From:	Everett, C. Stuart
To:	comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us; akimbell@fs.fed.us
Subject:	Chattooga Headwaters Managment Plan feedback - I support Alternative 8!
Date:	08/15/2008 08:27 AM

While I appreciate the effort the forest service has put into conducting the Capacity & Conflict Study on the Upper Chattooga, I resent the presupposition that, in all cases of angler-boater encounters, the angler's experience is presumed to be negatively impacted by the boater's presence rather than the boater's experience being negatively impacted by the angler.

Whitewater enthusiasts have not trampled 19 miles worth of unauthorized trails, left fishing line hanging from tree limbs along the river corridor, littered the forest with bait containers or food wrappers, nor have they 'impaired' the water quality of tributaries by operating a hatchery for a non-native and invasive trout species.

If whitewater boating is to be banned, or limited too peak days when the Forest Service predicts 450 cfs flows, then angling should also be restricted to peak days which are predicted by the Forest Service no more than 24 hours in advance and the limited number of trout permits which are good on only those days and available in the same locations as the whitewater permits. I propose that peak angling days can be announced on the forest service web site - perhaps on the same page as the peak whitewater day announcements. By doing so, the polluting trout hatchery could theoretically be closed as the pressure on the non-native trout population would be drastically diminished. I think we can all agree that a less impaired Chattooga would best satisfy the mandate of the Forest Service and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

If anglers as a user group are not being required to restrict their activities within the National Forest and/or on the Chattooga River, then I see no case for against whitewater users. Integration has been around since the 1960's and there is no separate but equal justification that can be made for limiting boaters to a handful of bureaucratically determined days during which they can enjoy the National Forests which belong to the American taxpayers.

I urge you to reconsider the current favored alternative (#4) and move forward instead with Alternative #8.

Sincerely,
Stuart Everett
Kingsport, TN