upper Chattooga alternatives - comments

Please find our comments on the recreational use alternatives for the Upper Chattooga.

Thank you,



Jackson-Macon Conservation Alliance Alternative Comments Chattooga 9-11-07.doc



"Armstrong"  
<arms7213@bellsouth.net>

09/11/2007 03:04 PM

To: <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: chattooga letter.doc

**September 11, 2007  
10 Tranquil Ave.  
Greenville, SC 29615**

**Dear Mr. Cleaves,**

**My father was in the USFS from 1933-1971. For 6 years he was Assistant Supervisor in Columbia. So, I have grown up with many of the issues you face about managing the US forests. My husband and I fly-fish in many exotic places, but for 22 years we always return to the Chattooga.**

**I am for Alternate #1 because it preserves the Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV) of the North Fork of the Chattooga. Alternates # 4, 5, & 6 will bring social clashes and ecological disaster by removing the large woody debris (LWD). We will soon have enough problems with the wooly adelgid stripping the cooling cover of the hemlocks from our streams. Let's not add to that problem!**

**Alternates #4, 5 & 6 would violate both the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act and the Wilderness Act. We fishermen already share 63% of the Chattooga with the boaters; that's enough. If they want to enjoy the solitude and beauty of the North Fork, they can walk up and walk back, like the rest of us.**

**There is nothing wrong in preserving the only foot travel stream in the Southeast. Regardless of the boaters' pressure (especially those who never have seen it!) do the right thing; preserve the ORV of this beautiful North Fork of the Chattooga.**

**Thank you for your attention.**

**Sincerely,**

**Meta Smith Armstrong**





"Bentley, Ken"  
<Ken.Bentley@carolinafi  
rst.com>

To: "or" <comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us>  
cc:  
Subject: HWY 28 BRIDGE

09/11/2007 03:05 PM

Please keep the restrictions as they currently are . No boats above the HWY 28 bridge