From:	Lynn Saussy
To:	comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@fs.fed.us
cc:	saxby_chambliss@chambliss.senate.gov; johnny_isakson@isakson.senate.gov; info@gafw.org; ga04ima@mail.house.gov
Subject:	Oppose boating on Upper Chattooga
Date:	07/17/2008 04:45 PM

Dear USDA Forest Service,
I am writing you personally to let you know I oppose Alternate #4 strongly. We, as people, need to understand, to see, that protecting our rivers from boating which is actually taking care of ourselves and our future generations. These pristine headwaters of the Upper Chattooga are so valuable that by keeping them protected and off limits to boating, we are ensuring our health and safety in the long run.
The boaters have plenty of places to go already.
Please please tell them no and to stop acting like demanding children!!

I support Alternate #2 and #3 which restrict boating in the Upper Chattooga River.

We are the species with the brains and foresight to mother/father the earth. We have the voice and the rivers, the animals and the trees do not. Stand up for these beings with your voice!!!
Thank you!
Sincerely,
Lynn Saussy
404-378-1631

I have copied below the comments from the Georgia ForestWatch to further emphasize the importance of your actions! Please read them.

The proposal does not appear to ensure the solitude and other "outstandingly remarkable values" required by law to be protected over all other considerations in the Ellicott Wilderness.

• The EA and the Alternative 4 proposal are geared toward the preferences of boaters and anglers, but ignore the needs of the many people who visit the Upper Chattooga corridor for traditional pastimes like swimming, hiking, camping, hunting, botanizing, nature photography and "getting away from it all for that rarest of experiences, solitude."

• The Forest Service proposal for boating does not clearly commit the law enforcement and resource protection personnel necessary to regulate a new, intrusive form of recreation and to educate the public about the new rules in this part of the river corridor.

• The proposal does not consistently and properly prevent the removal from the River of large woody debris (which is essential to the natural functioning of the river and the health of fish and other aquatic life; boaters like to cut these down trees out of the way); nor does it protect the various sensitive native plant species also found

in the corridor.

• Whitewater enthusiasts and "creek boaters" who are pushing hard for the new access already have miles and miles of challenging white water nearby on the 36 miles of the lower Chattooga, on Overflow and Holcomb Creeks, and on the West Fork, where boating is already legal and permitted.