

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
1	SCPRT	Add bullet to list of goals that reads “Set a baseline for future studies to determine changes over time.”	1-1	Although we agree the results of the study provide a baseline for future studies to determine future changes over time, this was not an original goal of the study as identified in the final study plan. We believe establishing a baseline (or another data point) is inherent in any study; thus, the change is not necessary.
2	SCPRT	Insert “(from 2001) after “existing aerial photographs” in first sentence of Section 2.0.	2-1	Edit has been made to the final report.
3	SCPRT	In regards to “full pond (360’ PD)” in the fourth line in Section 2.1, shouldn’t normal operating levels have been used? Or at least note that normal target level is ___ and operations occur between ___ ft and ___ ft., perhaps adding occasionally to an increased perception of crowding.	2-1	A discussion of how fluctuating lake levels may affect the results of the study is included in Section 4.0. We identified that full pond would be used in the study plan, but recognized that lower lake levels would affect the usable boating acreage of each segment.
4	SCPRT	Should the last sentence of the first paragraph of footnote #2 have “In periods of intense and lengthy drawdowns” inserted in front of the sentence?	2-1	This paragraph is copied verbatim from Lake Murray’s current Shoreline Management Plan. Floating docks may be moved during the lower winter levels provided they do not interfere with lake access.

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
5	SCPRT	In regards to the heading of Section 2.2, I suggest using the word estimate instead of count or tally since you are not actually counting the boats in 2006 nor do you have coverage of the whole lake and are estimating usage of different types of boating (Change throughout the document).	2-3	We have changed the heading to “Boat Count Estimates” and have updated the entire document to reflect the new wording.
6	SCPRT	There is additional estimation reported in the second paragraph of Section 2.2 in the phrase “the lake was only partially covered by aerial photography on some dates.”	2-3	You are correct; during the analysis of the existing photographs we discovered the entire lake was not photographed on some of the flights. We used the percentage of the lake that was not photographed to adjust our counts to reflect this. Although the general consensus of personnel involved with the original flights was there were not photographs because there were no boats in these areas, we felt our method of escalation provided a reasonable estimate of boats on the lake.
7	SCPRT	Change “count” to “estimate” in the first full sentence on this page.	2-4	See response to Comment #5.
8	SCPRT	Change the phrase “final boat counts estimated for 2006” to final boat estimates for 2006” in the first sentence under the section “Existing Recreational Boating Capacity”	2-6	See response to Comment #5.

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
9	SCPRT	Add a footnote after “estimates” in new phrase from previous comment that reads “Final boat estimates for 2006 are an estimate from the 2001 air photos with adjustments based on population increases for the area counties.”	2-6	Edit has been made to the final report.
10	SCPRT	In regards to the sentence “Since canoeing and kayaking are activities that can, and often do, take place within the 75-foot perimeter, we used the total estimated acreage for this activity rather than the usable acreage,” I doubt paddlers want to paddle in and out between docks either, but in cove ends and creek channels this makes sense.	3-1	Comment noted. No response necessary.
11	SCPRT	Change “Boat Counts” to “Boat Estimates” in heading of Section 3.2.	3-2	See response to Comment #5.
12	SCPRT	Change “count” to “estimate” in first sentence of Section 3.2.	3-2	See response to Comment #5.
13	SCPRT	Change “count” to “estimate” in second sentence of Section 3.2.	3-2	See response to Comment #5.
14	SCPRT	Change “Counts” to “Estimates” in heading of Table 3-2.	3-2	See response to Comment #5.

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
15	SCPRT	Change heading of first column to “Weekend”. Since you have no photos from these dates, you are giving a false impression of exact information rather than estimates. I suggest naming them weekend 1, weekend 2, etc. and providing a footnote about how it was derived. Some reviewers will only look at the table and believe you actually surveyed on these dates. An alternative would be Early May 06, Mid May 06, etc.	3-2	We have edited the table to reflect that we did not actually count boats on those dates in 2006.
16	SCPRT	How were distributions of boating use presented in Figures 3-1 and 3-2 determined? Was this from the public access site surveys, PRT data, or could you see it from the photos?	3-5	A citation to the Recreation Assessment Study Report, from which this information was derived, has been added to this section.
17	SCPRT	Insert “and character” after “ size” in the first sentence of the second paragraph.	3-6	Edit has been made to the final report.
18	SCPRT	Adding all Est. Opt. Boating Use from pages 3-11 through 3-13, I came up with 6,575, not the 6,577 reported in the second paragraph	3-6	The difference between the table and the text was due to rounding; we have edited the text to accurately reflect what is presented in the table.

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
19	SCPRT	<p>I'm not sure how you determined the different estimates since canoes/kayaks and probably jet skis are hard to identify in the air photos. I assume that power boating, angling, and water skiing are estimated from public rec. sites interviews. Sailing interviews were extremely limited since most dock at private/commercial marinas or residences.</p> <p>I suspect that Canoeing/Kayaking, Jet Skiing, and Sailing are underestimated because: 1. they are difficult to count on air photos, 2. you did not interview except at public rec. sites, and 3. you are only looking at certain weekends and holidays.</p> <p>It is odd that only 13 sailboats were reported for the entire study and 11 canoes and kayaks and each in just a few segments.</p> <p>It is also unusual that no jet skis were reported in 5 segments on weekends and 6 segments on holidays.</p>	3-7	<p>We have added footnotes to Figures 3-1 and 3-2 to clear up where the activity distributions come from.</p> <p>We have also edited the paragraph in Section 4.0 where this is discussed to reflect your concerns over different activity distributions between public sites and private and commercial access sites.</p>
20	SCPRT	<p>It seems really strange that 100% of the boat traffic in this highly residential and open water area is related to fishing – on a holiday especially. There are no power boats, jet skis, sailboats, or waterskiing???</p>	3-9	<p>Comment noted. According the results from the Recreation Assessment, use from public access areas for the section was solely fishing.</p>

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
21	SCPRT	Is Table 3-5 showing boating use or boating capacity? It would also help if the footnotes were on each page.	3-11	We have changed the table header to reflect that it shows “optimum recreation boating use”, which is also the capacity. We have included the footnotes on each page of the table.
22	SCPRT	Is the row reported as “Estimated Optimum Boating Use” a number of boats?	3-11	Yes; we have updated the table to make it easier to understand that this is a number of boats.
23	SCPRT	Change second sentence of first paragraph to read “Results show that Lake Murray is currently utilized well below its recreational boating capacity.”	3-14	Edit has been made to the final report.
24	SCPRT	Change footnote b in Table 3-6 to “from aerial estimates x population growth estimates”	3-14	Edit has been made to the final report.
25	SCPRT	Change footnote d in Table 3-6 to “from aerial estimates x population growth estimates”	3-14	Edit has been made to the final report.
26	SCPRT	In the last sentence of the second paragraph, 12 percent was used on page 3-14.	4-1	Edit has been made to the final report.
27	SCPRT	The discussion of the fluctuating water level in the third paragraph would be better if worked into the calculations up front.	4-1	See response to Comment #3.
28	SCPRT	Insert “Based on current population projections,” before the first sentence in the fourth paragraph.	4-1	Edit has been made to the final report.
29	SCPRT	Insert “30-“ before “50” in the parentheses of the first sentence of the fourth paragraph.	4-1	Edit has been made to the final report.

Response to Comments on the Boat Density Report

Saluda Project

JUNE 2007

Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Page #	Response
30	SCPRT	Insert “30-year” before the phrase “time frame” in the sentence “If we exclusively look at these projections and relate them to increased boating use, no segment will approach capacity during this time frame” in the first partial paragraph.	4-2	Edit has been made to the final report.
31	SCPRT	Insert the word “each” before “lake segment” in the first sentence of the first full paragraph.	4-2	Edit has been made to the final report.
32	SCPRT	Change the word “count” to “estimates” in the first and third sentences of the second paragraph.	4-2	Edit has been made to the final report.
33	SCPRT	You may want to note that many public access sites were identified in your other study as being at or approaching capacity and concentrations near these facilities may account for some perceptions of over-crowding.	4-4	We have included some additional discussion to reflect this concern.