From:	Mike Felts
Reply To:	Mike Felts
To:	comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us
cc:	patrick.mchenry@mail.house.gov; elizabeth.dole@senate.gov; richard.burr@senate.gov; senator_burr@burr.senate.gov; senator@burr.senate.gov; senator_dole@dole.senate.gov; senator@dole.senate.gov
Subject:	Chattooga River Project Comments
Date:	07/10/2008 12:23 AM

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

07/10/2008

RE: Chattooga River Project Comments

Dear Sumter National Forest,

My name is Mike Felts. I live in Hickory, NC and work as a business and technology consultant based in Charlotte, NC and working in Washington, DC and Raleigh, NC. As well, I spend as much time as I can outside and a portion of that time is spent on the beutiful waterways within NC and surrounding states.

I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment regarding the recreational management of the Chattooga River. I disagree with your analysis and your proposal. Both treat me and my community of river enthusiasts unfairly and your proposal would not meet my interests. Please consider the following concerns I have regarding this issue:

* The EA and preferred alternative are not equitable or protective of the river because they consider boating to be the only management variable, while other larger more impactful uses are not seriously considered for limits.
* The USFS preferred alternative includes a total ban on 2/3 of the upper river, a ban on tributary boating, and allows only 0-6 days of limited boating on the remaining reach – while allowing all other existing uses in unlimited numbers. This is not equitable and not acceptable!
* The EA offers no basis for the boating bans and limits
* The EA lacks a full range of alternatives
* The EA is no better or different than the last one, is at least a year late and has wasted millions in tax payer money

* The USFS hired qualified consultants and then ignored their input

* The 450 CFS average daily flow trigger in the preferred alternative is a flawed measure that should be eliminated from any considerations. There is no way a paddler can know this number and will be an administrative burden for the agency.

* Paddlers prefer an alternative similar to Alternative 8 that 1) fully allows boating on the entire Chattooga River below Grimshawes Bridge, 2) allows paddling on tributaries, 3) includes encounter standards based on a real user capacity analysis, 4) will equitably limit total use only when encounter standards are consistently exceeded, and 5) will do so using all available indirect measures first.

* The public should have the right to float on public Wild and Scenic Rivers regardless of who owns the land along the river.

* All aspects of the "Outstanding Remarkable Values" of Wild and Scenic Rivers should be protected on the entire river, not just in some areas.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please consider conducting a real user capacity analysis and immediately allowing boating in the same numbers, places, and seasons that you allow existing users. Paddling should be allowed in a similar manner to your alternative number 8, except on the entire Upper Chattooga River and its tributaries.

Thank you for considering these comments,

Sincerely,

J. Michael Felts II
2325 25th Avenue Ct NE
Hickory, NC 28601