

# **Chattooga River History Project Literature Review and Interview Summary**

*Prepared for*

**USDA Forest Service  
Francis Marion and Sumter National Forests**

*Prepared by*

**Tetra Tech EC, Inc.  
Atlanta, Georgia**

August 25, 2006

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Chattooga River originates in North Carolina and forms a partial border between the states of Georgia and South Carolina. It is one of the longer and larger free-flowing rivers in the southeast and is the only mountain river within a four-state region that has not been substantially developed along its length. The Chattooga River provides important recreation resources for local, regional, and national users and offers high quality fishing and boating.

A recent revision of the Sumter National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) addressed several recreation issues in the river corridor; among the management actions, the plan retained a 1976 ban on boating use upstream of Highway 28 (about 21 miles). This ban was later appealed by American Whitewater (AW), and the Forest Service (USFS) agreed to reassess that decision as part of broader examination of visitor capacity issues on the Upper Chattooga River. The Forest Service is employing a modified “Limits of Acceptable Change” (LAC) planning framework to address these visitor capacity issues, and is conducting several analysis “elements” to better inform that process or other management issues.

This report is one of those “elements,” and its goal is to describe the basis for the 1976 boating prohibition and other relevant capacity issues that informed initial management decisions for the Chattooga. This will include a description of the river’s USFS management history from about 1970 to the present based on existing documentation and a limited number of interviews with agency personnel.

Following a description of analysis methods, Section 1.2 provides a summary of the Chattooga River’s history from 1970 to the present and provides key findings by issue. Conclusions are summarized in Section 1.3, and are based on an integration of the document review and interview information.

### 1.1.1 Methods

Written documentation on use conflicts, river management issues, and public involvement associated with capacity issues were reviewed for this analysis. Table 1 describes documents provided by the USDA Forest Service for this review.

**Table 1-1.** Literature Review Documents

Document Name	Author	Year
Upper Chattooga River Visitor Capacity Analysis Plan	Doug Whittaker	2006
Affidavits from Max Gates and Jim Barrett		2006
Chattooga River Chronology Relating to Boating Above Highway 28	Terry Seyden	2005
History of the Access Closure Above Highway 28	John Cleeves	2005
History of the Boating Ban from the Angler's Perspective	Doug Adams	2002
Chattooga Wild and Scenic River – Analysis of Outstanding Remarkable Values	USDA FS	1996
Chattooga River Visitor Study	Dye et al	1994
Chattooga Sourcebook – An Interpretive Guide	William Clay	1993
Recommendations for Management of Private Floater Use on the Chattooga for Utah State Recreation Short Course Requirements	Brent Botts	1991
Sumter National Forest Land Management Plan Appendix M	USDA FS	1985
Chattooga River Recommended Management Objectives and Rationing Techniques	Joseph Wallace	1983
Chattooga River Visitor Characteristics	Carol Townsend	1982
Chattooga WSR Management Plan	USDA FS	1980
Handbook for Chattooga River Guides	Wildwater	1980
Chattooga! Case Study	Carol Townsend	1980
A Study of Floating Use on the Chattooga WSR	Craig et al	1979
Chattooga WSR Management Plan	USDA FS	1977
Chattooga WSR River Classification, Boundaries, and Development Plan	USDA FS	1976
Chattooga River Visitor Study	Howard et al	1975
Chattooga WSR Study Report	USDA FS	1971

**Note:** Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest literature review list

Because the written record of events may not have been comprehensive, interviews with decision-makers at the Forest Service and other natural resource agencies with knowledge of past forest decisions were also conducted. Table 2 provides a list of interviewees who could be located and agreed to participate; it includes Forest Service, South Carolina, and Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR) employees involved during or after the time of the boating ban above Highway 28.

**Table 1-2.** USDA Forest Service and Georgia Department of Natural Resources Interviewees

Name	Chattooga River Involvement
Max Gates	USDA Forest Service, Andrew Pickens District Ranger, 1961-1972 (Retired)
Jim Barrett	USDA Forest Service, Andrew Pickens District Ranger, 1972+ (Retired)
Dan Rankin	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Dillard Barron	USDA Forest Service, Tallulah District (Retired)
Charlie Huppuch	USDA Forest Service, Andrew Pickens Ranger District (Retired)
Monte Seehorn	USDA Forest Service, Andrew Pickens Ranger District (Retired)
Jeff Durniak	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
James Culp	USDA Forest Service, River Ranger, 1974-1980 (Retired)

**Note:** Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest interviewee list

Interviewees were asked a set of questions that pertain to the 1976 Chattooga boating closure, fishing stocking, and general assessments of capacity issues in the 1970’s and 80s. The set of questions (Table 3) elicits information on and gains insight into the closure when designated as a Wild and Scenic River (WSR). The questions were developed in an effort to gain insight on agency resource management decisions leading up to and including the 1976 boating ban. Information from the literature review was integrated with interview findings to provide greater understanding of the history of recreation use and management responses on the river.

**Table 1-3.** Interview Questions

Question Number	Question
1	What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?
2	What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?
3	What user conflicts occurred prior to the closure in 1976?
4	Why were the roads closed?
5	What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?
6	What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?
7	Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?
8	In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?
9	What stocking decisions were made and why?
10	In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?
11	How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?
12	What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?
13	What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?

**Note:** Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest interviewee question list

Despite using both a literature review and interview responses to gain insight about the motivating factors in 1976 boating ban some information gaps remain. There are limitations on

making generalizations based on the information presented here due to the lack of documentation from the 1970s (NEPA or similar processes were far less structured in that time period) and the uncertain motivations of some interview respondents. The boating ban on the Upper River has become controversial and advocacy positions may filter memories of historical management decisions and their basis.

## **1.2 KEY FINDINGS**

Findings are organized by 1) an overview of management actions accompanied by a timeline; 2) information on boater-angler or other conflicts; 3) the basis for the initial boating ban; 4) the basis for fish stocking changes; 5) capacity judgments in the 1970s; and 6) evidence of public involvement during decision-making processes.

### **1.2.1 Overview of Chattooga Management and Timeline**

USDA Forest Service (Forest Service) management began more active management of the river in 1968 when the Chattooga was recommended for Wild and Scenic River (WSR) consideration, largely because of its outstanding wild nature (Cleeves 2005). The following year, the Forest Service began a three-year suitability study of the portions of the Chattooga River that were being considered for designation as a WSR, which included reconnaissance boating trips down the entire river.

One year after publishing the 1971 suitability study, the popular movie “Deliverance” was released and boating use on the Chattooga River increased dramatically, particularly on the lower river. Floating use on the Chattooga was estimated to be 100 days in the late 1960’s and escalated to over 20,000 in 1973 (Craig et al 1979). Until 1973, all use was private. After that time, commercial outfitters were permitted to work on the river. Comparatively, there was still substantial private use from 1973 to 1975. However, every year since 1976 commercial boaters have outnumbered private boaters (USDA Forest Service 1996). Current use levels exceed 57,000 individuals per year, with about 70 percent of that use commercial (Vaigas 2006).

The release of the movie occurred about the same time that whitewater rafting was dramatically increasing, contributing to the popularity of the Chattooga (Botts 1991). As use increased, there were accidents (including boater fatalities) below Highway 28, and the FS began to initiate education and regulation programs to minimize those problems (Clay 1993).

In addition, conflicts between boaters and anglers apparently began to develop about this time. Forest Service law enforcement responded to several verbal and physical confrontations (USDA Forest Service 2006), probably on the lower river (although documents do not specify their location or the number of specific incidents). In these early years, the Forest Service did not systematically monitor or actively manage any type of use, and documentation of accidents or law enforcement incidents is sparse.

By 1974, the Chattooga River’s outstandingly remarkable fish, wildlife, recreation, scenic, and historic values were recognized by Congress through designation as a WSR. Within one year, the

Forest Service was mandated to establish boundaries, classify sections for the river, and prepare an administrative management plan. This led to more proactive recreation management yet, with a particular focus on removing or minimizing development in the corridor. In the initial management plan (printed in the Federal Register in 1976, p. 11819), the river was divided into geographic zones with different use patterns and characteristics; zoning by type of recreation setting (using the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum ROS) was the dominant recreation planning framework in use at that time, and language in the 1976 Plan clearly indicate interest in “providing a range of recreation opportunities characteristic of, and in harmony with, the nature of individual river segments.” (USDA Forest Service, 1976).

As part of the zoning effort, the segment above Highway 28 was closed to boating. There is limited written documentation of the specific reasons for the ban, but the “Classification, Boundaries, and Development Plan” provided in the March 22, 1976 Federal Register includes statements that suggest three possible reasons: safety, the lack of sufficient flows, and to prevent conflicts/provide angling opportunities without boating encounters.

The boating ban was not the main focus of the plan; most of it detailed “development” actions that included two other significant management decisions. First, many primitive roads to or along the river (often remnants of timber activities from the first half of the century) were closed to provide a more primitive recreation setting. Except for major roads that crossed the river, virtually every road that reached the river’s shore was gated at least a quarter mile or more from the water. This substantially modified many existing recreation uses (vehicle-based camping, fishing, and picnicking next to the river was no longer possible) and limited stocking truck access, with additional implications for fishing as discussed below. Second, several trails were planned to be built, which would provide new hiking based access to the corridor, particularly upstream of Highway 28.

From the late 1970s through the 1990s, subsequent management plans (most notably in 1985) basically mimicked the 1976 “blueprint” for the river. The 1976 development plan guided the creation of several new trails or improvements in subsequent years, particularly in the Upper River corridor. In addition, continued increases in Lower River boating led to some of the most active management of commercial boating use on a national Wild and Scenic River. This included limits on trips per day, daily time scheduling to minimize encounters between trips, strict regulations that keeps river campers from being visible from the river, and a mandatory use registration system for private and commercial uses. While boating use increases on the lower river segments were documented during this time, use estimates of anglers and hikers were less systematically tracked. Based on limited information, however, they also appear to have increased.

Recent planning led to a 2004 Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest Land Management Plan. While this plan maintained the boating ban above Highway 28, an appeal has led to a review of this action and related capacity issues. In the interim management is based on the

direction in the 1985 Forest Plan which maintains the restriction on boating above Highway 28 (Cleeves 2005).

**Table 1-4. Timeline**

Year	Event	Comment
1968	Wild and Scenic Rivers Act recommendation	Recommends that Chattooga for consideration as a designated river under the act
1968	Lower river boating use estimated at 100 floaters per year	Estimated, no registration system in place
1969	FS begins Wild and Scenic Study	
1969	Public Meeting Held in December	Highlands, NC
1970	Public Meeting Held in March	Clayton, GA
1970	Deliverance novel published	
1971	Wild and Scenic Study report published	
1971	Fish stocking changes in accordance to the 1971 WSR Study Report	
1971	Roads begin to be closed in accordance with WSRA	As recommended in the 1971 WSR Study
1972	Deliverance movie released	July 30, 1972
1972	Boating use estimated about 7,600 boaters per year	Estimated, no registration system in place
1974	Wild and Scenic River act designation	Designates the Chattooga as a Wild and Scenic River
1976	Chattooga Classification, Boundaries, and Development (CBD) Plan prohibits floating above Highway 28	Federal Register Vol. 41, No. 56
1977	Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Management Plan published	
1985	Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Management Plan published in an Appendix to the NF Land Management Plan	

**Note:** Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Management Timeline

### 1.2.2 Conflicts

The number and severity of boater-angler conflicts is a major issue in need of documentation. All interviewees agreed that after the publishing of the 1971 River Study and the release of the movie *Deliverance*, there was a huge influx of floaters on the Chattooga River. The floaters were largely non-local tourists, and their use affected locals who used the river for fishing, swimming, and picnicking. By 1974, some lower river anglers were probably displaced due to the lack of solitude. Responses from other anglers may have included aggressive displays of frustration over these changes, and may have included shouting, raft-slashing, rock throwing, fistfights, and gunplay (Adams 2002). Max Gates, in an affidavit, recalls numerous confrontations between these users before 1976.

Most of these conflicts probably took place below Highway 28, although interviewees were not specific about locations or incidents. Some interviewees recalled heavy use at the access points,

and physical confrontations apparently were more likely to occur at these congested put-in and take-out areas.

The implicit notion underlying the boating ban, according to some interviewees, was to ensure that these conflicts did not migrate to the Upper River, which had less use, a more primitive setting (classified as “wild”), and few boaters because of lower water levels and more difficult whitewater. The idea according to these interviewees was to ensure that local anglers had a segment to fish where encounters with floaters would not take place.

A related controversial issue at the time focused on road closures. All interviewees remember that closures severely limited historical vehicle-based access, as all of non-major roads within the one-quarter mile river corridor were closed (while not specifically required by the WSR Act, these closures undeniably made the river corridor more primitive). From a local user perspective, however, these closures were de facto restrictions on their use and were concurrent with (although not caused by) the influx of non-local users, most of whom were boaters. As a result, angler-boater conflicts may have been confounded or at least exacerbated by the local/non-local resentment focused on road closures.

Even after the boating ban in 1976, the boater-angler or local/non-local conflicts may still have lingered to some degree, with continuing effects on users and resource managers. The Handbook for River Guides (Wildwater 1980) includes a section on “community relations,” described the issue in terms of locals vs. outsiders, and warned of past “acts of destruction and harassment.” The substantial changes in use and access due to the movie and Wild & Scenic status clearly made some local people feel that “their” river had been taken away, and these frustrations may have played a role in the conflict incidents that apparently occurred.

### **1.2.3 Basis for the Boating Ban**

As discussed above, specific documentation of the reasons for the 1976 boating ban is sparse, but safety, low water, and conflict-reduction/zoning appear to be central. The 1971 Wild and Scenic River Study describes the section above Highway 28 as “providing fair to good fishing” but also notes that the section from Bullpen Bridge to Highway 28 is of special interest because it is the only stretch providing “high quality trout fishing [and] that is large enough to float...rubber rafts are suitable.” This section is also described as beautiful, with many dangerous portions (USDA Forest Service 1971).

The 1976 plan includes statements about the difficulty of the whitewater in the headwaters areas, indicating a safety concern: “[The Rock Gorge] includes exciting but treacherous whitewater” (p. 11847) and “they include some beautiful but hazardous whitewater that should not be floated” (p. 11847). Similarly, other statements suggest low water is a related issue: “because of the small water flow and ruggedness of the gorge area, floating is not recommended” (p. 11832), even though a section along Nicholson Fields is “shallow and easy for the inexperienced canoeist” (p. 11819).

The 1976 plan also implies a potential rationale associated with conflicts and the protection of angling experiences: “the recent increase in floaters using the river has had a detrimental effect on the fishing experience. Conflicts have developed on certain sections of the river where floaters and fisherman use the same waters” (p. 11819).

A later study of floating on the Chattooga concurs with these reasons asserting that the first twenty-six miles of the river was closed to boating because that portion of the river is “generally too small for floating during most water levels,” which is distinct from the pure safety concern. This document also suggested the ban provided an area where people could “fish and hike without encountering boating traffic (Craig et al. 1979).”

Interviewees generally agreed with each of these points. On safety issues, one interviewee remembers surveying the rugged, rough land and water in the first 26 miles and noting the section was dangerous for users that are not highly skilled. Other interviewees remember that during the initial increase of users on the river, there were no outfitters and many inexperienced floaters attempted the river without proper equipment or guides. Once outfitters were in place, their presence helped increase the level of safety and control. Deaths from 1972 to 1975 averaged five per year, but since 1976, deaths have averaged less than one per year (Wallace 1983).

On conflict/experience issues, several interviewees indicated that protecting fishing experiences was an important rationale. One interviewee noted that he felt it was a wonderful idea to designate that section as a fishing area. Another interviewee remembers the boater and angler conflict as the driving force behind the 1976 ban. He asserts that the Forest Service took that conflict into consideration, and that the ban was a joint decision involving the Forest Service and DNRs in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina.

#### **1.2.4 Trout Stocking Changes**

There has been stakeholder debate about concurrent stocking changes as the river became designated, roads were closed, and the boating ban was put into place. Documentation again is sparse, but during the 1971 WSR Study, the Forest Service suggested limiting stocking from Georgia, no stocking above Highway 28, but allowed for North Carolina to carry out stocking as needed. In South Carolina it recommended stocking at one point below Highway 28, and at the access points of Highway 28 Bridge and Burrell’s Ford (USDA Forest Service 1971). In 1976 and 1977, management direction stated that fish stocking from vehicles would be permitted only at Burrell’s Ford, the Highway 28 Bridge, Long Bottom Ford, and the Bull Pen Bridge on the main river and at Overflow and Warwoman bridges on the West Fort and the stocking changes were implicitly linked with the boating ban (USDA Forest Service 1976, USDA Forest Service 1977).” The 1985 plan confirmed these stocking priorities. Taken together, they suggest that stocking was generally encouraged on the upper river and discouraged on the lower.

However, all of the interviewees agree that there were no official bans on stocking on the lower river. One interviewee remembers that the changes to stocking decisions during his tenure with

the Forest Service were based on scientific reports and fish surveys (the idea being that the upper river has better conditions for stocking populations to survive). However, another recalls that stocking ceased in the lower sections of the river to be consistent with zoning decisions. He asserts that trout stocking was encouraged in the upper to facilitate fishing and discouraged below Highway 28 to facilitate boating.

In 1976, DNR quit stocking at a few places in North Carolina, but they were still stocking at the Highway 28 Bridge and Burrell's Ford in South Carolina. Helicopter stocking in replacement of the truck-based stocking began shortly thereafter, with some changes in helicopter stocking upstream of Burrells Ford because of the Ellicott Wilderness designation in 1975.

At least one interviewee remembers that the Department of Natural Resources once stocked all along the Chattooga River. After the wild and scenic designation was put in place and roads were closed, many stocking points were unreachable and stocking at those stations ceased. This interviewee also recalls the cessation of stocking below Highway 28 to help decrease conflicts between boaters and anglers. The idea here is that if the fishing becomes poor, fewer anglers will use the lower river and fewer conflicts would occur.

### **1.2.5 Impact and Capacity Judgments**

During the initial WSR Study, managers asserted that the "Chattooga River [was] not overused". However, even during this initial study, capacity concerns were evident. The study authors recommended that use and impacts be monitored and expressed concern that expected demand for multiple uses of the Chattooga River would increase because of the WSRA designation (a prophetic statement). Mitigation for this expected increase in demand included recommendations to assess the need for limiting the number of access points, budgeting for other access facility improvements, and monitoring the need for recreation developments to reduce pressure on "more primitive sections of the river (USDA Forest Service 1971)."

The assumption that use would increase was accurate. Floater use on the Chattooga went from estimates of 800 in 1971 to 21,000 in 1973 and over 36,000 in 1979 with most use occurring from May to September. The figures prior to about 1973 can be characterized as estimates. After that time, numbers were based on actual counts by river rangers, then in 1975 the figures were gathered via a mandatory self-registration system (Craig et al 1979).

This preparation for future demand was also helpful. Facility capacity for the river was reportedly adequate into the late 1970's, as there were enough parking lots, trails, etc. to accommodate existing recreational use. Regular site maintenance also appeared to mitigate the negligible amounts of site damage and compaction from foot traffic at trails and camps. According to most documents and interviewees, most capacity concerns focused on social or experiential issues such as encounters or conflicts (Craig et al 1979).

The 1985 Land Management Plan adopted more formalized recreation planning concepts, developing three Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) classes for land within the Chattooga River corridor (semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, and roaded natural).

ROS is a land classification system that categorizes national forestland into classes being defined by its setting and by the probable recreational experiences and activities it affords. Boating above Highway 28 remained prohibited and that section of the river was managed as semi-primitive (USDA Forest Service 1985).

As stated in several interviews, the USFS was concerned with capacity issues throughout early planning efforts, particularly social impacts that affect solitude. This led to substantial education/regulation programs among lower river boaters, which made up the bulk of the use on those segments. These actions were generally effective because most use occurred via three outfitters whose trips were limited. Throughout the 1980s, there was also more river staff than at present.

On the upper river, management attention was lower. While angling creel surveys and occasional university studies addressed aspects of use and impacts in these areas, there was no systematic use or impact monitoring.

### **1.2.6 Public Involvement**

As part of this 1971 study, the Forest Service held several public forums to discuss proposed changes in the management of the river and to receive input from the public (USDA Forest Service 2006). In the study two public meetings (see timeline) were conducted where the public had an opportunity to express their opinions concerning future management of the Chattooga River as a WSR (USDA Forest Service 1971).

During the Wild and Scenic River study process there were additional public meetings in the tri-state area. Of all the public involvement, in the recorded mail, oral statements, and written meeting notes only three individuals and one private hunt club opposed including the river as a WSR. Support for the designation came from 12 governmental agencies, 50 private organizations, 15 petitions, and over 900 individuals (USDA Forest Service 1971). In support of this documentation, all of the interviewees remember public involvement before and after the WSR designation, and during the time of the boating ban.

## **1.3 CONCLUSION**

The major points of interest are consistent between the literature review and the interviews. The river was not heavily used and was truly 'wild and scenic' prior to 1968, although road-accessible areas may have had some impact problems. The river gained exposure because of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act recommendation in 1968, the 1970's boom in whitewater rafting, and the movie "Deliverance" in 1972. After that point there was an influx in users on the river. Conflicts developed between 'outsider' floaters and local users, some of whom were probably displaced by the increasing use.

At the same time use was increasing, the amount of unskilled users unfamiliar with the Chattooga's wild nature and inexperienced in white water rafting was also increasing. Deaths resulted, conflict continued, and managers began to seek a way to mitigate both.

The solution above Highway 28 presented itself in two parts. First, closing the section of the river that was most dangerous helped with safety concerns. Second, it fostered a higher quality fishing experience and provided users with an experience of solitude on portions of the river not especially suited for floating.

Other management decisions that assisted with mitigation for safety, user displacement, and capacity concerns above and below Highway 28 included:

- The use of outfitter guides to provide instruction and proper equipment,
- The use of outfitter guides to assist in controlling the amount of commercial floaters, and
- Closing of the roads to limit access.

Information on stocking changes and public involvement was sought during the interviews and the literature review. There is no written evidence or personal reference to any official stocking bans or stocking changes based on moving multiple-use management away from fishing above Highway 28. There is, however, evidence that stocking changes were made due to road closures and fisheries management changes. There are multiple written references and personal recollections of public meetings during the 1971 suitability study. Information on public involvement during the development of the 1976 plan was not found.

## 1.4 REFERENCES

Adams, Doug. 2002. History of the Boating Ban from the Angler's Perspective.

Botts, Brent. 1991. Recommendations for Management of Private Floater Use on the Chattooga for Utah State Recreation Short Course Requirements.

Clay, William. 1993. Chattooga Sourcebook – An interpretive Guide.

Cleaves, John. 2005. History of the Access Closure above Highway 28 Report. Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest report.

Craig, Bill et al. 1979. A Study of Floating Use on the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River.

USDA Forest Service. 1971. Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Study Report. USDA Forest Service, Southern Region.

USDA Forest Service. 1976. Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Classification, Boundaries, and Development Plan. USDA Forest Service, Southern Region.

USDA Forest Service. 1977. Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. USDA Forest Service, Southern Region.

USDA Forest Service. 1985. Sumter National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, Appendix M – Chattooga Wild and Scenic River Management Plan. USDA Forest Service, Southern Region.

USDA Forest Service. 1996. Analysis of Outstanding and Remarkable Values of the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River 1971-1996. Francis Marion and Sumter National Forests. USDA Forest Service, Southern Region.

USDA Forest Service. 2006. Affidavits from Max Gates and Jim Barrett.

Vaigas, Wade. 2006. Summary Report of Floating Use on the Lower Chattooga River: West Fork to Tugaloo Landing 1998-2005. Clemson University.

Wallace, Joseph. 1983. Chattooga River – Recommended Management Objectives and Rationing Techniques. Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest report.

Wildwater. 1980. Handbook for River Guides.

**Appendix A** Individual Interview Responses

**Monte Seehorn, USDA Forest Service, Fish Biologist**  
**Interviewed on Wednesday, July 12, 2006 from 3:05-4:05 p.m.**

Monte can't remember when w&s designation came about – probably at the same time [1976]. He wrote the fish and wildlife [and scenic?] portion even though it had someone else's name on it.

He started the Chattooga Coalition in 1986. It came about because people started talking about soil sediment running into the water. He worked with them to improve the overall fish habitat. The coalition was made up of the 3 USFS offices, 3 DNR offices, and Trout Unlimited (in the states of GA, SC, and NC). There was a lot of fighting between boaters and anglers, and basically a part came from the recommendation by the coalition to keep it as it was (the same as the 1976 designation). There are a lot of boaters there, but not as many when the ban first started in 1976. The coalition has no power make decisions, except make recommendations to USFS and that's how the rules came about. Some concessions were made by giving those recommendations.

USFS made its determination and it [the river] was closed that way when it was set up as w&s. It may have been strictly USFS with outside groups. USFS made the recommendation because there were problems with boaters and fishermen back then. It was recommended just because the fishermen get teed off because when you have a lot of boats going down [the river] there are a lot of conflicts.

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1. – I wrote the fish and wildlife section, though it was under someone else's name. I prepared recommendations for the w&s designation and at that time there were already conflicts between the fishermen and boaters, especially at the time they designated it w&s.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 – The closure really didn't have anything to do with the [biophysical characteristics of the] river. It was a lot better for the fishermen when they didn't have boaters on the river. The water quality of the river didn't change without boating. It did improve the aesthetics of fisheries for the fishermen. The only difference is some fishermen were having conflicts, but with no boats they had better views. The boaters didn't change the basic water quality, but then there was not as much boating back then.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 – The roads closed basically because of the w&s designation more than anything else.

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 – There was a boater and fishermen conflict. The fishermen didn't like to fight the boats. USFS took this into consideration and agreed with DNR that DNR would deemphasize below Hwy 28 (to keep for boaters) and emphasize fish above Hwy 28. Of all 3 states in the coalition, all are opposed to boating above 28, even DNR. SC and GA affected the most because the river is on both sides of the bank in each state for about 15 miles, and only includes the headwaters in NC. USFS people in the coalition are pretty much unanimous that it is better not to have boats up there [Hwy 28]. It was pretty much unanimous at that time too [in 1976]. USFS was just taking input. Most of USFS that he knew agreed that it would be a problem if they allowed boating above Hwy 28, but if they didn't allow it then they wouldn't have to deal with the problem. Nobody was pushing for boating back then, but I'm not speaking for the boaters now. From 1986 on, they basically made a coalition recommendation to USFS to not allow boating above Hwy 28. They recommended that USFS keep the same boundary.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 – Frankly, the Chattooga River was sort of ignored back then until it was designated w&s. USFS tried to get the state to do some fish surveys. But there were no real issues before the closure. One of the guys who helped initiate the coalition had issues with sediment from roads into the river. Burrell's Ford Road was probably the biggest issue with significant contribution to sediment. This was a main road and was not closed anyway. He was not sure what roads were closed, probably the smaller roads with good views of the river (as part of the w&s designation). If a road was not used then it would be closed to become only a viewing area of the river. The roads are still a major issue. Trout Unlimited doesn't want them paved because it may bring in more fishermen and this is an issue now.

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 – You could say that because that's why they put the boating below and the fishermen above. When you got conflicts then somebody's going to think too much boating use. The states (DNRs in all 3 states) did creel surveys but back then the only decision was that there was conflict and this would deal capacity. I don't know how many fishermen and boaters were out there. They are just now trying to get a handle on the boating use, but they already have some data on the fish. When they designated the Ellicot area wilderness, the trails started getting a lot of heavy use. Anytime you designate an area as special, it does the opposite and brings people in.

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 – I'm not sure how to answer this question. There was obviously less boating and fishing on the river then than there is now. It hadn't reached capacity on fishing and boating. Some of the fishermen don't want to see 3-4 fishermen and if there is 1 boater, then it has exceeded capacity. It was not approaching capacity for fish use, but not sure what to say for boating use. For some reason or other they had it closed to exclude boating because it was interfering with the fishing. It doesn't mean there was a whole lot of boating back then, but they knew it was going to get heavier. The lower portion of Hwy 28 was obviously more suited to boaters with the bigger water and along this stretch, the fishermen only had one choice (put/take). So, not as much choice below Hwy 28 and the big water handled boaters better. Below Hwy 28 there was bigger water, better rapids, and most suited for boating. Above Hwy 28 they managed the fish better (more put/take areas).

In 1986 they determined where they can depend on natural reproduction – have natural fisheries. They found that there was not much of a fish population from Burrell Ford Road downstream so were stocking small fish to supplement the fishery down below the road where they had a put/take program. The put/take program was at 2 main river crossings (bridges). They monitored to make sure the population was OK. Stocking today is very successful. They have a delayed harvest area from Hwy 28 to Reed Creek. This area is used heavily enough by fishermen that boating there would really mess it up for fishing. Nobody in that coalition wants to see boaters above Hwy 28. Changes were made on stocking decisions based on fish reports. It is based now strictly on science. This is different to 1976 when stocking was limited to Burrell Ford Road, and Hwy 28. There was some stocking at Bullpen Bridge in NC (all put/take type stocking). Below Hwy 28 there were some put/take places, but based on the info they have now, they don't stock at bullpen anymore. You have Hwy 28, then Burrell Ford Road, then Bullpen, then Girmshawes crossings. There was stocking at all 4 in 1976, but then they quit stocking at 2 places in NC (Bullpen and Girmshawes). The two bridges in GA/SC (Hwy 28 and Burrell) are still stocking.

The only management in 1976 (the states active management) was the put/take points along the 4 bridges. I don't remember any limitations on boating until the ban was put on. But now they have better fish management. They do water quality monitoring, invertebrate monitoring, etc. to help the

fisheries and overall water conditions. From 1986 to present it is specific scientific management. The boating ban [of 1976] is part of the management. So in 1976 it was the first attempt to manage the river and that was to separate boaters and fishermen. The prime management was put/take prior to 1976 and up until 1986. There was not that much boating at that time – it was just getting started. They had some interest with some people but now it's a problem. There have been discussions about allowing boating just during certain times of the year and with certain water flows. But they haven't come up with a good plan yet. They are allowing a certain amount of boating above Hwy 28 to see at what level the fishermen will complain. I can tell you now that the first boater a fishermen sees is unreasonable.

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 – Just like any congressional designation, it goes out to the public just like any other. USFS came up with a proposal, put it in the Federal Register, asked to comment – when they put it in the FR whoever looks at it can send in comments. I'm sure there was some local USFS meetings, but not to the extent that they have these days. I can't remember who initiated the w&s proposal. The notice was probably placed in all local papers – I'm sure it was placed in the local papers.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

12 – It goes back again to the conflict with fishermen and boaters. It was just aesthetics, that's why they selected Hwy 28. It was a reasonable place make a break.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

13 – There were conflicts below Hwy 28 and that's the reason for the hassle before. There was real heavy use at the put/take areas. There was some conflict between 2 downstream (below Hwy 28) at that time near the put/take areas. USFS' solution was to give up something to get something else. This made USFS decide to get a reasonable point. Before the closure most boating was below Hwy 28 anyway. There was some boating above Hwy 28 but more below. Plus, it was a long way to get to the river from above Hwy 28 so that had good fishing. It was a long rough stretch and of course in low water, it's not that good (and not that many boaters went in the low water). And there was heavy stocking above, so some of the boaters probably didn't want to get in a fight. There was some boating even after the ban, but I'm not sure how they came through.

It's pretty simple. Trout Unlimited brought it up most of the time. DNR managed for fishermen primarily. USFS was trying to come up with a reasonable experience to give both the boaters and fishermen a quality experience.

**Charlie Huppuch, USDA Forest Service, Recreation Planner  
Interviewed on Thursday, July 13, 2006 from 3:35-4:15 p.m.**

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1 - Prior to 1976, USFS didn't own a lot of land around the river in the 60s and 70s. It was owned by a power company who later traded land with USFS. At that point (sometime in the late 60s, early 70s) the river was opened up to management by USFS. Charlie tried to survey/explore Section 1 of the river (above Hwy 28) when he first started there in the 60s. It was terrible and we almost didn't come back. It was very rugged, more so than in other sections. Before the WSR designation, it was so rugged – there was no organized trail system. It was wonderful because hardly anyone went up there, there was good fishing – that's the way at first before it became designated as a WSR. Then the movie came out and all kinds of people wanted to explore sections 2-4 (below Hwy 28). They started having a lot of drownings, especially when people were half drunk. The number of drownings got to be where they really needed to do some management. They started putting more restrictions on it and the number [of drownings] dropped off too. They left the area alone and then in the 70s when they were making the plan, they decided that the river could be zoned very well by closing the top portion above Hwy 28 because it was dangerous. They never thought the kayakers would go up there, and little did they know that some people were still trying it. So the supervisor and planner at the time (Charlie had already left) thought about zoning because of the danger – below Hwy 28 it was easier for people not so skilled. The river kind of zoned itself – with the top being wild, no rafting, and just fishing. So the supervisor and planner thought it zoned itself nicely because they didn't think rafters would do the hard part. In the 80s-90s Charlie worked with this forest again (from Atlanta) to continue managing the trails, outfitters, etc. But they never thought about opening the upper portion because it was too rugged and too wild and there was good fishing there. So, you wouldn't have the conflict if zoned. The only thing that's changed is now you have kayakers who want more challenging experiences. So the whole thing was to keep it wild and keep the conflict at bay. At the time, they didn't think the kayakers would ever want to do the harder part. From Section 2-4, the river also gets worse going down, but Sect 4 is still not as bad as Section 1.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 – It wasn't too much but people were beginning to think about it, then the movie came out. In the 70s, section 1 wasn't used for boating, even in the 80s, until recently.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 – There is wilderness in a portion of WSR so all of those roads were closed. Then small USFS roads along the ¼ mile boundary were also closed. People used to camp, etc right near the river (and drive up to it and wash their vehicles in the river). Then the roads closed and people had to start walking in taking their rafts.

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 – It was dangerous in Section 1 and it was a wonderful idea to keep it for the fishermen and reduce conflicts. Of course they didn't think there would be a lot of conflict at that time.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 – Well, I wasn't really privy to it because I moved away to another forest. I wasn't involved in the public process, but that was before other acts made it necessary to have more public involvement. So the supervisor at that time made the decision and he liked to fish there too.

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 – No I don't think so. Like I said, they didn't think anyone would canoe section 1. They didn't think anyone would run it because it was so bad. They thought it was a wonderful section for fishermen.

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 – It was lightly used by fishermen back then. Not a case of over-capacity. Sections 2-4 were not overrun in 1976 but after the movie it started to pick up. USFS said they would go with 3 outfitters to do real management (the outfitters set up how many runs/day, how many people on the river, etc). That was contested by other outfitters too. Use really built up after the movie then it just continued to grow. But they kept the capacity down by allowing the outfitters only x number of people per day. I assume it was good fishing below Hwy 28 – people would drive to the river and the natives fished there. The tourists were mainly boaters. In 1976, it wasn't that big a deal for fishing. Sections 3-4 still had conflicts with anglers.

***What stocking decisions were made and why?***

9 – Doesn't know.

***In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?***

10 – Before 1976, it was pretty light management, not that intensive. USFS started to do some management techniques. Got a lot more intensive after the management plan and it was designated WSR (mainly later in the 80s).

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 – I wasn't involved in that – more decisions after that in the late 80-90s. Bill Craig, the recreation planner at that time died.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

12 – I don't think there was anything – just light use – nothing heavy, maybe some dispersed camping. That was the only use before 1976. I camped there in the late 80s and it was still light camping and fishing.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

13 – All kinds. Management reduced impacts driving to the river. They were having conflicts seeing groups on the river so started managing that. The river was being managed very well in the 80s and 90s. Today USFS doesn't have the personnel to manage it like it did back then. They used to have wilderness and river rangers – not sure if they have those anymore. It came from a rugged area because of no management to something nice. It will be a travesty if they allow it to disintegrate.

**Jeff Durniak, Georgia DNR, Regional Fisheries Coordinator  
Interviewed on July 14, 2006**

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1 – Jeff came on in 1985 and is working with Cleeves on issues, providing technical stuff. He doesn't have any direct relation to the closure of the river in 1976. But his agency is one of two agencies (GA and SC DNR) that is affected by the river.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 – Personally, he doesn't know.

***What user conflicts occurred prior to the closure in 1976?***

3 – As I understand from other river and wildlife managers, the conflicts were between several users. Boaters and anglers and equestrian users and non-equestrian users. In other words, the competition for space at access roads is increasing. Just driving to the river can create problems – you can still drive to the river at some areas.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 – Some roads were closed and created competition for that space with competing/conflicting recreation types. WRS designation closed roads because they were within a ¼ mile corridor with scenic and wild classifications – the roads were severely limited. The recreation classification is more liberal, the scenic classification tightens up, and the wild classification is practically wilderness.

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 – It appeared to be, from USFS documents. The documents in the Federal Register creating it included strongly zoned uses. This promoted boating and the quality of boating on the lower river. Also, this promoted fishing and the quality of fishing on the upper river. It [zoning] is a valid management tool based on USFS's written narrative. DNR supports the existing zoning and existing management plan for the river.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 – n/a

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 – I think all the documents were made on capacity concerns. In some of the specific access points, it was the only access point in several river miles. The users were dumping out at those points. It was the perception of the USFS river corridor at the time and their perceptions of capacity.

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 – Not qualified to answer

***What stocking decisions were made and why?***

9- Refer to SC DNR because they do the vast majority of stocking. The stocking decisions were dictated by USFS. Basically, SC DNR was asked to cease stocking of trout on the lower river and encouraged to stock it up higher (i.e., zoning). The whole crux of the matter is the zoning.

***In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?***

10 – Based on history record, it was managed for both. That’s what USFS does – they manage multiple uses. I think they tried to zone and manage it better.

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 – Based on written record, had public meetings and a chance to call or send a note to USFS. I think that’s in the public record for USFS management plan based on my secondhand knowledge through USFS and DNR it was an extensive process. There was ample public opportunity.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

12 – Unaware of any at that time

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

13 – Unaware of any at that time

**Dillard Barron, USDA Forest Service, Law Enforcement Officer  
Interviewed on July 11, 2006**

Dillard Barron did not want to be interviewed, fearing that his involvement with the Chattooga River was not significant enough to cover management issue questions. He did, however, consent to giving me his opinion on any law enforcement issues and users on the river.

Dillard Barron was a law enforcement officer on the Tallulah District of the Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest in the 1970s. He remembers that the locals were largely supportive of the Chattooga being designated as a Wild and Scenic River. He also remembers that once the tourist floaters began angering local fisherman confrontations between those to communities of place became common. He believes that by 1975 a lot of the conflicts had died down.

**Max Gates, USDA Forest Service, District Ranger  
Interviewed on July 12, 2006**

Maxie Gates consented to a recorded interview.

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1 – Andrew Pickens District Ranger from 1961 to 1972.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 – The river was very wild. Not many users besides local fisherman, and perhaps a stray floater or inner tuber.

***What user conflicts occurred prior to the closure in 1976?***

3 – After Deliverance and the 1971 WSR study there were conflicts. Before that time, there were no conflicts. With the influx of people coming to float the river, the locals and the “outsiders got into conflicts. There were no outfitters to help control the crowds and to guide people on how to use the river. There were deaths, 17 – 19 drownings.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 – The roads were closed due to the WSRA direction that roads within a ¼ mile corridor.

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 – There was not a lot of stocking going on prior to 1971.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 – Boating ban was to control the use of the river to some extent. The river was divided into zones, and section 1 (above Hwy. 28) was arbitrarily chosen to close to floating. That part wasn't as suitable for floating because of the flows.

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 – Besides user conflicts, no issues before the ban of boating.

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 – They were concerned with the solitude experience. They decision was made to allow no more than three outfitters. The outfitters had a limit to how many rafts they could take on the river, to avoid crowding. The limit was close to 6 rafts an hour apart.

***What stocking decisions were made and why?***

9 – No stocking ban was in place before 1972

***In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?***

10 – The river was being managed for both floating and fishing, and any other applicable use.

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 – There were public meetings held in Walhalla, Clemson, Highlands, and Clayton.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

12/13 – They were concerned with both resource and social impacts. They wanted to provide a wilderness experience, but the river got crowded easily when groups of floaters encountered other groups of floaters on the river. The resource impacts did not seem to be occurring, so they were primarily concerned with social impacts. Fisherman tended to feel pushed out, and looking for other places to fish because of the floaters.

**Jim Barrett, USDA Forest Service, District Ranger**  
**Interviewed on July 13, 2006**

Jim Barrett did not consent to be recorded.

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1 – District Ranger for the Francis Marion and Sumter National Forest.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 – Little use until WSRA study and the release of Deliverance, which increased use and conflict.

***What user conflicts occurred prior to the closure in 1976?***

3 – Before the closure no significant conflicts, the river was low and that made for good fly fishing.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 – The roads were closed to limit access as directed in the WSRA.

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 – Remembers that safety was a large part of the decision because of the rugged sections that were difficult for beginners to navigate. They also wanted to manage that area of the river for fishing because of the pristine nature of it. The section above Hwy 28 was best suited for fishing and hiking.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 – Road closures were a major issue. The locals were being limited from historically used roads and that caused a lot of controversy.

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 – Capacity was thought of in terms of the wilderness experience. Capacity limits were studied so as not to overload the resource, but to manage for a solitude experience was the emphasis as that time.

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 – At that time the managers knew that too many users would detract from a good experience, and that was exactly what was happening.

***What stocking decisions were made and why?***

9 – Remembers that in sections designated as wild there was no stocking, so above that section in NC there was stocking (in the headwaters). Does not remember any ban on stocking.

***In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?***

10 – The river was managed for both, and more under the multiple use approach.

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 – There were public sessions where people were given the opportunity to express their opinions.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

12/13 – Social impacts were more prevalent than any resource impacts above and below Highway 28. Once access was limited, the visual aspect of the river corridor improved.

**Dan Rankin, South Carolina DNR, Regional Fisheries Coordinator  
Interviewed on July 18, 2006**

Dan was happy to participate in the interview process but wanted to be sure that we knew his involvement with the Chattooga is current, and what he knows about the closure history he learned from his trainers and supervisors at DNR who were there when the ban was initiated.

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1 – Department of Natural Resources Regional Fisheries Coordinator for 14 counties surrounding the Chattooga River. Has experience on the river as a resource manager and user, and was trained by the Fisheries Biologist of the 1970s and 80s.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 – n/a

***What user conflicts occurred prior to the closure in 1976?***

3 – From his former supervisor, Randy Geddings, he learned that there were conflicts below Highway 28 between boaters and anglers. No recollections of much use by boaters or conflicts above Highway 28.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 – The road closures were directed by the Wild and Scenic River Act (WSRA).

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 – From what he was told, conflicts were the main reasons.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 – n/a

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 – n/a

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 – n/a

***What stocking decisions were made and why?***

9 – DNR stocked put/take trout at several locations along the river. Once roads were closed some stocking ceased because the stations were inaccessible (Thrifts Ferry, Sandy Ford, Earls Ford, Big Island, and Battleground).

Highway 76 was a particular stocking site that DNR was asked, by letter from the District Ranger, to stop stocking in order to control conflicts between boaters and anglers. Dan believes that the ranger

thought as long as the trout were scarce, fishing would cease in that area and conflicts would be cut down.

Stocking above Highway 28 was never an issue, as boating was limited there so fishing was supported.

***In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?***

10 – Both, in different sections.

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 – n/a

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

12 – n/a

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

13 – n/a

**James Culp, USDA Forest Service, River Ranger  
Responded to questionnaire sent to him on August 10, 2006**

***What is your connection to the Chattooga River Closure?***

1 - I worked for the USFS as the "River Ranger" between 1974 - 1980. As such, I was the primary author of the first Wild & Scenic River Management Plan.

***What was the condition of the river prior to the closure in 1976?***

2 - This is too vague to really answer. Essentially, river usage of all categories was increasing (boating, fishing, hiking, off-road vehicles, horse-back riding, etc.). Consequently, adverse environmental impact was increasing, more in some places than others.

***What user conflicts occurred prior to the closure in 1976?***

3 - There had been several reports of incidents of verbal confrontations between users. Occasionally, it was reported that guns were waved but there is nothing other than anecdotal evidence. The majority of the confrontations were between anglers and boater/innertubers on the portion of the river commonly referred to as Section II (HWY 28 - Earles Ford). I frequently had run-ins with innertubers and canoeist while I was fishing. Most had no real control over their crafts and I was expected to get out of their way. In their defense, once committed to a rapid your ability to maneuver becomes limited.

***Why were the roads closed?***

4 - Road access was closed to protect the river from undue erosion. Also, within those sections of the river classified as "Wild," the management philosophy was to manage similarly to a wilderness area (e.g. no motorized equipment or access).

***What were the reasons for developing the boating ban above Hwy 28?***

5 - During that time (early 1970's) most rigid watercraft were made of either aluminum, fiberglass or ABS. Kayaks were longer (13'2" typically) and (arguably) less maneuverable. The upper Chattooga is the most suitable portion of river for sustaining trout, as most of the river is too warm and too turbid. The upper river would be navigable only during periods of high run-off and, even then, be a very dangerous section for all but the most capable boater. The inaccessibility of the gorge would make rescue difficult and dangerous for the S&R personnel. The steepness of the river combined with the narrow and very technical channels and lack of established portages made it generally not suitable for boating. By restricting boaters to the area below HWY 28 Bridge, we provide to the hiking/angling public an area where they can go to experience a wilderness environment without concern about conflict with boaters. Our approach was to recognize that "the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few" and to provide "the greatest good for the greatest number over the longest time." The number of times the section could be navigated SAFELY is very small; the number of boaters who could SAFELY run the section during those flows is also very small. The blanket restriction precludes those boaters who overestimate their ability and/or underestimate the water flow. It also precludes the "Macho" effect.

***What issues were you addressing prior to the closure?***

6 - Prior to the closure, I lived in a house owned by the USFS near what is now the HWY 28 Access Site. It was almost normal for me to be awakened to a pounding on my door to either go pull some jeep driver out or go look for some overdue tube rider above HWY 28. It happened many times a summer. We were addressing the environmental impacts of the ORV, the adverse impact that ORV have on a "wilderness experience," the safety of the S&R personnel and the safety of the visitor.

***Where any decisions made based on capacity concerns?***

7 - Not that I can recall. Most of the river use was concentrated to the summer months, which allowed significant recovery time for the resource.

***In your opinion, was the river approaching capacity at the time?***

8 - No, not overall. There were times at very specific locations where it may have been (e.g. HWY 76 bridge over July 4th) but those were isolated events.

***What stocking decisions were made and why?***

9 - Trout populations on the Chattooga are essentially a Put and Take proposition. Stockings were done on a regular basis at road access points although we did conduct helicopter stocking once or twice between HWY 28 and Burrell's Ford. To my knowledge, all stocking decisions were made by the SC Dept of Natural Resources. Perry Shatley (wildlife technician for the APRD during that time) could be of more help. I think he still lives in the Walhalla area.

***In your opinion, was the river being managed for boating or angling?***

10 - The river was being managed for the protection of the resource and the safety of the visitor. Efforts were being made to accommodate ALL users. The area with the best fishing was available for fishermen; the area best suited for boating was available for boaters.

***How was the public involved and/or consulted during the decision-making process?***

11 - Yes. Prior to going to publication, I talked with representatives from the commercial outfitters, the Georgia Canoe Association, the Sierra Club, Trout Unlimited, SC Dept. of Natural Resources, US Fish & Wildlife Service (who formerly ran the Fish Hatchery), Oconee County Sheriff's office, Rabun County Sheriff's office, the State Office of the USFS, and the RO of the USFS. After that, there were the "normal" public hearings prior to implementation. As I recall, there were three public hearings. Interestingly, most of the outcry was about the road closures. The USFS really caught hell about that.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use above Hwy 28?***

12 - Erosion, degradation of water quality, litter, loss of "wilderness experience," and incompatible uses (boating/fishing). It was felt that the reduced access resulting from restrictions on ORV use would alleviate most of those impacts while the boating restriction would resolve the last.

***What impacts were believed to occur from river use below Hwy 28?***

13 - Similar to above but the area below HWY 28 Bridge, down to Earle's Ford at least, is managed in a different context. Consequently, the loss of "wilderness experience" was considered acceptable. The reduced access again would resolve most of the impacts.