From: Michelle Burnett
To: comments-southern-francismarion-sumter@FSNOTES
Subject: Fw: Chattooge River plan
Date: 07/31/2008 10:13 AM

<><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><>

Michelle Burnett
Public Affairs Officer
Francis Marion & Sumter
National Forests (South Carolina)
4931 Broad River Road
Columbia, SC 29212-3530

Phone: (803) 561-4091
Fax: (803) 561-4004
Cell: (803) 920-6167
E-mail: michelleburnett@fs.fed.us
Website: http://www.fs.fed.us/r8/fms

----- Forwarded by Michelle Burnett/R8/USDAFS on 07/31/2008 10:13 AM -----

Jeanne LeBoeuf/R8/USDAFS

07/30/2008 12:49 PM

To Michelle Burnett/R8/USDAFS@FSNOTES
cc
Subject Fw: Chattooge River plan

==========

Jeanne S. LeBoeuf
Staff Assistant to Forest Supervisor
Francis Marion & Sumter NFs in SC
Phone 803-561-4081
Fax 803-561-4004
Confidential Fax 803-561-4082
Email: jleboeuf@fs.fed.us

==========

----- Forwarded by Jeanne LeBoeuf/R8/USDAFS on 07/30/2008 12:49 PM -----

Rosanne Rowe / WO / USDAFS

07/30/2008 12:48 PM

To Jerome Thomas/R8/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Jeanne LeBoeuf/R8/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc Chris N Brown/WO/USDAFS@FSNOTES

Subject Fw: Chattooge River plan

Rosanne Rowe
Executive Assistant to the Chief
WO, Office of the Chief, Yates 4NW
Office: 202-205-8439
Cell: 202-384-7412
Fax: 202-358-4063
Email: rosannerowe@fs.fed.us

----- Forwarded by Rosanne Rowe/WO/USDAFS on 07/30/2008 12:48 PM -----

"Knox Worde" <playboatr@earthlink.net>

07/30/2008 11:54 AM

Please respond to playboatr@earthlink.net

To akimbell@fs.fed.us

cc

Subject Re: Chattooge River plan

Dear Ms Kimbell,

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

- The USFS has spent thirteen years searching for a reason to limit paddling on the Chattooga and has found ***none***. It is time to open the river to boating.
- The EA is not a user capacity analysis and does not reference one. The American Whitewater appeal

decision required a user capacity analysis. Where is it?

- No alternative is acceptable because they all include boating bans on the upper Chattooga Cliffs reach and on tributaries without any justification.
- The EA and preferred alternative are not equitable or protective of the river because they considers 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 wilderness conforming existing uses in unlimited numbers.. This is not equitable and not acceptable! Using the flow and date limitations listed under the proposal and reviewing historical flow data; only 1 day in the last 5 years would boating been possibly allowed!
- 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.
- 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 directing that a real user capacity analysis be conducted and immediately allowing boating in the same numbers, places, and seasons that allow all existing users.

In closing I would like to comment that I am also a fisherman; I have been so for over 45 years. I can see no logic in the claim of a "conflict" between persons fishing and boating; it just isn't true. This proposed ruling is irrational, unjustifiable and is in violation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. It is unfortunate that additional taxpayers' dollars will be spent before this issue is rightfully resolved.

Thank you for considering these comments,

Sincerely,

T K Worde

763 J E Burnette Rd
Bryson City, NC 28713

Knox Worde
playboatr@earthlink.net