

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1:

Questions and Answers about the New River Wild and Scenic River Study (Revised: Summer 2004)

What is the Upper New River Wild and Scenic River Study?

The United States Congress created the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System in 1968 to protect some of the nation's most outstanding free-flowing rivers and river segments for the benefit of future generations. The Upper New River Wild and Scenic River Study was authorized by the Congress and the President to determine whether an approximately 20-mile section of the New River straddling the Virginia/West Virginia border should be added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The study is being conducted by the National Park Service.

When was the study authorized?

The study was authorized on October 26, 1992, with the enactment of Public Law 102-525, which amended Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)).

What is the study area?

The study area is defined by Public Law 102-525 as follows:

"The segment defined by public lands commencing at the U.S. Route 460 Bridge over the New River in [Glen Lyn] Virginia to the maximum summer pool elevation (1410 feet above mean sea level) of Bluestone Lake in [Hinton] West Virginia."

The authorizing legislation limits the Wild and Scenic River study area to the river segment and the adjacent corridor defined by public lands owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers within the Bluestone Project Area.

Wasn't this study completed during the 1990s?

No. The National Park Service (NPS) started the study soon after its authorization by Congress and completed several initial steps, but the study was put on hold in 1997 before it could be completed.

Why was the study put on hold?

To allow staff from the New River Gorge National River and the West Virginia Division of Natural Resources (DNR) to focus on developing a new license agreement for the Bluestone National Scenic River (NSR), which is adjacent to the study area. The park and the West Virginia DNR came to an agreement on the new license for the Bluestone NSR in the fall of 2002, and the study was reactivated in 2003.

Who is conducting the study?

The Northeast Region / Philadelphia Office of the National Park Service has lead responsibility for the study on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior (who was assigned responsibility in the authorizing legislation). The National Park Service has engaged Phil Huffman and Drew Parkin, consultants with substantial experience on Wild and Scenic River studies, to assist with the project.

What is the study process?

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides a process for determining whether rivers are *eligible* and *suitable* for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System.

To be *eligible*, a river or river segment must be free-flowing and possess at least one outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historical, cultural, or other similar value. Eligible segments are classified as “wild”, “scenic”, or “recreational” based on established criteria, including existing water quality, the amount of development along the river corridor, and accessibility.

The *suitability* determination involves an evaluation of whether Wild and Scenic River designation would be an appropriate element of long-term management of the river or, in other words, whether designation makes sense for the river in question. This evaluation includes:

- considerations of existing land ownership and management,
- alternatives for how the river might be administered and managed if designated,
- what the effects of designation might be (including whether designation would provide additional protection to important river-related resources), and
- whether there is support for designation among key stakeholders (*e.g.*, local communities, state and federal agencies, and nongovernmental organizations).

Has the river been found eligible for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System?

The National Park Service released a draft eligibility report in July 1994. The Study Team has recently verified and updated the findings from the draft report. The study segment is eligible for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and meets the criteria for “scenic” river classification.

Six outstandingly remarkable resource values have been documented in the study area: scenery, fish, wildlife, recreation, geology/hydrology, and archeological/historic resources.

Does management of river flows at the Claytor Dam upstream or the Bluestone Dam downstream affect the study segment’s “free-flowing” condition and eligibility for Wild and Scenic River designation?

No. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act defines free-flowing as “existing or flowing in a natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modification of the waterway.” This definition applies to modifications of the waterway *within* the established boundaries of the study area, and therefore does not preclude eligibility in cases with impoundments upstream or downstream and managed flows.

Indeed, there are many examples of designated Wild and Scenic Rivers above and below existing dams and impoundments, such as the Bluestone National Scenic River. And while the segment of the Upper New River currently under study is subject to occasional inundation for downstream flood control at times of high flows, the segment is flowing and riverine in appearance most of the time and meets the “free-flowing” criterion.

What are the next steps in the study process?

(1) Evaluate the pros and cons of potential management alternatives for the study area (including some with Wild and Scenic River designation and some without), (2) Prepare a draft study report for public review and comment, and (3) Identify an appropriate alternative for future management (if possible). These steps will be completed before the National Park Service presents the study findings to the Secretary of Interior. Following departmental review, the final report will be forwarded to the President, who transmits it with a recommendation to the Congress. It is then up to the Congress to decide whether to designate the study area into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System through federal legislation.

Will there be opportunities for the public to participate in the study process?

Yes. The National Park Service will hold open public gatherings at key junctures in the process to provide information and seek public input. The NPS will publicize these events through the local media and other mechanisms. The first round of public open houses was held in December 2003. Additional public gatherings will be held in July and fall, 2004. These events will be publicized through press releases to the regional media and announcements to individuals on the NPS mailing list for the project.

Have any decisions been made as a result of this study about future management or designation of the river?

No. The National Park Service does not have any preconceived ideas regarding future management or designation, other than that the river and its adjacent corridor should be managed to conserve the important resource values identified in the eligibility analysis.

Will there be a land transfer if the river is designated?

The National Park Service has no preconception regarding whether this would be desirable or warranted, nor is there any requirement that this be a component of management. The issue will be one of many to be considered in the exploration of possible management alternatives.

Who will make the final decision about whether or not to designate the river?

The National Park Service will prepare a study report that contains findings and several alternatives for future management. The report will be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, who will, in turn, forward it to the President. The report will be submitted to Congress by the President. A final decision to designate the study segment into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System would be in the form of federal legislation passed by Congress and signed by the President.

What are the implications of the study and potential wild and scenic designation on the Drift and Debris Study and the Dam Safety Assurance Project at Bluestone Dam?

The Wild and Scenic River study area stops at the maximum summer pool elevation of Bluestone Lake (1410 feet above sea level). The study and potential designation will have no effect on project operations that do not affect the river upstream of the current maximum summer pool elevation.

Would the Tri-Cities Hydropower Project be affected in any way if the river were to be added to the Wild and Scenic River system?

The National Park Service's understanding is that the hydropower project is proposed to be operated as a "run-of-river" project utilizing the existing maximum summer pool elevation. As such, the hydropower project would not be affected by Wild and Scenic River designation.

What effects would wild and scenic river designation have for the New River?

The fundamental result of designation would be a permanent prohibition on new dams and other water development projects that would have a negative effect on the river and related natural, cultural, and recreational resources. (In fact, one of the original reasons river advocates were interested in pursuing potential designation of the New River was to prevent a proposed electric transmission line from crossing the river in the heart of the study area.)

Designation also would increase the likelihood that federal actions of all kinds would be consistent with river management objectives. In addition, designation could serve as leverage to secure funding, technical assistance, volunteer involvement, and other commitments to improve river management and protection. Also, depending on how (or if) local interests wish to market the designation, it could be used to help bolster local economies through increased recreation and tourism. Less tangible benefits often accompany designation as well, including increased public awareness of the value of the river area and increased civic pride.

If the river were designated into the National Wild and Scenic River System, who would have management responsibility for the river and lands adjacent to the river within the study area?

No decisions have been made about future management of the river were it to be designated. This issue will be considered with the public during the evaluation of management alternatives, and the National Park Service will provide findings and alternatives on which agency or agencies might be assigned responsibility for managing and administering the river if it is designated.

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides flexibility in assigning management responsibility, as long as the river is managed to specified standards. Current Wild and Scenic Rivers include examples of federal management, state management, local management, and combinations.

Could the Army Corps of Engineers be the administering agency if the river were designated?

Yes. There is nothing in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act that would preclude the Army Corps of Engineers from being the administering agency. The Army Corps currently has administrative responsibility for a section of the Cossatot Wild and Scenic River in Arkansas.

Could the states of West Virginia and Virginia be the administering agencies?

Yes. There are a number of examples of state-administered National Wild and Scenic Rivers.

The most long-established example is the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, which has been administered by the state of Maine since its designation into the national system in 1970.

Would current hunting and fishing activities within the Bluestone Wildlife Management Area be allowed to continue if the river is designated?

Yes. Fishing and hunting are regulated under state laws. Hunting and fishing are allowed in Wild and Scenic River areas, except if additional regulations are necessary to ensure public safety (e.g., establishing no hunting zones near campgrounds) or to achieve other critical management objectives (e.g., protecting the habitat of an endangered species).

Who would manage wildlife and the existing campgrounds within the Bluestone Wildlife Management Area if the river were designated?

These issues will be considered during the evaluation of management alternatives, and the existing managers will be actively consulted and involved in the decision process. There is no Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requirement that would preclude the state(s) from continuing to manage campgrounds or wildlife management areas within a designated Wild and Scenic River. (For example, the West Virginia DNR currently manages the Bluestone River Unit of the Bluestone Wildlife Management Area, which surrounds the Bluestone National Scenic River.)

APPENDIX 2: Summary of Current Resource Management

The following table presents a summary description of current management in the study area. Separate descriptions are provided for West Virginia and Virginia. The descriptions of management practices in West Virginia are derived from (1) the West Virginia Division of Natural Resource’s license with the Army Corps of Engineers, (2) DNR’s Wildlife Management Plan (2001-2006) for the Bluestone Wildlife Management Area, (3) generic DNR wildlife and recreation management policies, and (4) DNR wildlife and recreation management practices within the Bluestone WMA not covered in 1, 2, or 3. There is no comparable state management program in the Virginia portion of the study area. The Army Corps of Engineers maintains some management presence in Virginia, but not on a day-to-day basis. The Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries has authority over fish and wildlife management, including hunting, fishing, and trapping. There is, however, no active fish and wildlife management beyond biological surveys and normal enforcement of state laws and regulations.

Management Factor	West Virginia portion of the study area	Virginia portion of the study area
MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND OTHER AQUATIC SPECIES		
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of focal species is conducted in the broader context of other species and the overall ecosystem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.
Reintroduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brook trout are stocked in Indian Creek. • Reintroduction of extirpated species or stocking of depleted native species is allowed in order to reestablish species or strengthen ecosystem processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None presently, but possible subject to same basic policy as WV.
Stocking naturalized species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of naturalized species such as smallmouth bass is allowed following applicable environmental review, including evaluation of (1) potential effects on native species and the aquatic environment, and (2) potential biological and social benefits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as WV.
Stocking non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of brown, rainbow, and golden rainbow trout in Indian Creek is conducted because it continues to serve a recreational fishing purpose and is not believed to adversely affect native species. • Other stocking of non-native species does not occur unless it can be demonstrated that this would serve an important biological or social purpose and would not adversely affect native species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None presently, but possible subject to same basic policy as WV.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No species in the study area is currently listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. West Virginia does not have a formal state equivalent but does 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as WV.

Management Factor	West Virginia portion of the study area	Virginia portion of the study area
	maintain a list of sensitive species through the Natural Heritage Program. Any species that may be federally listed in the future would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.	
MANAGEMENT OF TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE		
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management emphasizes “featured species associations,” in which management actions for featured species also benefit a variety of other species. (For example, managing for turkey habitat benefits smoky shrews, hermit thrushes, towhees, woodpeckers, great crested flycatchers, dusky salamanders, Fowlers toads, and black snakes, among other species.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific management program for the area.
Re-introduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-introduction of extirpated species or stocking of depleted native species is allowed in order to reestablish species or strengthen ecosystem processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific management program for the area, but basic policy is the same as WV.
Introduction of non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a general policy of no introductions of non-native wildlife species. Exceptions are made only following applicable environmental review, including evaluations of the potential effects on native species and the environment, and the potential biological and social benefits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific management program for the area, but basic policy is the same as WV.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No species in the study area is currently listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. West Virginia does not have a formal state equivalent but does maintain a list of sensitive species through the Natural Heritage Program. Any species that may be federally listed in the future would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.
HABITAT MANAGEMENT		
Management of ecological processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management relies on natural processes where practical. Judicious use of active habitat management is allowed in order to meet specific wildlife management objectives. Active management includes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific management program for the area.

Management Factor	West Virginia portion of the study area	Virginia portion of the study area
	<p>(1) creating, reestablishing, and maintaining clearings to enhance wildlife habitat, (2) forest management for vegetative species diversity and mast production, (3) planting trees, shrubs, and/or herbaceous species for wildlife food, cover and critical habitat, and (4) controlling water levels in selected wetlands for migratory bird and aquatic furbearer sustenance.</p>	
<p>Management of non-native plants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While preference is given to native species, non-native plants can be introduced in clearings and along roads and trails if these are the only feasible choice for the anticipated use and if managers have confidence that these plants will not spread to other areas. • Invasive exotic plants are controlled to the extent practical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.
<p>Agriculture</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR grants special use permits allowing cultivation of hay and row crops (e.g., corn) on approximately 390 acres throughout the Bluestone WMA in WV as a means to achieve wildlife management objectives. • All agricultural activities are conducted in accordance with recognized best management practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACE leases approximately 190 acres in VA for cultivation of hay and row crops (e.g., corn). While these leases provide habitat benefits for wildlife, they are not part of an overall wildlife management program for the area (as is the case in WV). • All agricultural activities are conducted in accordance with recognized best management practices.
<p>Forest stand management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest management using both even-aged and uneven-aged silvicultural systems is utilized to enhance wildlife habitat. Forest stands are managed using various techniques, including clearcuts, shelterwood cuts, single-tree selection, group selection, and deferment cuts. Harvests are limited to that needed to achieve a specific wildlife objective, and are conducted in accordance with recognized BMPs. • Timber damaged or destroyed by natural hazard or insect infestations may be removed through salvage operations if this is compatible with wildlife management objectives. • Managers have the option to conduct forest management operations using private contractors if this is the most efficient and economical way to achieve objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.

Management Factor	West Virginia portion of the study area	Virginia portion of the study area
Fire management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed burning is recognized as an ecologically sound way to maintain or create wildlife habitat and may be used as appropriate. • Wildfire is managed under the guidance of the state forestry department and according to applicable state or federal regulations and BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.
Maintaining existing clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing clearings are maintained if they continue to serve a management purpose. • Existing clearings are maintained using a range of techniques (e.g., mowing, burning, brushhogging). Heavy equipment (e.g., bulldozers, road graders) can be used but must follow BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.
Reclaiming overgrown clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reclaiming of clearings is allowed. Heavy equipment can be used when required but must follow BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.
New clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New clearings may be created as necessary to meet wildlife objectives. • Use of timber harvesting techniques to make clearings is subject to provisions described above under “forest stand management”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific management program for the area.
Shoreline modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoreline modifications are subject to reviews under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and applicable state laws. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as in WV.
Wetlands construction/restoration and management of water control structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing artificial wetlands and water manipulation projects are maintained to the extent they continue to support wildlife objectives. New projects may be constructed only if they serve a demonstrated site management need and can be implemented with low impact to the environment. • New projects within the bed and banks of the New River are subject to reviews under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and applicable state laws. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New projects within the bed and banks of the New River are subject to reviews under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and applicable state laws.
Use of pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, fish toxicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-restrictive use pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, and fish toxicants may be used judiciously to meet management objectives. Use of other pesticides and herbicides occur only when no other alternative is available. • All use of these chemicals is subject to applicable state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All use of these chemicals is subject to applicable state and federal laws and policies.

Management Factor	West Virginia portion of the study area	Virginia portion of the study area
Management of federal and state sensitive plant species	<p>and federal laws and policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No species known to exist in the study area is currently listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. (Virginia spirea is suspected to exist in the study area.) West Virginia does not have a formal state equivalent but does maintain a list of sensitive species through the Natural Heritage Program. Any species that may be federally listed in the future would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as in WV.
MANAGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PUBLIC USES		
Dispersed pedestrian access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire area is open to foot traffic, except when and where restrictions are necessary for public safety, resource management (e.g., protection of wildlife nesting areas), or protection of agricultural or other leaseholdings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire area is open to foot traffic, except when and where restrictions are necessary for public safety or protection of agricultural or other leaseholdings.
Hunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hunting is allowed subject to applicable state regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as in WV.
Fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing is allowed subject to applicable state regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.
Trapping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trapping is allowed subject to applicable state regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.
Wildlife/nature observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife/nature observation is allowed, subject to other access policies (e.g., restrictions for public safety or resource management). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.
Camping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping is allowed at designated sites, subject to state regulations, policies, and fees. Dispersed “backcountry” camping is prohibited. Camping on islands or other boat access only locations is not regulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping in tents and recreational vehicles is allowed at designated sites in the Glen Lyn town park just upstream of the Route 460 Bridge. Camping downstream of the bridge occurs at numerous informal sites along the river, but is not managed.
Boating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No restrictions are placed on use of non-motorized or motorized watercraft, including personal watercraft (PWCs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.
Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products including fishing bait (e.g., worms, insects, minnows) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.

Management Factor	West Virginia portion of the study area	Virginia portion of the study area
	and wild edibles (e.g., berries, mushrooms) for personal, non-commercial use is allowed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gathering for other purposes (e.g., commercial sale) is prohibited. 	
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited and reasonable restrictions may be placed on public access to certain areas and/or for certain uses during hunting seasons, flood hazards, or other times when public safety is a concern. Safety zones are enforced around campgrounds and other high use areas. Hunting and shooting is not allowed in these areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public safety is largely unregulated except for occasional patrols and enforcement of state hunting and fishing regulations (by county sheriff, VA DGIF conservation officers, and ACE staff).
MANAGEMENT OF OTHER PUBLIC USES		
Non-motorized recreational travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hiking and horseback riding are allowed on a limited number of designated routes, subject to appropriate access restrictions related to public safety, wildlife management, or resource protection. Bicycling is limited to roadways designated for motor vehicle use. Because of their importance as the primary emphases of the area, fish and wildlife management and traditional public uses are given priority over non-motorized recreational travel (e.g., the location and timing of non-motorized recreation is managed to avoid conflicts with fish and wildlife management or traditional public uses). Organized horseback riding and bicycling events are not permitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no designated non-motorized travel routes and no formal management of this use.
Motor vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automobiles, light trucks, motorcycles and recreational vehicles are allowed on designated roadways. Motorized all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) are not allowed (except on designated state motor vehicle roadways if authorized for such use under state law). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motor vehicle use is largely unregulated and some resource damage has occurred.
Commercial recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial outfitters and guides (boat livery operators, fishing guides, etc.) are allowed to operate in the area. Commercial use is limited at present, and commercial permits are not required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as WV.

MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION FACILITIES		
Public access facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing roads and related facilities (e.g., gates) are managed for consistency with the area’s management objectives. Some areas are gated and closed to limit public access in order to achieve resource management goals. Road and trail construction and maintenance are consistent with erosion and sedimentation control BMP standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access along roadways is not restricted. The road beyond the Appalachian Power Company’s flyash facility on river left is maintained infrequently by ACE.
Camping and day use areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 300 designated campsites exist at three state-managed camping areas in the study area (Indian Creek, Cedar Branch, Shanklin’s Ferry). Nearly 80 additional sites are located at the Bull Falls camping area just downstream of the study area. Bertha camping area, another 2 miles downstream has 55 campsites. All of these camping areas are primitive in nature, with basic facilities (e.g., picnic tables, trash cans, pit toilets) but no electrical, water, or sewage hook-ups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Glen Lyn town park provides sites for tent and RV camping. The park has picnic tables and toilet facilities. Downstream of the Route 460 Bridge there are no designated campsites.
Boat landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All camping areas have boat launches that are maintained by the state. Some are carry-in and some are accessible by vehicle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a boat ramp at the Glen Lyn town park that is maintained by the town. Informal, unimproved launch sites exist downstream of the Route 460 Bridge on river left.
Trails for hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foot trails and bridal paths exist but are few in number and maintained infrequently. No trails for mountain biking have been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no formal trails.
Other areas and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DNR-Parks maintains a rustic lodge and a horse barn. DNR also has a visitor contact station at the park headquarters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.

MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC AND ARCHEOLOGIC RESOURCES		
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known historic/archeological sites are protected. • A preliminary inventory of historic/archeological sites has been completed by ACE. • Management activities that might disturb historic or archeological sites (e.g., agricultural practices such as plowing; creating/maintaining/reclaiming clearings; establishing new facilities such as campsites) must comply with applicable state and federal historic protection laws and regulations. Site reviews occur frequently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as WV, although the lack of management activity (other than limited road maintenance and use of agriculture areas) results in few historic/archeological reviews.
MANAGEMENT OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTER / VISUAL RESOURCES		
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no formal visual resource management program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as WV.

APPENDIX 3: Detailed Criteria for Determining Wild and Scenic River Classification

Following are the criteria used to determine whether a river that has been found eligible for wild and scenic river designation should be classified as “wild,” “scenic,” or “recreational.” These criteria are excerpted from the federal guidelines for eligibility, classification, and management of wild and scenic river areas.

“Wild” Rivers

The criteria for wild river areas include:

1. Free of impoundments
2. Generally inaccessible except by trail
 - No roads, railroads, or other provisions for vehicular travel.
 - A few inconspicuous roads leading to the boundary of the river area are acceptable.
3. Watersheds or shorelines essentially primitive
 - Little or no evidence of human activity.
 - Shoreline and immediate watershed essentially free of structures such as buildings, pipelines, power lines, dams, pumps, generators, diversion works, rip-rap and other modifications.
 - A few inconspicuous structures, particularly those of historic or cultural value at the time of the study, are acceptable.
 - A limited amount of domestic livestock grazing or hay production is acceptable.
 - No row crops or ongoing timber harvest is acceptable.
 - The river area should show little or no evidence of past logging activities.
4. Waters unpolluted
 - The water quality of a wild river will meet or exceed federal criteria or federally approved state standards for aesthetics, for propagation of fish and wildlife normally adapted to the habitat of the stream, and for primary contact recreation except where exceeded by natural conditions.

“Scenic” Rivers

The criteria for scenic river areas include:

1. Free of impoundments
2. Watersheds still largely primitive and shorelines largely undeveloped
 - Should not show substantial evidence of human activity.
 - May have some existing development.
 - Shorelines and the immediate river environment present an overall natural character.
 - In places, land may be developed for agricultural purposes.
 - Row crops, timber harvest, and other resource uses are acceptable providing such activity is accomplished without a substantial adverse effect on the natural appearance of the river or its immediate environment.

- Any structure or concentration of structures must be limited to relatively short reaches of the segment under consideration for designation.

3. Accessible in places by road

- Roads may reach the river area and occasionally bridge the river.
- Presence of short stretches of conspicuous roads or railroads are acceptable.
- Presence of longer stretches of inconspicuous and well-screened roads or railroads are acceptable.
- Consideration should be given to the type of use for which such roads or railroads were constructed and the type of use which would occur within the area. Lower intensity uses are more compatible with a scenic classification than high intensity uses.

“Recreational” Rivers

The criteria for recreational river areas include:

1. Readily accessible by road or railroad

- May contain existing parallel roads or railroads in close proximity to one or both banks of the river as well as bridge crossings and roads fording or ending at the river.

2. Some development along the shoreline

- Area may have been developed for the full range of agricultural and forestry uses.
- May show evidence of past and ongoing timber harvest.
- May include some residential, commercial, or similar development.

3. Some impoundment or diversion in the past

- May be some existing impoundments, diversions, and other modifications of the waterway.
- Existing low dams, diversion works, rip-rap, and other minor structures are acceptable.
- The river should generally be natural and riverine in appearance.

APPENDIX 4: List of Issues

This appendix provides a list of issues and concerns related to the segment of the New River and adjacent federal lands currently being that are under study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The key study issues described in Chapter 4 were drawn from this list. Issues were identified by the study team through discussions with the Interagency Work Group, conversations with other interested parties, review of relevant documents, and the two rounds of public meetings that were held in the study area in December 2003 and July 2004.

This list is not a verbatim transcription of issues as articulated by interested parties. Rather, issues have been restated for clarity and consistency. However, care has taken to ensure that the intent and content of the issues listed accurately reflect the sentiment of those who expressed them. Issues identified by more than one person have been consolidated to avoid redundancy. In some instances the study team has included parenthetical statements following issue statements in order to clarify or explain the issue.

This is a comprehensive list; no issue expressed by the public has been omitted. In some cases issues may appear to conflict. That is normal as issues were identified by a number of individuals, some of whom may have differing perspectives. Inclusion of an issue in this list does not necessarily mean that the issue is valid or that it is supported by any given agency, stakeholder group, or individual.

The list of issues is divided into two general groups:

1. Current Issues: Issues relating to the study area under current management.
2. Future Issues: Issues relating to potential future management options, including wild and scenic river designation.

Within each of these two groupings, issues are organized into four categories: (1) natural and cultural resources, (2) recreation and public use, (3) landscape character, and (4) socio-economics. Within these general categories are several specific sub-headings. To facilitate reference, individual issues are numbered. Numbers are sequential and do not imply significance or priority.

Readers are encouraged to review this list with an eye toward determining if their issues have been included and are accurately and fairly stated.

Current Issues

1. Natural and Cultural Resources

Flow

No issues related to current flow patterns or management of flows in the study area were identified.

Water quality

Current Issue 1.1: River only partially meets the Clean Water Act “fishable” goal (due to elevated zinc and PCB 1254 levels in carp tissue).

Current Issue 1.2: Water quality degradation from upstream point and/or non-point sources, e.g., trash in river coming from upstream sources, sediment discharges from tributaries in Virginia.

Current Issue 1.3: Potential for sediment discharges from Appalachian Power Company’s settling ponds and flyash treatment facilities in Glen Lyn, e.g., runoff from landfill during heavy rains, potential inundation of settling ponds at extreme high water.

River Shorelands

Current Issue 1.4: Effect of campgrounds located next to the river on river ecology and river recreation.

Fish and aquatic biota

No current issues related to fish and aquatic biota in the study area were identified.

Wildlife and wildlife habitats

Current Issue 1.5: Lack of information on the potential presence of rare plants or plant communities makes protection difficult.

Archeological and historic resources

Current Issue 1.6: Need for improved protection of known sensitive historic and archeological sites to prevent pillaging.

Current Issue 1.7: Need for information on the location of suspected historic and archeological sites in order that these might be better protected.

Current Issue 1.8: Lack of a comprehensive framework for managing historic and archeological resources. (While there is an excellent inventory in place, there is need for a comprehensive management plan and a systematic evaluation of National Historic Register eligibility.)

Current Issue 1.9: Unrealized potential for interpretation of cultural resources (e.g., historic settlements, archeological sites, Mary Ingles Trail, old warrior trail at Indian Creek, bateau route).

Current Issue 1.10: Potential impacts on archeological and historic resources from agricultural practices, especially tilling, in leased areas.

2. Recreation and Public Use

Traditional public uses: hunting, fishing, and trapping

Current Issue 2.1: Unrealized potential for fishing, hunting and other recreational activities in the upper portion of study area, i.e., Glen Lyn to Shanklin's Ferry.

Current Issue 2.2: Confusion and inconvenience concerning state fishing license requirements near the Virginia/West Virginia border. (Near the border it is difficult to determine which state a boat may be in. Also, many boaters float from Virginia to West Virginia and would desire to fish throughout the trip but cannot unless they possess licenses for both states.)

Traditional public uses: boating

Current Issue 2.3: Unrealized potential for multi-day family and youth group boating trips.

Current Issue 2.4: Lack of boat access-only primitive campsites.

Traditional public uses: camping

Current Issue 2.5: Impacts of flooding on recreational facilities; desire that recreational facilities be flood-proofed to prevent economic loss and environmental damage.

Current Issue 2.6: Unrealized potential at Glen Lyn town park. Facilities could be improved or upgraded.

Current Issue 2.7: Unsanitary conditions during flooding events at some WV camping areas due to primitive toilet facilities.

Current Issue 2.8: Unmanaged recreational use on riparian lands in Virginia has damaged shorelands and is causing a sanitation problem. (Resource damage includes loss of vegetation and erosion.)

Current Issue 2.9: Some campsites in West Virginia camping areas that are very near the water and sometimes in the floodway may detract from the natural character of the area and/or adversely effect sensitive riparian resources.

Other public uses (hiking, horseback riding, etc.)

Current Issue 2.10: In general, there is increasing demand for access for hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding; and this area appears well-suited for these uses.

Current Issue 2.11: Potential conflicts between non-wildlife-dependent recreational use (e.g., hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding) and wildlife management; desire among managers and some users to restrict recreational access from key habitat areas during nesting and brood seasons; potential safety concerns during hunting season.

Public access and recreational facilities

Current Issue 2.12: Limited resources for managing recreational facilities and uses, especially in Virginia.

Current Issue 2.13: Potential opportunity to use federally owned islands upstream of Route 460 Bridge for conservation and recreation purposes, especially in conjunction with the New River Blueway water trail project.

Current Issue 2.14: Unrealized potential to develop a partnership with Appalachian Power regarding use of company owned or licensed islands and shorelands.

Current Issue 2.15: Unrealized potential for interpretation and public education regarding the New River and river-related resources.

Current Issue 2.16: Need for maintenance of paved and unpaved access roads. Cost of maintenance is also an issue.

Current Issue 2.17: Resource damage related to unpaved campground roads that are in or near the floodway and are subject to flooding after periods of heavy rain and/or inundation from operation of Bluestone Dam.

Current Issue 2.18: Frequent inaccessibility of the Crump's Bottom/Bull Falls area due to weather and road conditions.

Current Issue 2.19: Difficulty of access to the river along the west side of the river in Virginia due to the unimproved nature of the road and one particularly steep section; concern that the road is often rendered impassible by inclement weather; feeling among some members of the public that the road should be improved or closed.

Current Issue 2.20: Potential for conflicts between different types of users if the west side road in Virginia is improved and recreational use increases as a result.

Current Issue 2.21: Limited river access in the Virginia portion.

Current Issue 2.22: Primitive boat landings at existing campgrounds in West Virginia that need improvement.

3. Landscape Character

Remote and undeveloped character

Current Issue 3.1: Vulnerability of wildlife and other resource values within study area to the effects of potential development of adjacent private lands, particularly where the study area is narrow.

Current Issue 3.2: Vulnerability of the study area's natural character to degradation from potential power line or other large energy, communications, or transportation projects.

Scenic Resources

Current Issue 3.3: Potential for power line or other large energy, communications, or transportation projects to detract from scenic vistas.

4. Socio-economics

Operation of Bluestone Dam

No issues identified.

Operation of other existing water resource projects

No issues identified.

New or modified water resource projects

No issues identified.

Private Property

No issues identified.

Land use leases (agriculture, fly ash, town park)

Current Issue 4.1: Potential for re-use of Appalachian Power's existing fly ash landfill in Glen Lyn, Virginia, for recreation and/or other public purposes that complement the conservation and recreational use of the river corridor.

Public safety

Current Issue 4.2: Effect of limited law enforcement and management presence in the Virginia portion of study area on public safety.

Nearby public lands

Current Issue 4.3: Unrealized potential for increased cohesion and coordination between the study area and adjacent management units, including Bluestone and Pipestem Resort State Parks, Bluestone National Scenic River, Bluestone Lake, and New River Gorge National River.

Tax revenue

No issues identified.

Local and regional economy

Current Issue 4.4: Unrealized potential to use the amenities of the study area, possibly in combined with other nearby public lands (including Bluestone and Pipestem Resort State Parks, New River Gorge National River, and Jefferson National Forest), and other regional initiatives (including the New River Parkway, the New River Blueway, the Mary Ingles Trail, and local/county heritage initiatives) as a means to increase the tourism economy in Hinton, Glen Lyn, and the greater four-county area.

Quality of life

Current Issue 4.5: Unrealized potential for increased coordination with other New River watershed initiatives (e.g., American Heritage River Initiative) that may have a positive effect on the quality of life of local residents

Future Issues (Related to Potential Wild and Scenic River Designation and/or Future Management)

The following issues reflect the concerns of various stakeholder groups and individuals regarding possible effects of changing current management. There is some overlap with the current management issues identified above. However, there is a difference in how the issues are approached and it is therefore important to list them here as well.

These issues were identified prior to the development of the management alternatives described in Chapter 5. In fact, these issues had a significant influence in the development of project goals, management principles, and assurances, and in the crafting of alternatives. As a result, some of these issues may have been resolved. It will be left to readers to make their own decisions regarding the continued applicability of these issues.

Future management issues are organized using the same headings as the current management issues.

1. Natural and Cultural Resources

Flow

Future Issue 1.1: Effect of wild and scenic designation on future upstream projects and activities that may affect flow.

Future Issue 1.2: Effects on river-related natural and/or cultural resource values if the pool elevation in Bluestone Lake is permanently raised, either for hydropower generation or to provide greater depth in shallow areas for boats.

Future Issue 1.3: Effects on river-related natural values from new upstream water projects, especially potential water withdrawals in Wythe and Grayson counties in Virginia.

Future Issue 1.4: Effects on river-related natural and/or cultural resource values from potential development of a pump storage energy generation project within Bluestone Project Area.

Water quality

Future Issue 1.5: Effect of wild and scenic designation on future upstream projects and activities that may affect water quality.

Fish and aquatic biota

Future Issue 1.6: Concern that designation might restrict the states in making decisions regarding stocking of native or non-native fish species.

Wildlife and wildlife habitat

General concerns:

Future Issue 1.7: Concern that NPS policies on habitat management differ from those of WV DNR and that NPS administration could limit DNR's ability to manage fish and wildlife resources to the standards set by that agency. Some stakeholders desire assurances that DNR will be allowed to continue its current wildlife management activities if the river is designated as a wild and scenic river.

Future Issue 1.8: Desire that DNR continue to manage wildlife habitat regardless of the alternative selected.

Future issue 1.9: Concern that NPS policies would require increased environmental review for normal maintenance activities and that this would both increase costs and delay action.

Subject matter concerns:

Future Issue 1.10: Concern that planting of non-native plant species in disturbed areas (e.g., clearings, roads, trails) for wildlife purposes would be limited under wild and scenic designation with NPS administration. (State wildlife managers suggest that certain non-native plants are desirable as forage for wildlife. Also, many agricultural crops are not native but provide forage for wildlife, and having farmers plant these crops under lease is viewed as a most economically efficient way to maintain some clearings.)

Future Issue 1.11: Concern that NPS policies would limit use of agriculture (e.g., haying, cultivating row crops) as a means to maintain clearings and that this would lead to a decrease in wildlife habitat diversity.

Future Issue 1.12: Concern that NPS policies would limit the use of timber management practices that are currently used to establish or restore clearings, making it difficult to maintain wildlife habitat diversity; allied concern that NPS policies against the use of commercial forestry would make habitat management more expensive and/or difficult to implement.

Future Issue 1.13: Concern that use of heavy equipment to conduct land management activities to maintain or restore clearings would be limited under wild and scenic designation with NPS administration and that this would make it difficult to maintain habitat diversity.

Future Issue 1.14: Concern that creation of new wildlife clearings would be limited under wild and scenic designation with NPS administration.

Future Issue 1.15: Concern that wetland construction and maintenance would be limited under wild and scenic designation with NPS administration.

Future Issue 1.16: Concern that use of pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, and fish toxicants for wildlife management purposes would be restricted under NPS administration; allied concern that local and regional efforts to control black flies would also be restricted.

Archeological and historic resources

Future Issue 1.17: Concern that protection and interpretation of archeological and historic sites may not be a priority unless NPS is involved in administration and management.

Future Issue 1.18: Concern that the increased attention to archeological and historic sites likely to occur with NPS management not be allowed to detract from wildlife habitat management and traditional public uses.

2. Recreation and Public Use

Traditional public uses: hunting, fishing, and trapping

Future Issue 2.1: Concern that changes in management may restrict opportunities for hunting and fishing.

Future Issue 2.2: Concern that changes in management may diminish existing state authorities to regulate hunting, fishing and trapping.

Future Issue 2.3: Concern that changing in management may result in declines in game populations, thereby decreasing the quality of the hunting experience.

Future Issue 2.4: Concern that high-quality fishing could decline if too many new users come to the area in the future.

Future Issue 2.5: Opportunity to use this process to establish reciprocal fishing licenses for WV and VA in the wild and scenic river area.

Traditional public uses: boating

Future Issue 2.6: Concern that changes in management could result in burdensome requirements for outfitter licensing.

Future Issue 2.7: Concern about how river recreation in general would be managed if the river is designated as a wild and scenic river.

Traditional public uses: camping

Future Issue 2.8: Concern that any new recreational facilities developed in the future be flood-proofed.

Future Issue 2.9: Desire that shoreline camping in Virginia be allowed to continue if the river is designated; desire for improved camping ground downstream of Rt. 460 Bridge in VA because the Glen Lyn campground is often full now.

Future Issue 2.10: Concern that changes in management could lead to development of new facilities even if existing areas have unused capacity.

Future Issue 2.11: Concern that wild and scenic river designation might limit improvements to existing camping sites and development of new campsites, and possibly restrict public use within existing sites.

Future Issue 2.12: Concern over prohibitions on “backcountry” camping, including camping on islands or other boat access only locations. (Backcountry and island camping are currently prohibited.)

Other public uses, including general recreation issues

Future Issue 2.13: Concern that NPS would encourage new recreational uses that might conflict with traditional wildlife-oriented public uses.

Future Issue 2.14: Question regarding whether facilities could be improved or whether new developments would be allowed if the river were designated as a wild and scenic river.

Future Issue 2.15: Concern that improving the west side road in Virginia could significantly increase use and could lead to conflicts between different types of users.

3. Landscape Character

Remote and undeveloped character

Future Issue 3.1: Concern that the temporary protection for the study segment from water resource development projects during the study period will end three years after the report is submitted to Congress if the river is not designated wild and scenic, making the river vulnerable again to new crossings from electric transmission lines, gas pipelines, and similar regional-scale development projects.

Scenic Resources

No issues identified.

4. Socioeconomics

Operation of Bluestone Dam (flood retention, hydro, dam safety assurance, drift and debris project)

Future Issue 4.1: Concern about whether wild and scenic river designation would restrict ACE's ability to operate the Bluestone Project for its authorized purposes of flood control, hydropower, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

Future Issue 4.2: Concern about whether designation would affect ACE's upstream flowage rights and thereby restrict ACE's ability to hold back water during flood events.

Future Issue 4.3: Concern about whether designation would restrict proposals to retrofit Bluestone Dam for energy production.

Future Issue 4.4: Concern about whether designation would require ACE to relinquish ownership of lands that are necessary for Bluestone Dam operations.

Operation of other existing water resource projects

Future Issue 4.5: Concern that river-related resource values, particularly fish and river recreation, could be adversely impacted if variability of releases from Claytor Dam are allowed to increase as a result of re-licensing. (Note: Claytor Dam operates according to a license with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that establishes minimum flows and flow ramping requirements. This project will be re-licensed in the near future.)

Future Issue 4.6: Concern about whether designation would require Appalachian Power Company to change its operation of the Glen Lyn Plant or Claytor Dam.

Private property

Future Issue 4.7: Concern about whether new water quality regulations would be required on tributaries if the river is designated as a wild and scenic river and that this could adversely affect landowners.

Future Issue 4.8: Concern about whether private property would be subject to purchase through condemnation. (Stakeholders expressed a desire that any future land acquisition involve willing sellers only.)

Land use leases

Future Issue 4.9: Concern about whether agricultural leases would be terminated under various management alternatives, which could be economically detrimental to those holding these leases.

Future Issue 4.10: Concern that designation of the New River as a wild and scenic river might restrict Appalachian Power Company's ability to continue to operate the existing fly ash facility.

Public safety

Future Issue 4.11: Concern regarding who would have responsibility for law enforcement if NPS and the states were both involved in management. (Would there be concurrent jurisdiction?)

Nearby public lands

Future Issue 4.12: Concern that transfer of management might leave ACE with outlier land parcels that would be difficult to manage. (Areas of concern include islands and shorelands upstream of the designation boundary in Virginia, and Bull Falls and Bertha camping areas in West Virginia.)

Tax revenue

Future Issue 4.13: Concern that changes in management may result in diminished property tax payments to the counties. (This issue was not raised in scoping meetings. It was identified as an issue by the study team.)

Local and regional economy

Future Issue 4.14: Potential for designation as a wild and scenic river to enhance the area's position as a tourism destination and thereby support the local and regional economy.

Quality of life

Future Issue 4.15: Concern that traditional uses of the study area will be curtailed if designation as a wild and scenic river results in a drastically different land management strategy.

APPENDIX 5.A: Detailed Description of Management Alternatives

The following table provides additional information on a variety of important aspects of the four management alternatives. This additional information is intended to supplement the summary descriptions of the alternatives presented in Chapter 5.4. Readers are also encouraged to refer to Appendices 2.A and 5.C, which contain specific guidelines and standards for resource management that would apply under the different alternatives.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
PURPOSE	Maintain the existing level of resource protection, and continue current uses and management practices.	Provide added protection for the free-flowing condition and outstanding resource values of this stretch of the New River (as described in Chapter 3), while maintaining the current emphasis on fish and wildlife management and traditional public uses.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.
GOALS, MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES, AND ASSURANCES	N/A	The goals, management principles, and assurances articulated in Chapter 5.2 would serve as a foundation for future management, and should be directly referenced in the authorizing legislation (see next row below).	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.
LEGAL AUTHORIZATION	Management would continue to be based on existing authorities, including the original authorization of the Bluestone Project and the current license between ACE and WVDNR.	A federal law would be enacted designating this part of the New River as a WSR. The law would specify important management provisions and authorize federal funding to implement the designation.	Same as Alternative 2, plus the authorizing law would transfer administration of the federal/ACE lands in the designated area and upstream to NPS.	Same as Alternative 2, plus the authorizing law would transfer ownership and management responsibility of federal/ACE lands in the designated area and upstream to the states of VA and WV. The law also would specify any conditions associated with the transfer of ownership (e.g., reversion to federal ownership if the state(s) no longer wanted to manage the lands for conservation purposes).
GEOGRAPHIC AREA	The study area, which includes the New River from the Rt. 460 bridge in Glen Lyn, VA to 1,410-foot elevation above Steer Island in WV and adjacent federal lands. ACE also administers lands adjacent to Bluestone Lake and a	WSR: The New River from approximately 1-¼ mile downstream of the Route 460 Bridge in Giles County, VA downstream to the confluence with Buffalo Creek near Steer Island in Summers County, WV, and	Same as Alternative 2, plus the Bertha Camping Area could be included in the area under NPS administration and management (although it would not be within the designated WSR segment).	Same as Alternative 2.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
	narrow corridor of land upstream of the Rt. 460 bridge as part of the Bluestone Project Area.	adjacent federal/ACE lands. (See detailed description of suggested boundaries in Chapter 5.3.5 and Figures 5.1 and 5.2.) Upstream Areas: Additional portions of the river and adjacent federal lands within the Bluestone Project Area upstream would not be included in WSR designation, but would be managed by the same agency in same way as designated segment.		
LAND OWNERSHIP AND ADMINISTERING AGENCY	Federal/ACE	Federal/ACE	Federal/NPS	State/VA SONR and WVDNR
AGENCIES INVOLVED IN MANAGEMENT	VA: ACE, DGIF WV: ACE, DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks	VA: ACE, DGIF & possibly DCR WV: ACE, DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks	VA: NPS, DGIF WV: NPS, DNR-WRS	VA: DCR &/or DGIF WV: DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks
FEDERAL/STATE RELATIONSHIP FOR LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	VA: ACE would continue to be the primary manager. DGIF would continue its current role in fish and wildlife management (e.g., enforcing state fish and game regulations, managing species and populations). WV: ACE would continue to delegate primary on-the-ground management responsibility for fish and wildlife, habitat, recreation, and campgrounds to DNR through the existing license.	VA: Same as Alternative 1, or ACE could delegate primary on-the-ground management responsibility to DCR or DGIF if they agreed. If DCR assumed this responsibility the area would be managed as a state park; if DGIF did so it would be managed as a wildlife management area. WV: Same as Alternative 1.	VA: NPS would be the primary manager. DGIF would continue its current role in fish and wildlife management (e.g., enforcing state regulations, managing species and populations), and NPS and DGIF could cooperate on additional initiatives. WV: As the administering federal agency, NPS would have primary management responsibility but DNR-WRS would also be involved in managing fish, wildlife, habitat, and related public uses. NPS would be the primary manager of campgrounds, river recreation, and non-traditional	VA: N/A (due to state land ownership) WV: N/A (due to state land ownership)

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
			public uses.	
RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE	<p>Fish & Aquatic Biota: DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS in WV.</p> <p>Terrestrial Wildlife: DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS in WV.</p> <p>Habitat: ACE in VA; DNR-WRS in WV</p>	<p>Fish & Aquatic Biota: Same as Alternative 1.</p> <p>Terrestrial Wildlife: Same as Alternative 1.</p> <p>Habitat: ACE or DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS in WV</p>	<p>Fish & Aquatic Biota: NPS & DGIF in VA; NPS & DNR-WRS in WV</p> <p>Terrestrial Wildlife: NPS & DGIF in VA; NPS & DNR-WRS in WV</p> <p>Habitat: NPS in VA; NPS & DNR-WRS in WV</p>	<p>Fish & Aquatic Biota: Same as Alternative 1.</p> <p>Terrestrial Wildlife: Same as Alternative 1.</p> <p>Habitat: DCR &/or DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS in WV</p>
RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC USE	<p>Hunting, Fishing, & Trapping: DGIF & ACE in VA; DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Boating & Camping: ACE in VA; DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Other Public Uses: ACE in VA; DNR-Parks in WV</p>	<p>Hunting, Fishing, & Trapping: Same as Alternative 1.</p> <p>Boating & Camping: ACE or DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Other Public Uses: ACE or DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-Parks in WV</p>	<p>Hunting, Fishing, & Trapping: NPS & DGIF in VA; NPS & DNR-WRS in WV</p> <p>Boating & Camping: NPS in VA & WV</p> <p>Other Public Uses: NPS in VA & WV</p>	<p>Hunting, Fishing, & Trapping: DGIF & possibly DCR in VA; DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Boating & Camping: DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Other Public Uses: DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-Parks in WV</p>
RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF OTHER RESOURCES	<p>Cultural Resources: ACE in VA; ACE & DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Landscape Character: ACE in VA; DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p>	<p>Cultural Resources: ACE & possibly DCR or DGIF in VA; ACE & DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Landscape Character: ACE or DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p>	<p>Cultural Resources: NPS in VA & WV</p> <p>Landscape Character: NPS in VA & WV</p>	<p>Cultural Resources: DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p> <p>Landscape Character: DCR or DGIF in VA; DNR-WRS & DNR-Parks in WV</p>
RESPONSIBILITY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY	<p>VA: ACE, DGIF & county sheriff</p> <p>WV: ACE, DNR-Parks, DNR-WRS & county sheriff</p>	<p>VA: Same as Alternative 1, and possibly DCR.</p> <p>WV: Same as Alternative 1.</p>	<p>VA: NPS, DGIF & county sheriff</p> <p>WV: NPS, DNR-Parks, DNR-WRS & county sheriff</p>	<p>VA: DCR &/or DGIF, & county sheriff</p> <p>WV: DNR-Parks, DNR-WRS & county sheriff</p>

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT	<p>VA: N/A</p> <p>WV: License between ACE and DNR (current license expires June, 2025).</p>	<p>VA: N/A, or management agreement/license between ACE and DCR or DGIF. This agreement would be consistent with goals, management principles, and assurances presented in Chapter 5.2 and resource management standards in Appendix 5.C.1.</p> <p>WV: Same as Alternative 1, except license would be modified as needed to ensure consistency with goals, management principles, and assurances presented in Chapter 5.2 and resource management standards in Appendix 5.C.1.</p>	<p>VA: N/A</p> <p>WV: License between NPS and DNR. License would be modeled on the existing NPS/DNR license for Bluestone NSR. License would be consistent with goals, management principles, and assurances presented in Chapter 5.2 and resource management standards in Appendix 5.C.2.</p>	<p>VA: N/A (due to no federal role in land ownership/management)</p> <p>WV: N/A (due to no federal role in land ownership/management)</p>
MANAGEMENT PLAN	<p>ACE has a master plan for the overall Bluestone Project Area. WVDNR prepares 5-year wildlife management plans for Bluestone WMA (current plan covers 2001-2006).</p>	<p>ACE would have lead responsibility for preparing a comprehensive management plan for the designated area in close consultation with the states within 3 years of designation. The plan would be consistent with the WSRA; the authorizing legislation; the goals, management principles, and assurances presented in Chapter 5.2; and the management agreement(s) described above. ACE would consult with NPS/Northeast Regional Office in developing the plan in light of NPS's responsibility for implementing WSRA Section 7 (as discussed under "Implementation of WSRA Section 7" below). Potential components of the management</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 2, except:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) NPS would have lead responsibility; (2) The plan would also cover the Bluestone NSR; (3) VA SONR and WVDNR would be invited to participate as official cooperating agencies; and (4) DNR's 5-year management plans would be coordinated with NPS's five-year strategic plans for the area. 	<p>Same as Alternative 2, except:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) VA SONR and WVDNR would have lead responsibility; (2) The Secretary of the Interior would approve the plan to ensure consistency with WSRA requirements; (3) Other planning requirements would depend on state policy; and (4) The NPS could provide technical assistance in developing the plan if the states requested and if funding were available.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
		<p>plan identified during the study period are described in Appendix 5.D.</p> <p>WVDNR (and DGIF or DCR, if one or the other chose to accept primary on-the-ground management responsibility in VA) would prepare 5-year management plans for its activities. These plans would be consistent with the comprehensive management plan.</p>		
ANNUAL WORK PLAN	<p>VA: N/A</p> <p>WV: DNR would continue to prepare annual work plans for ACE review and approval.</p>	<p>VA: N/A or, if DGIF or DCR accepted primary on-the-ground management responsibility, they would prepare annual work plans for ACE review and approval.</p> <p>WV: Same as Alternative 1.</p>	<p>VA: N/A</p> <p>WV: DNR would prepare annual work plans in consultation with NPS. Plans would also cover Bluestone NSR. NPS would review and approve prior to implementation.</p>	<p>VA: N/A</p> <p>WV: N/A</p>
COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION AMONG MANAGEMENT AGENCIES	<p>VA: Occasional informal communication between ACE and DGIF field staff.</p> <p>WV: Annual meeting between ACE and DNR to review draft annual work plan. Frequent informal communication and collaboration between field staff.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 1. If DCR or DGIF assumed primary on-the-ground management responsibility in VA and established a formal management agreement with ACE, the agencies would meet annually to review draft work plan and would have frequent informal communication between field staff. Also, there would be increased collaboration between DCR/DGIF and DNR on cross-boundary planning and management for relevant issues (e.g., river recreation, wildlife habitat).</p>	<p>VA: NPS would collaborate with DGIF as needed/appropriate on fish, wildlife, and habitat issues.</p> <p>WV: NPS and DNR supervisors and field managers would meet annually to review draft annual work plan. Field staff would have frequent informal communication, and would seek opportunities for collaboration in implementing management activities and projects (e.g., conducting prescribed burns).</p>	<p>DCR &/or DGIF would meet annually with DNR to discuss their respective management and collaboration on cross-boundary planning and management for relevant issues (e.g., river recreation, wildlife habitat). Field staff would communicate informally as needed/appropriate.</p>

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
GENERAL DIRECTION FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN BOTH STATES	Management would continue to emphasize fish, wildlife, and related traditional public uses.	Same as Alternative 1, plus management would be consistent with the following: (1) the general WSRA policy of protecting and enhancing the area’s free-flowing condition and outstanding resources; (2) the goals, management principles, and assurances presented in Chapter 5.2; and (3) the maintenance of conditions sufficient for WSRA “scenic” classification.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION COMMON TO BOTH STATES FOR SPECIFIC RESOURCES	<p>The New River would continue to be managed as a warmwater fishery emphasizing smallmouth bass, flathead and channel catfish, and hybrid striped bass. No stocking would be envisioned in the New River in VA or WV. (DNR-WRS would continue to stock sterile hybrid striped bass in Bluestone Lake and brown and rainbow trout in Indian Creek.) DGIF and DNR-WRS would continue their ongoing assessment of New River walleye populations.</p> <p>In conducting land management activities, ACE (in VA) and DNR (in WV) would continue to be mindful of identified historic and archeological resources. Significant new efforts to identify, protect and/or interpret these resources would be unlikely.</p>	Same as Alternative 1.	<p>Fisheries management in both states would be the same as for Alternative 1. Under NPS lead, there would be somewhat greater emphasis relative to the other alternatives on the following:</p> <p>(1) enhancing river-related recreational opportunities (e.g., establishing new primitive boat-only campsites, developing a limited number of new access points) and increasing management of river recreation;</p> <p>(2) expanding visitor services (e.g., limited interpretive programs);</p> <p>(3) seeking new opportunities for public uses such as trails for hiking, biking, and horseback riding that would not degrade resources or conflict with traditional uses or wildlife management; and</p> <p>(4) identifying, protecting and interpreting historic and archeologic resources.</p>	Same as Alternative 1.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS SPECIFIC TO VIRGINIA	Management would continue to be limited due to ACE’s funding and staff constraints and the lack of a management agreement with VA agencies. ACE would continue to lease some land for agricultural activities that have wildlife benefits. Management of recreation and public use would continue to consist of limited law enforcement, maintenance of the unimproved road paralleling the west shore of the river, and maintenance by the Town of Glen Lyn of the park immediately upstream of the Route 460 bridge that provides a river access point, campground, and day use area.	Additional management attention would be given to the VA portion. Emphasis would be placed on the following: (1) enhancing river-related recreational opportunities (e.g., improving existing access points) and increasing management of river recreation; (2) increasing law enforcement and public safety; (3) cleaning up and restoring degraded sites; and (4) pursuing potential capital improvements (e.g., upgrading the existing access road, possible limited development of new day and/or overnight use areas).	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2. VA portion would be managed either by DCR as a state park or by DGIF as a wildlife management area.
MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS SPECIFIC TO WEST VIRGINIA	DNR-WRS would continue to manage the area as part of Bluestone WMA, using an integrated system of wildlife, agricultural, and forest management practices to enhance wildlife habitat primarily for game species. Management of recreation and public use would continue to emphasize fish and wildlife-related activities (hunting, fishing, trapping, & wildlife observation) and other traditional activities (boating and camping). Opportunities for other types of recreation (e.g., hiking, horseback riding) would continue to be limited, and permitted only to the extent they are compatible with wildlife objectives. DNR-Parks	Same as Alternative 1, and DNR-Parks would increase efforts to enhance existing campgrounds where needed and if funding permits (e.g., improving sanitary facilities, establishing distinct parking areas, relocating campsites away from the floodway).	Management by NPS and DNR-WRS would continue the current emphasis on fish and wildlife and related traditional public uses, but would include greater reliance on natural processes and some limitations on active habitat management. NPS would enhance existing campgrounds (as DNR-Parks would do in Alternative 2). The area would continue to be part of the Bluestone WMA (unless DNR chose to remove it from the WMA).	Same as Alternative 2.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
	<p>would continue its current approach to managing campgrounds and boating access, and its increasing involvement in managing river recreation. (See Chapter 2 for further description.)</p>			
<p>DETAILED STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>Current guidelines would continue to apply. (See description in Appendix 2.A.)</p>	<p>Management of natural, cultural and recreational resources would be in accordance with standards presented in Appendix 5.C.1.</p>	<p>Management of natural, cultural and recreational resources would be in accordance with standards presented in Appendix 5.C.2. These standards are similar but not identical to those for Alternative 2. Differences between the two sets of standards are indicated in Appendix 5.C.3.</p> <p>(Note: Any desired exceptions to generic NPS management policies would need to be specified in the authorizing legislation – for instance, to authorize continued hunting and trapping.)</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 2.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF WSRA SECTION 7</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Responsibility: DOI/NPS (Northeast Regional Office), in consultation with other federal and state agencies involved in managing the New River corridor.</p> <p>Approach: NPS review of proposed FERC-licensed projects and other federally assisted water resources projects would emphasize protection of the designated segment’s free-flowing condition and outstanding resource values (fish, wildlife, recreation, scenery, geology/hydrology, and historic/archeologic resources). (See Chapter 1.2.3 for further discussion.)</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 2.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 2.</p>

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS	ACE and WVDNR would continue to be responsible for complying with applicable federal and state laws (e.g., Endangered Species Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Archeological Resources Protection Act, Clean Water Act).	All planning and management activities would comply with applicable federal and state laws. Primary responsibility for compliance would fall to the agency whose regulations require the action (ACE for federal, WVDNR and possibly VA SONR for state), except ACE would be responsible for compliance with State Historic Preservation Office under NHPA Section 106. Whichever agency is not in lead for a given project would provide support as needed.	Same as Alternative 2, except NPS would have lead responsibility for federal and NHPA Section 106 compliance rather than ACE.	Same as Alternative 2, except VA SONR and WVDNR would have full responsibility for required compliance.
COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT	ACE would continue to be responsible for complying with NEPA.	ACE would have lead responsibility for NEPA compliance. The comprehensive management plan would require an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS), which could serve as complete NEPA compliance for select actions ACE and states would identify “categorical exclusions” under NEPA for routine recurring activities (e.g., maintaining existing wildlife habitat clearings, routine maintenance on existing facilities such as campgrounds, river access, trails). Potential construction projects would require separate NEPA compliance.	Same as Alternative 2, except: (1) NPS would have lead responsibility for NEPA compliance rather than ACE; and (2) compliance needed for potential construction projects would be covered under NPS-prepared EA/EIS done in conjunction with development concept plan (DCP) that would be prepared subsequent to management plan/EIS.	N/A (except any federal permits or assistance would require NEPA compliance, which would be the responsibility of the applicable federal agency).
FUNDING	ACE would continue to receive federal funding to support its limited current management in the study area. The State of West Virginia would continue to provide funding for DNR	ACE would be authorized to receive new federal funding to implement the WSR designation (including administering the area,	NPS would be authorized to receive new federal funding to implement the WSR designation. WVDNR’s long-term involvement in management would be supported by state funding and	New federal funding could be made available to VA SONR and WVDNR, possibly through a federal/state cost-share to assist with initial costs of implementing WSR designation (including developing a

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
	management, including DNR-WRS management of habitat and wildlife-related public uses and DNR-Parks management of camping facilities and other public uses. DNR and DGIF would continue to be eligible to apply for federal funding from relevant sources (e.g., Wallop-Breaux, Dingell-Johnson programs).	developing a comprehensive management plan, enhancing management in VA, addressing essential infrastructure and other capital needs identified in management plan, etc.). If SONR chooses to assume lead on-the-ground management responsibility in VA, federal funding could be made available through ACE to assist with start-up costs (possibly through a federal/state cost-share). In VA and/or WV, long-term state involvement in management would be supported by state funding, which could be supplemented by other federal sources (e.g., Wallop-Breaux, Dingell-Johnson programs).	potentially supplemented by other federal sources (e.g., Pittman-Robertson, Wallop-Breaux, and Dingell-Johnson programs).	comprehensive management plan, enhancing management in VA, and addressing essential infrastructure and other capital needs identified in management plan). Long-term state management would be supported by state funding and potentially supplemented by other federal sources (e.g., Pittman-Robertson, Wallop-Breaux, and Dingell-Johnson programs).
RELATIONSHIP WITH ADJACENT COMMUNITIES AND COUNTIES	There would continue to be no formal, ongoing community involvement program, and no concerted effort to incorporate this area into a regional tourism strategy or as a contributing factor to the region’s quality of life. ACE and WVDNR would continue to consult with neighboring communities and counties on relevant issues/projects.	Neighboring communities and counties would be consulted during the development and implementation of the management plan. Opportunities for partnerships with local entities would be sought for specific projects. Local interests could use the area’s national designation as a tool in their tourism strategies if they wanted, and ACE and state managers would make increased efforts to coordinate with these efforts.	Same as Alternative 2, except NPS efforts to coordinate with regional tourism strategies likely would be more extensive.	Same as Alternative 2, except state efforts to coordinate with regional interests on tourism issues likely would not be as extensive as Alternatives 2 or 3.
RELATIONSHIP WITH BLUESTONE NATIONAL SCENIC RIVER	WVDNR would continue to be involved in managing fish, wildlife, habitat, and related public uses throughout the Bluestone WMA, including both the study area and Bluestone NSR portions. Habitat management along the	Same as Alternative 1, except there could be increased collaboration in the management of the two areas (e.g., in the development of management plans for each and in communicating similarities and differences	While technically the New River WSR and the Bluestone NSR would be separate management units, the NPS would administer and manage the two areas together. NPS would prepare a single general management plan	Same as Alternative 2.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE #1	ALTERNATIVE #2	ALTERNATIVE #3	ALTERNATIVE #4
	<p>Bluestone NSR likely would continue to be somewhat more limited than in the study area.</p>	<p>between the areas to the public) since both would be designated as WSRs.</p>	<p>for both areas, and resource management would be in accordance with the same standards (i.e., those presented in Appendix 5.C.2). NPS and WVDNR would manage fish, wildlife, habitat, and related public uses in the same way in both areas. The two agencies would establish a single license covering their relationship for both areas, and DNR’s annual work plans would address their efforts in both areas.</p>	

APPENDIX 5.B. Summary of Possible Regional Connection Strategies

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 5.1.3, the study team and other participants were mindful in developing management alternatives that the New River study area is part of a larger geographic, ecological, economic, and social region, and that it could play a pivotal role in shaping the future of the broader region. With this in mind, a number of strategies were identified that could be used to more fully connect this section of the New River to the larger region. These strategies are described below. Some may work better with one or another of the action alternatives for the study area that are described in Chapter 5 (i.e., Alternatives 2, 3, and 4), while others would work with any action alternative. It is important to note, though, that each of the management alternatives described in this report stands on its own. Decisions regarding the selection of a preferred alternative for the study area of the New River can (and should) be made independent of decisions regarding the broader regional connection strategies identified below.

Regional Strategy 1: No Explicit Regional Connections

Under this option the New River study area would be managed with no explicit connection to the larger region beyond what is normally expected of any federally or state owned public use area. Outreach to adjacent communities and interest groups would occur, and managers would cooperate with other efforts as appropriate, but there would be no explicit effort to make larger regional connections. This option is essentially a status quo strategy against which all others might be judged.

Regional Strategy 2: Enhanced Connections to Adjacent Lands

Under this option additional attention would be given to devising cooperative management strategies with adjacent public lands. This would apply in particular to three blocks of land: Bluestone State Park, Bluestone National Scenic River, and lands administered by the Army Corps of Engineers adjacent to Bluestone Lake.

Bluestone State Park. Part of Bluestone State Park is on state land and part is leased from the ACE. This study offers an excellent opportunity to make a decision regarding whether or not ACE lands in Bluestone State Park should be transferred to the State of West Virginia, both because all of the relevant players are collaborating on this study and because any federal legislation that might result would provide a convenient mechanism for transferring ownership of the federal lands. This is not an issue having significant policy implications. The issue mainly revolves around whether this action would provide for more efficient management in the future. The decision on whether this transfer should occur should be made in close consultation with ACE and West Virginia DNR.

Bluestone NSR. Should Alternative 3 be adopted for the study area, the designated WSR portions of both the New River and the Bluestone River would be administered by the National Park Service with DNR-Wildlife Resources Section involved in management of fish and wildlife

and related public uses. In this case, it would seem reasonable that effort be made to provide for consistency in the management of the two areas, both to encourage management efficiency and simplify public understanding. With this in mind, Alternative 3 calls for the two areas to be managed together, to be covered by a single comprehensive management plan, and to be subject to the same standards for resource management.

Should either Alternative 2 or 4 be selected, there is likely to be some difference in the management approach and standards for the two river areas. Given their geographic proximity and the fact that both would be designated as National Wild and Scenic Rivers, this could be confusing to users of these areas. Under Alternative 2, it would also add to the complexity of management for DNR, which would be involved in certain aspects of management for both areas but under different federal administering agencies (i.e., ACE on the New River and NPS on the Bluestone River). To mitigate for this, managers of the two areas could develop consistent management regimes for both or, while retaining different approaches, take special care to communicate the differences and similarities to the public.

Bluestone Lake Shorelands. If Alternative 2 or 4 were selected, DNR would be the primary manager of habitat and recreation for both the New River WSR and the lake shorelands. Given that the lands are adjacent and the same agency would be the manager of both areas, it would seem logical to have both properties managed according to the same resource management standards – that is, the standards developed for these alternatives (as shown in Appendix 5.C.1) would apply to the lake shorelands as well. However, such consistency would not be a requirement, and any decision on this would be left to ACE and DNR.

If Alternative 3 were selected, DNR would be involved in management of the designated WSR portions of both the New River and the Bluestone River through licenses with NPS, and also would continue to have primary responsibility for resource management of ACE-administered lands around Bluestone Lake. However, resource management of these areas would follow two sets of standards, one set by NPS for the New and Bluestone WSRs and the other set by ACE for the lake shorelands. While it is likely that these standards would differ somewhat, for the benefit of both managers and the user public it would be desirable to make them consistent wherever possible and to clearly describe any differences.

Regional Strategy 3: Informal Regional Connections

New River WSR managers could informally, yet proactively, engage in appropriate regional initiatives. These might include participating in future planning and implementation activities for the New River Parkway, the New River American Heritage River, New River Blueway, Virginia Birding and Wildlife Trail, and other efforts focused on conservation, recreation, quality of life, and economic development activities in adjacent communities and surrounding counties. Under this scenario, managers of the New River WSR would be participants in these regional activities, but not necessarily coordinators or facilitators.

This strategy could be implemented regardless of the action alternative selected.

Regional Strategy 4: A National Recreation Area

In this strategy, Congress would establish a national recreation area (NRA) that would encompass the New River WSR, the Bluestone NSR, Pipestem State Park, Bluestone State Park, and possibly the Bluestone Lake shorelands. The NRA would be coordinated by the National Park Service. Management authority would not change hands for any of the areas involved, with the possible exception of the New River WSR depending on which management alternative had been selected separately for it. Each unit of this NRA would continue to be managed independently, but special effort would be made to coordinate activities and market the area as one unified yet multi-dimensional recreation resource. As coordinator of the NRA, the National Park Service's responsibility would be limited to facilitating interagency action, possibly with the assistance of an interagency coordinating committee. Neither the National Park Service nor an interagency coordinating committee would have authority to direct management activities on properties managed by any member agency.

This strategy would likely work best with action Alternative 3, though it might also be possible in conjunction with Alternative 2. The NRA strategy would not be appropriate for Alternative 4 because of the absence of federal involvement in land ownership and management along the New River WSR under that alternative.

Regional Strategy 5: Strong Connections with the New River American Heritage River and Blueway.

Under this strategy, special effort would be made to connect the New River WSR with two ongoing, tri-state initiatives involving most or all of the New River mainstem: the New River American Heritage River, and the New River Blueway. The study area could serve as an important link in this system, along with the previously designated New River WSR in North Carolina, the New River Trail State Park in Virginia, and the New River Gorge National River immediately downstream of the study area. Managers of the New River study area would be active in long-range planning for the heritage river/blueway, and would take actions within the study area that supported the larger objective. An example would be to coordinate development of boating access points and boat access campsites with similar actions in other areas along the river.

This strategy would work equally well with any action alternative.

Regional Strategy 6: A National or State Heritage Area

Under this strategy, the New River would serve as the fulcrum or anchor for a more expansive regional recreation, resource conservation, and economic development initiative that encompassed other significant natural, cultural, and recreational resources in any one of the surrounding counties or, possibly, the entire four county region. The intent would be to enhance the awareness and protection of important resources, improve the quality of life for residents, and attract visitors by identifying, interpreting, and promoting key natural, cultural, and/or recreational themes. This could involve a "heritage area study" conducted by the federal

government, state government(s), or a combination. If the federal government were involved, the National Park Service would likely coordinate the project as a “special resource study.”

This strategy would work equally well with any action alternative. The lead agency for the New River WSR, be it ACE, NPS, or the states, would not necessarily be charged with implementing the heritage area program, but would be expected to be a participant (much as would be the case with strategy 3 above).

Regional Strategy 7: A Broad-scale National Conservation Area

There are ongoing efforts within the greater Virginia and West Virginia area to “brand” certain high quality recreational resources on and around the New River in order to give higher visibility to the area and attract more visitors who would use the various resources and contribute to the local economy. This branding initiative could be bolstered through designation of a “National Conservation Area” that could include the study area, adjacent public lands (the same areas in the NRA in strategy #4 above), the New River Gorge National River, the Gauley River NRA, and, depending on the scope and content, nearby portions of the Jefferson National Forest. This strategy would focus on marketing the region, and could help to highlight on the natural amenities and recreational opportunities of the river and surrounding mountain areas. It would involve a certain amount of inter-area coordination, but each public area would continue to be managed independently.

This strategy would work equally well with any action alternative.

Regional Strategy 8: An Interstate Recreation or Conservation Area

The states of Virginia and West Virginia could initiate an interstate recreation area or conservation area that would cover the same territory as the NRA in strategy 4 but would be designated and coordinated by the states.

This strategy would only apply to Alternative 4.

Making Decisions on a Regional Context Strategy

It is recommended that the four alternatives for management of the New River study area be considered separately from the broader regional strategies described immediately above. It is possible that management decisions for the study area will be made prior to making a final decision on any additional regional strategy or strategies. In this case, it might suffice to simply have an idea of which regional strategies might seem reasonable for the future, and then let experience with implementing the selected action alternative for the study area suggest a direction for regional connections.

On the other hand, at least some of the regional connection strategies could be efficiently implemented in tandem with a given action alternative. For example, should it be decided to pursue a national recreation area (strategy 4) with either Alternative 2 or 3, both the selected

alternative for the study area and the broader NRA designation could be achieved through the same legislation. Similarly, legislation developed to achieve a preferred action alternative for the study area could also be used as a means to authorize a special resource study (a precursor to strategy 6), or the transfer of title to ACE-administered lands within Bluestone State Park to the state of West Virginia (should it be determined that such a transfer is warranted as part of strategy 2).

It is worth noting that the various regional context strategies are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, it would be possible to implement strategy 5 (strong connections to the American Heritage River and Blueway) with strategy 6 (federal or state heritage area) concurrently. Strategy 2 (enhanced connections to adjacent lands) would also work with many of the other strategies.

APPENDIX 5.C. Resource Management Standards for the Action Alternatives

This appendix consists of three components:

- Appendix 5.C.1 contains standards for the management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources and related facilities that would apply under both Alternative 2 and Alternative 4;
- Appendix 5.C.2 contains comparable standards for resource management that would apply under Alternative 3; and
- Appendix 5.C.3 contains a table comparing the two sets of management standards.

The resource management standards contained in Appendices 5.C.1 and 5.C.2 were developed by members of the interagency working group from the agencies that would be involved in the various alternatives, with assistance from the study team. The standards are intended to supplement the descriptions of the alternatives provided in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.A. They represent a greater level of detail and specificity than is typically included in wild and scenic river study reports for federal land situations, but the interagency working group and the study team agreed that this additional information was necessary in this situation in order to provide the affected agencies and other interested parties with the clearest picture possible of how resource management would be conducted under each of the alternatives.

Management standards are of sufficient importance that the specific standards that apply to the alternative ultimately selected for implementation should be referenced directly in the federal legislation that would designate the river as a national wild and scenic river. This would provide assurances to managers and the public that the area would be managed in a manner consistent with the description of the selected alternative and its associated resource management standards, rather than in strict accordance with the general management policies of the agencies that would be involved in administering and managing the area.

APPENDIX 5.C.1. Resource Management Standards for Alternatives 2 and 4

Following are standards for the management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources and related facilities that would apply under Alternatives 2 and 4. While the standards presented below provide the general outline for management under those alternatives, more detailed prescriptions would be developed in a comprehensive management plan that would be prepared if either alternative is ultimately selected for implementation. Those more detailed prescriptions would be consistent with the general standards presented below.

Note that the standards below would apply only to the area affected by Alternatives 2 and 4 – that is, the New River from the confluence with Buffalo Creek above Steer Island in West Virginia upstream to the upper extent of the Bluestone Project Area above Glen Lyn, Virginia, and adjacent federal lands. (See Chapter 5.3.5 for a more detailed description.) Resource management activities and public use on other nearby public lands and waters would not be affected (for example, the stocking of muskellunge fingerlings in the Bluestone River and sterile hybrid striped bass in Bluestone Lake, or the speed of motorboats and use of personal watercraft on Bluestone Lake).

In Virginia, Alternatives 2 and 4 allow for either a state park or a state-administered wildlife management area if the Commonwealth of Virginia chooses to take on management responsibility. While the management standards that follow would apply to either a state park or a wildlife management area, it is important to remember that Virginia state parks and state wildlife management areas are managed by different agencies with different missions and management policies. Therefore, how the management standards below would be applied could differ depending on whether the Commonwealth chose to establish a state park or wildlife management area. Also, if Alternative 2 is ultimately selected and the Commonwealth chooses *not* to take on management responsibility for the affected area in Virginia, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would retain management responsibility for the area and the standards below would apply to their management.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4
MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND OTHER AQUATIC SPECIES	
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of focal species would continue to be conducted in the broader context of other species and the overall ecosystem
Reintroduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reintroduction of extirpated species or stocking of depleted native species would be allowed in order to reestablish species or strengthen ecosystem processes.
Stocking naturalized species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of naturalized species such as smallmouth bass would be allowed following applicable environmental review, including evaluation of (1) potential effects on native species and the aquatic environment, and (2) potential biological and social benefits.
Stocking non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of brown and rainbow trout in Indian Creek would continue to the extent that this continues to serve a recreational fishing purpose and does not adversely affect native species. • Other stocking of non-native species would not occur unless it could be demonstrated that this would serve an important biological or social purpose and would not adversely affect native species.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and state equivalents would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.
MANAGEMENT OF TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE	
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would continue to emphasize “featured species associations”, in which management actions for featured species also benefit a variety of other species. (For example, managing for turkey habitat benefits smoky shrews, hermit thrushes, towhees, woodpeckers, great crested flycatchers, dusky salamanders, Fowlers toads, and black snakes, among other species.)
Re-introduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-introduction of extirpated species or stocking of depleted native species would be allowed in order to reestablish species or strengthen ecosystem processes.
Introduction of non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a general policy of no introductions of non-native wildlife species. Exceptions would be made only following applicable environmental review, including evaluations of the potential effects on native species and the environment, and the potential biological and social benefits.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and state equivalents would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.
HABITAT MANAGEMENT	
Management of ecological processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would rely on natural processes where practical. Judicious use of active habitat management would be allowed in order to meet specific wildlife management objectives. Active management could include (1) creating, reestablishing, and maintaining clearings to enhance wildlife habitat, (2) forest management for vegetative species diversity and mast production, (3) planting trees, shrubs, and/or herbaceous species for wildlife food, cover and critical

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4
	habitat, and (4) controlling water levels in selected wetlands for migratory bird and aquatic furbearer sustenance.
Management of non-native plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While preference would be given to native species, non-native plants could be introduced in clearings and along roads and trails if these were the only realistic choice for the anticipated use and if managers have confidence that these plants would not spread to other areas. • Invasive exotic plants would be controlled to the extent practical.
Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture (e.g., haying and cultivating row crops such as corn) would be used where appropriate as a means to achieve wildlife objectives. • Commercial leases could be used to accomplish habitat management objectives. • All agricultural activities would be conducted in accordance with recognized best management practices (BMPs).
Forest stand management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest management using both even-aged and uneven-aged silvicultural systems would be utilized to enhance wildlife habitat. Forest stands would be managed using various techniques, including clearcuts, shelterwood cuts, single tree selection, group selection, and deferment cuts. Harvests would be limited to that needed to achieve a specific wildlife objective, and would be conducted in accordance with recognized BMPs. Clearcuts and shelterwood cuts would be limited to a maximum size of 25 acres. Managers would be encouraged to experiment with different cut patterns and techniques (e.g., timber stand improvement) to determine those that produce the desired outcome with low environmental impact. • Timber damaged or destroyed by natural hazard or insect infestations could be removed through salvage operations if this is compatible with natural resource management objectives. • Managers would have the option to conduct forest management operations using private contractors if this is the most efficient and economical way to achieve objectives.
Fire management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed burning would be recognized as an ecologically sound way to maintain or create wildlife habitat and would be used as appropriate. • Wildfire would be managed under the guidance of state forestry departments and according to applicable state or federal regulations and BMPs.
Maintaining existing clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing clearings would be maintained if they continue to serve a management purpose. • Existing clearings would be maintained using a range of techniques (e.g., mowing, burning, brush-hogging). Heavy equipment (e.g., bulldozers, road graders) could be used when required but must follow BMPs to minimize erosion and sedimentation into streams, while protecting archeological resources.
Reclaiming overgrown clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reclaiming of clearings would be allowed. Heavy equipment could be used when required but must follow BMPs.
New clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New clearings would be created as necessary to meet wildlife objectives. • Use of timber harvesting techniques to make clearings would be subject to provisions described above under “forest stand management”.
Shoreline modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New projects would not be allowed unless they would address a demonstrated public need and could be accomplished with low environmental impact and no adverse effect on identified outstanding resource values. • Shoreline modification projects would likely require W&SRA Section 7 review.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4
Wetlands construction/restoration and management of water control structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing artificial wetlands and water manipulation projects would continue to be maintained as long as they support wildlife objectives. New projects would be constructed only if they would serve a demonstrated site management need and could be implemented with low impact to the environment. New projects within the bed and banks of the New River would require W&SRA Section 7 review.
Use of pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, fish toxicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-restrictive use pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, and fish toxicants would be used judiciously to meet management objectives. Use of other pesticides and herbicides would occur only when no other alternative is available. All use of these chemicals would be subject to applicable state and federal laws and policies.
Management of federal and state sensitive plant species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and state equivalents would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.
MANAGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PUBLIC USES	
Dispersed pedestrian access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire area would continue to be open to foot traffic, except when and where restrictions are necessary for public safety, resource management (e.g., protection of wildlife nesting areas), or protection of agricultural or other lease holdings.
Hunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hunting would be allowed and guaranteed in legislation. Hunting would be subject to applicable state regulations.
Fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing would be allowed and guaranteed in legislation. Fishing would be subject to applicable state regulations.
Trapping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trapping would be allowed and guaranteed in legislation. Trapping would be subject to applicable state regulations.
Wildlife/nature observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife/nature observation would be allowed, subject to other access policies (e.g., restrictions for public safety or resource management).
Camping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping would be allowed at designated sites, subject to federal and/or state regulations, policies, and fees. Dispersed “backcountry” camping would be prohibited. Camping on islands or other boat access only locations would be prohibited unless sites were designated for this purpose.
Boating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional use of motorized and non-motorized boats for low-impact recreational purposes would be allowed, subject to applicable state regulations. Personal watercraft (PWCs) would not be allowed. Launching of boats from trailers would be restricted to designated ramps. Steps would be taken to discourage introduction of exotic species via boats and trailers.
Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products including fishing bait (e.g., worms, insects, minnows) and wild edibles (e.g., berries, mushrooms) for personal, non-commercial use would be allowed. Gathering for other purposes (e.g., commercial sale) would be prohibited.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited and reasonable restrictions may be placed on public access to certain areas and/or for certain uses during hunting seasons, flood hazards, or other times when public safety is a concern. • Safety zones would be enforced around campgrounds and other high use areas. Hunting and shooting would not be allowed in these areas.
MANAGEMENT OF OTHER PUBLIC USES	
Non-motorized recreational travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding on designated routes would be allowed, subject to appropriate access restrictions related to public safety, wildlife management, or resource protection. • Because of their importance as the primary emphases of the area, fish and wildlife management and traditional public uses would be given priority over non-motorized recreational travel (e.g., the location and timing of non-motorized recreation would be managed to minimize conflicts with fish and wildlife management or traditional public uses). • Organized horseback riding and bicycling events are not permitted in WV.
Motor vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automobiles, light trucks, motorcycles and recreational vehicles would be allowed on designated roadways. • Motorized all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) would not be allowed (except on designated state motor vehicle roadways if authorized for such use under state law).
Commercial recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial outfitters and guides (boat livery operators, fishing guides, etc.) would be allowed to operate in the area. Any commercial permits that might be required in the future would be established and administered in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and policies. • No single commercial entity would be given an exclusive license to provide livery or guiding services throughout the designated national wild and scenic river area.
MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION FACILITIES	
Public access facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing roads and related facilities (e.g., gates) would be managed for consistency with the area’s management objectives. Some areas may be gated and closed to limit public access in order to achieve resource management goals. • Priority would be given to enhancing existing roads, parking lots, and other access facilities over developing new facilities. • New access roads or parking areas would be developed only if they would meet a demonstrated need and not adversely impact riparian zones, fish and wildlife, traditional public uses, and/or the relatively undeveloped, remote character of the area. • Road and trail construction and maintenance would be consistent with erosion and sedimentation control BMP standards.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4
Camping and day use areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, camping areas would be primitive in nature, with no electrical, water, or sewage hook-ups. Due to its accessibility and relatively developed surroundings, camping facilities at the existing town park in Glen Lyn, VA, (upstream of the Route 460 Bridge) could be less primitive than at other, more remote areas. • Existing designated camping and day use sites in WV would continue to operate. Campsites where use is causing significant erosion or degradation of the riparian corridor would be stabilized, phased out or relocated over time. Other campground improvements would be made over time, with priority given to upgrading sanitary facilities and stabilizing/hardening sites within 100 feet of the high water mark. • Managers would work with the Town of Glen Lyn to enhance the existing town park. • In VA, existing informal camping and day use areas would be evaluated to determine how best to provide appropriate public use and protect the environment. Some existing sites would be closed in order to stop resource degradation, and would be actively restored or allowed to naturally revegetate. Others would be improved through site stabilization/hardening, providing sanitary facilities, etc. • Priority would be given to enhancing existing campgrounds and day use areas over developing new facilities. • New camping and day use areas would be developed only if there is a demonstrated need and would largely be limited to replacement of other sites that are being closed. In general, new campsites would be located at least one hundred feet from the river. New camping and day use areas within 100 feet of the river would be limited to sites that are outside of the normal floodplain, that are not subject to excessive erosion, and that do not excessively intrude on the natural setting as viewed from the river. Any new sites within 100 feet of the river would be stabilized to minimize erosion. • Camping and day use areas, both existing and potential, would be managed such that health and safety requirements are met, vehicles are restricted to designated roadways and parking areas, and the relatively undeveloped, remote character of the area is maintained.
Boat landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing boat ramps would be maintained and improved as needed over time. • A limited number of new boat ramps may be developed in the future, although priority would be given to meeting demand through improvements to existing ramps. • The boat launch at the park in Glen Lyn would serve as a primary location in VA for boat access to the river downstream.
Trails for hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing trails would remain open and be maintained unless environmental damage or conflicts with resource management objectives or traditional public uses occur. • New trails or facilities would be developed only if they meet a demonstrated need. Conflicts with fish and wildlife and other public uses would be avoided by judicious siting of facilities and/or closure during certain times of the year, for example, during critical wildlife rearing seasons or hunting seasons.
Other areas and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers would work with the American Electric Power Company to determine a suitable public use for the existing flyash landfill in Glen Lyn once it has reached its disposal capacity.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4
MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC AND ARCHEOLOGIC RESOURCES	
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known historic/archeological sites would be protected. • An inventory of historic/archeological sites would be completed. • Management activities that might disturb historic or archeological sites (e.g., agricultural practices such as plowing; creating/maintaining/reclaiming clearings; establishing new facilities such as campgrounds) would comply with applicable state and federal historic protection laws and regulations. • Managers would seek to ensure that public use of the area does not adversely affect historic and archeological resources. • Interpretation of historic sites would not be a management priority, but could be provided if and when sufficient capacity exists (i.e., funding, staff, and/or an appropriate partnership opportunity) and it is determined that interpretive activities and associated public use would not result in degradation of sensitive resources or interfere with wildlife management and traditional public uses.
MANAGEMENT OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTER	
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In designing, constructing, and/or maintaining facilities for public access/recreation and management purposes, managers would seek to minimize impacts on the relatively undeveloped and remote character of the area. • No land manipulation or placement of structures or facilities would be undertaken that resulted in permanent intrusions to mid or long-range views of the river corridor. • Signage and other visitor information and education facilities would be designed so as to not detract from the area's relatively undeveloped and remote character.

APPENDIX 5.C.2. Resource Management Standards for Alternative 3

Following are standards for the management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources and related facilities that would apply under Alternative 3. While the standards presented below provide the general outline for management under that alternative, more detailed prescriptions would be developed in the general management plan and subsequent planning documents that would be prepared if Alternative 3 is ultimately selected for implementation. Those more detailed prescriptions would be consistent with the general standards presented below.

Note that the standards below would apply to the area affected by Alternative 3, that is, the New River from the confluence with Buffalo Creek above Steer Island in West Virginia upstream to the upper extent of the Bluestone Project Area above Glen Lyn, Virginia, and adjacent federal lands. (See Chapter 5.3.5 for a more detailed description.) Resource management activities and public use on other nearby public lands and waters would not be affected (for example, the stocking of muskellunge fingerlings in the Bluestone River and sterile hybrid striped bass in Bluestone Lake, or the speed of motorboats and use of personal watercraft on Bluestone Lake).

It is also important to note that some of the standards described below (for instance, allowing trapping and maintaining existing agricultural clearings) may entail a departure from the National Park Service's generic management policies for lands under its administration. These exceptions to NPS policy would need to be specifically authorized in the legislation designating the area as a National Wild and Scenic River and assigning administrative responsibility to the NPS. Note that while hunting is often prohibited in national parks and national monuments, this is not the case with National Park Service-administered wild and scenic rivers that are not in national parks or monuments. In fact, Section 13(a) of the WSRA specifies that hunting and fishing will be allowed to continue.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVE 3
MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND OTHER AQUATIC SPECIES	
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of focal species would continue to be conducted in the broader context of other species and the overall ecosystem
Reintroduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reintroduction of extirpated species or stocking of depleted native species would be allowed in order to reestablish species or strengthen ecosystem processes.
Stocking naturalized species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of naturalized species such as smallmouth bass would be allowed following applicable environmental review, including evaluation of (1) potential effects on native species and the aquatic environment, and (2) potential biological and social benefits.
Stocking non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of brown and rainbow trout in Indian Creek would continue to the extent that this continues to serve a recreational fishing purpose and does not adversely affect native species. • Other stocking of non-native species would not occur unless it could be demonstrated that this would serve an important biological purpose and would not adversely affect native species.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and state equivalents would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.
MANAGEMENT OF TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE	
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would continue to emphasize “featured species associations”, in which management actions for featured species also benefit a variety of other species. (For example, managing for turkey habitat benefits smoky shrews, hermit thrushes, towhees, woodpeckers, great crested flycatchers, dusky salamanders, Fowlers toads, and black snakes, among other species.)
Re-introduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-introduction of extirpated species or stocking of depleted native species would be allowed in order to reestablish species or strengthen ecosystem processes.
Introduction of non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a general policy of no introductions of non-native wildlife species.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and state equivalents would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.
HABITAT MANAGEMENT	
Management of ecological processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would rely on natural processes where practical. Judicious use of active habitat management would be allowed in order to meet specific wildlife management objectives. Active management could include (1) maintaining existing clearings to enhance wildlife habitat, and (2) maintaining water levels in the existing wetlands site at Crump’s Bottom for migratory bird and aquatic furbearer sustenance.
Management of non-native plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invasive exotic plants would be controlled to the extent practical.
Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture (e.g., haying and cultivating row crops such as corn) would be used where appropriate in existing areas, as a means to achieve wildlife habitat management objectives.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVE 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial leases could be used as warranted to accomplish habitat management objectives. • All agricultural activities would be conducted in accordance with recognized best management practices (BMPs).
Forest stand management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest stands would be managed for natural succession. • Timber damaged or destroyed by natural hazard or insect infestations could be removed through salvage operations if this is compatible with natural resource management objectives.
Fire management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed burning would be recognized as an ecologically sound way to maintain wildlife habitat and/or to accelerate natural succession as appropriate. • Wildfire would be managed under the guidance of state forestry departments, and the National Park Service, according to applicable state and federal regulations and BMPs.
Maintaining existing clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing clearings would be maintained if they continue to serve a management purpose. • Existing clearings would be maintained using a range of techniques (e.g., mowing, burning, brush-hogging). Heavy equipment (e.g., bulldozers, road graders) could be used when required but must follow BMPs to minimize erosion and sedimentation into streams, while protecting archeological resources.
Reclaiming overgrown clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reclaiming of clearings associated with road traces would be allowed, based on the general management plan. Heavy equipment could be used when required but must follow BMPs.
New clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new clearings would be created for habitat purposes.
Shoreline modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New projects would not be allowed unless they would address a demonstrated public need and could be accomplished with low environmental impact and no adverse effect on identified outstanding resource values. • Shoreline modification projects would likely require W&SRA Section 7 review.
Wetlands construction/restoration and management of water control structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing artificial wetlands and water manipulation projects would continue to be maintained as long as they support wildlife objectives. • New projects within the bed and banks of the New River would require W&SRA Section 7 review.
Use of pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, fish toxicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-restrictive use pesticides-and fish toxicants would be used judiciously to meet management objectives. All use of these chemicals would be subject to applicable state and federal laws and National Park Service policies.
Management of federal and state sensitive plant species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and state equivalents would be managed in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and recovery plans.
MANAGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PUBLIC USES	
Dispersed pedestrian access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire area would continue to be open to foot traffic, except when and where restrictions are necessary for public safety, resource management (e.g., protection of wildlife nesting areas), or protection of agricultural or other lease holdings.
Hunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunting would be allowed and guaranteed in legislation. • Hunting would be subject to applicable state regulations.
Fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing would be allowed and guaranteed in legislation. • Fishing would be subject to applicable state regulations.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVE 3
Trapping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trapping would be allowed and guaranteed in legislation. • Trapping would be subject to applicable state regulations.
Wildlife/nature observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife/nature observation would be allowed, subject to other access policies (e.g., restrictions for public safety or resource management).
Camping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camping would be allowed at designated sites, subject to federal regulations, policies, and fees. • Dispersed “backcountry” camping would be considered based on the general management plan. • Camping on islands or other boat access only locations would be considered based on the general management plan.
Boating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional use of motorized and non-motorized boats for low-impact recreational purposes would be allowed, subject to applicable state regulations. • Personal watercraft (PWCs) would not be allowed. • Launching of boats from trailers would be restricted to designated ramps. • Steps would be taken to discourage introduction of exotic species via boats and trailers.
Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products including fishing bait (e.g., worms, insects, minnows) and wild edibles (e.g., berries, mushrooms) for personal, non-commercial use would be allowed. • Gathering for other purposes (e.g., commercial sale) would be prohibited.
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited and reasonable restrictions may be placed on public access to certain areas and/or for certain uses during hunting seasons, flood hazards, or other times when public safety is a concern. • Safety zones would be enforced around campgrounds and other high use areas. Hunting and shooting would not be allowed in these areas.
MANAGEMENT OF OTHER PUBLIC USES	
Non-motorized recreational travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding on designated routes would be allowed, subject to appropriate access restrictions related to public safety, wildlife management, or resource protection. • Because of their importance, fish and wildlife management and traditional public uses would be given priority over non-motorized recreational travel (e.g., the location and timing of non-motorized recreation would be managed to minimize conflicts with fish and wildlife management or traditional public uses).
Motor vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automobiles, light trucks, motorcycles and recreational vehicles would be allowed on designated roadways. • Motorized all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) would not be allowed (except on designated state motor vehicle roadways if authorized for such use under state law).
Commercial recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial outfitters and guides (boat livery operators, fishing guides, etc.) would be allowed to operate in the area. Any commercial permits that might be required in the future would be established and administered in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and policies. • (Commercial fishing and boating guides would be licensed by the state(s), as is the case in the New River Gorge National River and the Gauley River National Recreation Area, or by the NPS through issuance of incidental business permits.) • No single commercial entity would be given an exclusive license to provide livery or guiding services throughout the designated national wild and scenic river area.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVE 3
MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION FACILITIES	
Public access facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing roads and related facilities (e.g., gates) would be managed for consistency with the area’s management objectives. Some areas may be gated and closed to limit public access in order to achieve resource management goals. • Priority would be given to enhancing existing roads, parking lots, and other access facilities over developing new facilities. • New access roads or parking areas would be developed only if they would meet a demonstrated need and would not adversely impact riparian zones, fish and wildlife, traditional public uses, and/or the relatively undeveloped, remote character of the area. • Road and trail construction and maintenance would be consistent with erosion and sedimentation control BMP standards.
Camping and day use areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, camping areas would be relatively primitive in nature, with basic sanitary facilities, picnic tables, and well water provided but no electrical, water, or sewage hook-ups. Due to its accessibility and relatively developed surroundings, the existing town park in Glen Lyn, VA, (upstream of the Route 460 Bridge) could offer additional amenities beyond those available at other, more remote camping areas. • Existing designated camping and day use sites in WV would continue to operate. Campsites where use is causing significant erosion or degradation of the riparian corridor would be stabilized, phased out or relocated over time. Other campground improvements would be made over time, with priority given to upgrading sanitary facilities and stabilizing/hardening sites within 100 feet of the high water mark. • Managers would work with the Town of Glen Lyn to enhance the existing town park (e.g., upgrade sanitary facilities). • In VA, existing informal camping and day use areas would be evaluated to determine how best to provide appropriate public use and protect the environment. Some existing sites would be closed in order to stop resource degradation, and would be actively restored or allowed to naturally re-vegetate. Others would be improved through site stabilization/hardening, providing sanitary facilities, etc. • Priority would be given to enhancing existing campgrounds and day use areas over developing new facilities. • New camping and day use areas would be developed only if there is a demonstrated need and would largely be limited to replacement of other sites that are being closed. In general, new campsites would be located at least one hundred feet from the river. New camping and day use areas within 100 feet of the river would be limited to sites that are outside of the normal floodplain, that are not subject to excessive erosion, and that do not excessively intrude on the natural setting as viewed from the river. Any new sites within 100 feet of the river would be stabilized/hardened to minimize erosion. • Camping and day use areas, both existing and potential, would be managed such that health and safety requirements are met, vehicles are restricted to designated roadways and parking areas, and the relatively undeveloped, remote character of the area is maintained.
Boat landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing boat ramps would be maintained and improved as needed over time, with an emphasis placed on using the most environmentally sensitive techniques that are feasible for the particular situation. • A limited number of new boat ramps may be developed in the future, although priority would be given to meeting demand through improvements to existing ramps. • The boat launch at the park in Glen Lyn would serve as a primary location in VA for boat access to the river downstream.
Trails for hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing trails would remain open and be maintained unless environmental damage or conflicts with resource management objectives or traditional public uses occur.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	STANDARDS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNDER ALTERNATIVE 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New trails or facilities would be developed only if they meet a demonstrated need. Conflicts with fish and wildlife and other public uses would be avoided by judicious siting of facilities and/or closure during certain times of the year, for example, during critical wildlife rearing seasons or hunting seasons.
Other areas and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers would work with the American Electric Power Company to determine a suitable public use for the existing flyash landfill in Glen Lyn once it has reached its disposal capacity.
MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC AND ARCHEOLOGIC RESOURCES	
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known historic/archeological sites would be protected. • An inventory of historic/archeological sites would be completed. • Management activities that might disturb historic or archeological sites (e.g., agricultural practices such as plowing; creating/maintaining/reclaiming clearings; establishing new facilities such as campgrounds) would comply with applicable state and federal historic protection laws and regulations. • Managers would seek to ensure that public use of the area does not adversely affect historic and archeological resources. • Interpretation of historic sites would be provided as determined by the general management plan and subsequent planning documents.
MANAGEMENT OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTER	
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In designing, constructing, and/or maintaining facilities for public access/recreation and management purposes, managers would seek to minimize impacts on the relatively undeveloped and remote character of the area. • No land manipulation or placement of structures or facilities would be undertaken that resulted in permanent intrusions to mid or long-range views of the river corridor. • Signage and other visitor information and education facilities would be designed so as to not detract from the area's relatively undeveloped and remote character.

APPENDIX 5.C.3. Comparison of Resource Management Standards for Alternatives 2, 3 and 4

The following table provides a side-by-side comparison of the resource management standards for Alternatives 2 and 4 (which adhere to the same set of standards) with those for Alternative 3. For those management factors for which the standards for all 3 alternatives are the same, this is indicated with the notation “Same”. For those management factors for which the standards for Alternatives 2 and 4 differ from those for Alternative 3, the standards for all three alternatives are presented in their entirety even if some or most of the language is the same. Underlining is provided to assist the reader in identifying differences. Please refer back to the preceding parts of this appendix for complete descriptions of resource management standards for Alternatives 2, 3 and 4.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3
MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND OTHER AQUATIC SPECIES		
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Reintroduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Stocking naturalized species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Stocking non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of brown and rainbow trout in Indian Creek would continue to the extent that this continues to serve a recreational fishing purpose and does not adversely affect native species. • Other stocking of non-native species would not occur unless it could be demonstrated that this would serve an important biological <u>or social</u> purpose and would not adversely affect native species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocking of brown and rainbow trout in Indian Creek would continue to the extent that this continues to serve a recreational fishing purpose and does not adversely affect native species. • Other stocking of non-native species would not occur unless it could be demonstrated that this would serve an important biological purpose and would not adversely affect native species.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
MANAGEMENT OF TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE		
Single species management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Re-introduction and stocking of native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3
Introduction of non-native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a general policy of no introductions of non-native wildlife species. <u>Exceptions would be made only following applicable environmental review, including evaluations of the potential effects on native species and the environment, and the potential biological and social benefits.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a general policy of no introductions of non-native wildlife species.
Management of federal and state sensitive species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
HABITAT MANAGEMENT		
Management of ecological processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would rely on natural processes where practical. Judicious use of active habitat management would be allowed in order to meet specific wildlife management objectives. Active management could include <u>(1) creating, reestablishing, and maintaining clearings to enhance wildlife habitat, (2) forest management for vegetative species diversity and mast production, (3) planting trees, shrubs, and/or herbaceous species for wildlife food, cover and critical habitat, and (4) controlling water levels in selected wetlands for migratory bird and aquatic furbearer sustenance.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management would rely on natural processes where practical. Judicious use of active habitat management would be allowed in order to meet specific wildlife management objectives. Active management could include <u>(1) maintaining existing clearings to enhance wildlife habitat, and (2) maintaining water levels in the existing wetlands site at Crump’s Bottom for migratory bird and aquatic furbearer sustenance.</u>
Management of non-native plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>While preference would be given to native species, non-native plants could be introduced in clearings and along roads and trails if these were the only realistic choice for the anticipated use and if managers have confidence that these plants would not spread to other areas.</u> • Invasive exotic plants would be controlled to the extent practical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invasive exotic plants would be controlled to the extent practical.
Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture (e.g. haying and cultivating row crops such as corn) would be used where appropriate as a means to achieve wildlife objectives. • Commercial leases would be used as warranted to accomplish habitat management objectives. • All agricultural activities would be conducted in accordance with recognized best management practices (BMPs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture (e.g. haying and cultivating row crops such as corn) would be used where appropriate <u>in existing areas</u> as a means to achieve wildlife habitat management objectives. • Commercial leases could be used as warranted to accomplish habitat management objectives. • All agricultural activities would be conducted in accordance with recognized best management practices (BMPs).

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3
Forest stand management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Forest management using both even-aged and uneven-aged silvicultural systems would be utilized to enhance wildlife habitat. Forest stands would be managed using various techniques, including clearcuts, shelterwood cuts, single tree selection, group selection, and deferment cuts. Harvests would be limited to that needed to achieve a specific wildlife objective, and would be conducted in accordance with recognized BMPs. Clearcuts and shelterwood cuts would be limited to a maximum size of 25 acres. Managers would be encouraged to experiment with different cut patterns and techniques (e.g., timber stand improvement) to determine those that produce the desired outcome with low environmental impact.</u> • Timber damaged or destroyed by natural hazard or insect infestations could be removed through salvage operations if this is compatible with natural resource management objectives. • <u>Managers would have the option to conduct forest management operations using private contractors if this is the most efficient and economical way to achieve objectives.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Forest stands would be managed for natural succession.</u> • Timber damaged or destroyed by natural hazard or insect infestations could be removed through salvage operations if this is compatible with natural resource management objectives.
Fire management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed burning would be recognized as an ecologically sound way to maintain <u>or create</u> wildlife habitat and would be used as appropriate. • Wildfire would be managed under the guidance of state forestry departments and according to applicable state or federal regulations and BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed burning would be recognized as an ecologically sound way to maintain wildlife habitat <u>and/or to accelerate natural succession as appropriate.</u> • Wildfire would be managed under the guidance of state forestry departments, and the National Park Service, according to applicable state and federal regulations and BMPs.
Maintaining existing clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Reclaiming overgrown clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reclaiming of clearings would be allowed. Heavy equipment could be used when required but must follow BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reclaiming of clearings <u>associated with road traces</u> would be allowed, <u>based on the general management plan.</u> Heavy equipment could be used when required but must follow BMPs.

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3
New clearings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>New clearings would be created as necessary to meet wildlife objectives.</u> • <u>Use of timber harvesting techniques to make clearings would be subject to provisions described above under “forest stand management”.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>No new clearings would be created for habitat purposes.</u>
Shoreline modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Wetlands construction/restoration and management of water control structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing artificial wetlands and water manipulation projects would continue to be maintained as long as they support wildlife objectives. <u>New projects would be constructed only if they would serve a demonstrated site management need and could be implemented with low impact to the environment.</u> • New projects within the bed and banks of the New River would require W&SRA Section 7 review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing artificial wetlands and water manipulation projects would continue to be maintained as long as they support wildlife objectives. • New projects within the bed and banks of the New River would require W&SRA Section 7 review.
Use of pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, fish toxicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-restrictive use pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, and fish toxicants would be used judiciously to meet management objectives. <u>Use of other pesticides and herbicides would occur only when no other alternative is available.</u> All use of these chemicals would be subject to applicable state and federal laws and policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-restrictive use pesticides-and fish toxicants would be used judiciously to meet management objectives. All use of these chemicals would be subject to applicable state and federal laws <u>and National Park Service policies.</u>
Management of federal and state sensitive plant species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
MANAGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PUBLIC USES		
Dispersed pedestrian access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Hunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Fishing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Trapping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Wildlife/nature observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3
Camping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camping would be allowed at designated sites, subject to federal <u>and/or state</u> regulations, policies, and fees. • Dispersed “backcountry” camping would be <u>prohibited</u>. • Camping on islands or other boat access only locations would be <u>prohibited unless sites were designated for this purpose</u>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camping would be allowed at designated sites, subject to federal regulations, policies, and fees. • Dispersed “backcountry” camping would be <u>considered based on the final general management plan</u>. • Camping on islands or other boat access only locations would be <u>considered based on a final general management plan</u>.
Boating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Gathering of abundant and renewable natural products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
MANAGEMENT OF OTHER PUBLIC USES		
Non-motorized recreational travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Motor vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Commercial recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC ACCESS AND RECREATION FACILITIES		
Public access facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Camping and day use areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Boat landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Trails for hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same
Other areas and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same

MANAGEMENT FACTOR	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 4	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STANDARDS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3
MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC AND ARCHEOLOGIC RESOURCES		
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known historic/archeological sites would be protected. • An inventory of historic/archeological sites would be completed. • Management activities that might disturb historic or archeological sites (e.g., agricultural practices such as plowing; creating/maintaining/reclaiming clearings; establishing new facilities such as campgrounds) would comply with applicable state and federal historic protection laws and regulations. • Managers would seek to ensure that public use of the area does not adversely affect historic and archeological resources. • <u>Interpretation of historic sites would not be a management priority, but could be provided if and when sufficient capacity exists (i.e., funding, staff, and/or an appropriate partnership opportunity) and it is determined that interpretive activities and associated public use would not result in degradation of sensitive resources or interfere with wildlife management and traditional public uses.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known historic/archeological sites would be protected. • An inventory of historic/archeological sites would be completed. • Management activities that might disturb historic or archeological sites (e.g., agricultural practices such as plowing; creating/maintaining/reclaiming clearings; establishing new facilities such as campgrounds) would comply with applicable state and federal historic protection laws and regulations. • Managers would seek to ensure that public use of the area does not adversely affect historic and archeological resources. • <u>Interpretation of historic sites would be provided as determined by the general management plan and subsequent planning documents.</u>
MANAGEMENT OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTER		
General standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same

APPENDIX 5.D. Potential Management Plan Components

Introduction

If one of the action alternatives (i.e., Alternative 2, 3, or 4) is ultimately selected and implemented, a management plan will be prepared to guide future management activities and to implement the National Wild and Scenic River designation. The goals, management principles, and assurances defined in Chapter 5.2 will be incorporated into any such plan, along with the relevant resource management standards from Appendix 5.C.

During the study process, a number of additional actions were suggested for inclusion in the management plan. These proposed actions are listed below. Some aim to resolve existing issues, others to fill unmet needs. Some of the actions are so central to one or more of the action alternatives that they have been incorporated directly into the description of the alternatives in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.A, and into the corresponding standards for resource management in Appendix 5.C. Others are ideas that, while not mandatory, are worthy of consideration when a management plan is developed because they appear to enjoy broad-based support and would be consistent with any future management approach.

Site Improvements:

- Assist the Town of Glen Lyn, Virginia, to make improvements to the town-managed riverfront park (e.g. upgrade restroom facilities). These improvements would be aimed at establishing this location as a principal point for river access and providing information to the public.
- Enhance existing campgrounds in the West Virginia portion of the study area. Depending on location, these improvements may include updating sanitary facilities, moving campsites in eroded/sensitive riparian areas away from the immediate shoreline and revegetating eroded sites, defining parking areas, etc.
- Evaluate the need, cost, and desirability of establishing a developed campground with basic facilities (including sanitary facilities and potable water) along the river in Virginia.
- In collaboration with Appalachian Power (AP), evaluate the potential for re-use of AP's existing fly ash landfill in Glen Lyn, Virginia for recreation and/or other purposes that complement the conservation and recreational use of the river corridor. Any proposal for re-use of the site must recognize and respect AP's need to continue to dispose of fly ash, which will occur on another site outside of, but near, the study boundary. Particular attention should be given to potential safety issues that could arise from increased public use of the existing narrow road that AP's trucks will need to use to haul fly ash to the new landfill.
- Restore, protect and monitor degraded sites in Virginia, including informal river access points, primitive campsites, and areas heavily impacted by 4-wheel drive vehicles.

Management:

- Increase management presence and law enforcement in the Virginia portion of the study area.
- Organize an annual river cleanup, perhaps as a collaborative, public participation project.
- Establish a policy to confine the use of motorized vehicles to designated roadways in order to protect wildlife, habitat, and other sensitive resources, and to avoid disrupting traditional recreational activities.
- Explore the feasibility of allowing holders of valid Virginia or West Virginia fishing licenses to fish the New River in both states.

Planning:

- Develop a recreation/public access plan that emphasizes traditional uses and explores opportunities for other uses, provided that those opportunities would not conflict with traditional uses or degrade resources. This plan also should address the issue of public use carrying capacity.
- Develop a strategy for enhancing river-related recreational opportunities by, for example, improving access; establishing boat access only campsites; providing information on access, safety, and potential trips; developing a system for notifying recreationists about any closure of road access gates, campgrounds, boat ramps and other facilities (including signage at the boat put-in at the town park in Glen Lyn, Virginia, to notify boaters who are planning to take out at the campgrounds in West Virginia); etc.
- Develop plans for the management of natural, cultural and visual resources. These plans (which could be separate documents or components of a comprehensive management plan) could include identification of important resources, analysis of threats and opportunities, consideration of additional measures to protect and (where feasible) enhance important resources, and identification of appropriate mechanisms for increasing public understanding of these resources. The cultural resource component could include evaluating the potential eligibility of historic/archeologic sites (e.g., prehistoric village sites and batteau chutes) for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and preparing the necessary nomination forms.
- Evaluate the need for land acquisition and, if acquisition is needed, develop a judicious (limited) land acquisition plan with public input. (As described in the assurances presented in Chapter 5.2, any land acquisition would be from willing sellers or through donation.)
- Develop a plan for public information, education and interpretation that complements the conservation and recreational use of the area, and emphasizes facilities and techniques that are consistent with the area's relatively remote, undeveloped character.
- Develop a road management plan that would identify potential road improvements, access limitations/closures, maintenance responsibilities, and funding requirements.
- Evaluate opportunities for enhanced conservation and recreation on federally owned lands (including islands) within the Bluestone Project Area upstream of the designated wild and scenic river area.

Research:

- Conduct a study of the rate and extent of siltation in Bluestone Lake to determine the potential impacts of sedimentation on lake levels, lake recreation, and the free flowing character of the New River immediately upstream of Bluestone Lake (i.e., in the lowermost portion of the designated NWSR segment).
- Complete the inventory of historic and archeological sites initiated by the Army Corps of Engineers.
- Complete baseline inventories for biological and physical resources.
- Conduct a public use carrying capacity study and establish a long-term program to monitor public use of the area.

Linkages:

- Develop a strategy for interaction with the towns/cities of Glen Lyn, Virginia, and Hinton, West Virginia, that would emphasize their status as gateway communities. Develop similar connections to the three abutting West Virginia counties and Giles County, Virginia.
- Develop meaningful and mutually beneficial partnerships with appropriate private sector entities, including Appalachian Power, outfitters/guides, local and regional sporting groups, conservation organizations, etc.
- Explore and develop connections with other river conservation and outdoor recreation initiatives in the region, such as the Bluestone National Scenic River, the New River Blueway, the New River American Heritage River Initiative, the New River Gorge National River and Gauley River National Recreation Area, the Jefferson National Forest, and watershed efforts on Indian Creek and the upper Bluestone River. (See Appendix 5.B for further discussion of potential strategies for connecting the designated NWSR area with these and other regional initiatives.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berry, L. A. and R. A. Silvester. 1995. *Bluestone Wildlife Management Area, Bluestone River Unit, Wildlife Management Plan, 1995-1999*. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Charleston, WV.
- Berry, L. A. and R. A. Silvester. 2001. *Bluestone Wildlife Management Area, Wildlife Management Plan, 2001-2006*. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Charleston, WV.
- Cincotta, D. not dated. *Old Secrets of the New River*. Information brochure. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Wildlife Diversity Program, Elkins, WV.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. 1993. *State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan 1993-97*. Department of Conservation and Recreation, Richmond, Virginia.
- Edwards, G. T. 1987. Mary Draper Ingles: the story of a pioneer heroine's captivity and escape. *Proc. New River Symp.* 6:71-80.
- Edwards, G. T. 1988. Following the rivers in Mary Draper Ingles' footsteps: a conversation with Eleanore Lahr. *Proc. New River Symp.* 7:29-38.
- Fridley, Harry M. 1953. "The Geomorphic History of the New-Kanawha River System". *The Scientific Monthly*. Washington, DC.
- Garland, E. 1986. Historic settlement analysis by remotely sensed data. *Proc. New River Symp.* 5:113-122.
- Hipple, F. S. 1993. The changing structure of income and employment in the New River Valley. *Proc. New River Symp.* 11-56-64.
- Huddleston, E. 1995. The New River and the American landscape tradition. *Proc. New River Symp.* 12:21-31.
- Hudson, M. L. 1986. Early navigation surveys on the New River. *Proc. New River Symp.* 5:131-140.
- Ingram, Bruce. 2002. *The New River Guide*. Ecopress, an imprint of the Finnelly Company, Minneapolis, MN.
- Interagency Wild and Scenic Rivers Coordinating Council. 2002. *Wild and Scenic Rivers Reference Guide*. USDA Forest Service and USDI Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Park Service, Washington, DC.

Jirka, K. J. 1985. A review of the mussel fauna of the New River (WV). *Proc. New River Symp.* 4:27-38.

Leonard, P. M. 1985. Comparisons of fish assemblages in the New River (WV). *Proc. New River Symp.* 4:95-106.

Markham, S. L., C. H. Hocutt, and J. R. Stauffer, Jr. 1980. The Crayfish and the Freshwater Mussels of the lower New River, Virginia and West Virginia. *Natural History Miscellanea* (208). The Chicago Academy of Sciences, Chicago, IL.

Maslowski, R. F. 1982. Archeology of the Bluestone Reservation. *Proc. New River Symp.*1: 185-194.

Maslowski, R. F. 1983. Indian pottery from the Bluestone Reservation, Hinton, West Virginia. *Proc. New River Symp.* 2:69-88.

Maslowski, R. F. 1984. Historic sites in Crump's Bottom, Bluestone Reservation. *Proc. New River Symp.* 3:183-192.

Maslowski, R. F. 1986. Relationship of archeological sites to soils in the New River Valley of West Virginia. *Proc. New River Symp.* 5:165-173.

McNeely, J. W. 1993. There is a river: a description of the New River in the Bluestone Project area. *Proc. New River Symp.*11: 31-40.

Morgan, J. and Mayfield, M. 1993. The New River as the old river. *Proc. New River Symp.* 11:1-9.

National Committee for the New River, Inc. 1993. *The New River in the Bluestone Project Area: Narrows, VA--Bluestone Lake, WV.* Jefferson, North Carolina.

National Park Service. 2003. *Department of the Interior License for the Management of Fish, Wildlife, and Related Habitats at Bluestone National Scenic River.* National Park Service, New River Gorge National River, Glen Jean, WV.

National Park Service. 1994. *New River Wild and Scenic River Study: Draft Eligibility and Classification Report.* National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, Philadelphia, PA.

National Park Service. 1995. *Farmington River Wild and Scenic River Study Final Report.* National Park Service, North Atlantic Regional Office, Boston, MA.

National Park Service. 2003. *Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail – National Historic Trail Feasibility Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement.* National Park Service, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, PA.

National Park Service. 2005. Mission statement. Internet web site.
<http://www.nps.gov/legacy/mission.html>

National Park Service. Undated. *Director's Order 12 Handbook: Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making*. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

New River Parkway Authority 1991. *New River Parkway Concept Plan*. Hinton, West Virginia.

Smith, J. 1988. New River Bateaus. *Proc. New River Symp.* 7:1-4.

Taylor, C. I. 1995. Survival of wild turkey hens in the New River Valley, Summers County, West Virginia. *Proc. New River Symp.* 12:97-109.

Taylor, C. I. 1997. Home range and movement of wild turkey hens in the New River Valley, Summers County, West Virginia. *Proc. New River Symp.* 14:67-79.

Tolin, W. A. 1984. Survey of freshwater mussels, New River (Wylie Islands to Bluestone Lake), Lower Bluestone River, and Indian Creek, Summers County, West Virginia. *Planning Aid Report*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Elkins, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1994. *Draft Environmental Assessment Bluestone Lake, West Virginia Dam Safety Program*. Huntington District, West Virginia.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Undated. *Department of the Army License, Management of Fish and Game*. Representation of the original 1950 unnumbered license agreement and a compilation of four subsequent modifications [for the Bluestone Project Area in West Virginia]. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1997. *Lake Operational Management Plan*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1949. *Master Plan for Public Use Development and Reservoir Utilization*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1982. *Department of the Army Lease of Industrial Facilities, Bluestone Lake, Virginia and West Virginia*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1994. *Reconnaissance level evaluation report for Bluestone Lake hydropower study (draft)*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1998. *Bluestone Lake Historic Properties Management Plan (draft)*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2005. Bluestone Dam historic pool elevation data 1950-2004. Excel spreadsheet. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District, Huntington, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2005. Bluestone Project land inundation records. Unpublished records. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bluestone Project, Hinton, WV.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2005. Mission statement. Internet web site. <http://www.usace.army.mil/who.html#Mission>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. Census 2000 data for the State of Virginia. Internet web site. <http://www.census.gov/census2000/states/va>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. Census 2000 data for the State of West Virginia. Internet web site. <http://www.census.gov/census2000/states/wv>.

U.S.D.A. Forest Service. 1991. *Lower Klickitat River Wild and Scenic River Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement*. U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR.

U.S.D.A. Forest Service. 1991. *Upper Klickitat River Wild and Scenic River Study Report and Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement*. Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR.

U.S. Department of the Interior and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1982. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System: final revised guidelines for eligibility, classification, and management of river areas. *Federal Register*, Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. Dates Vary. 7.5 minute topographic maps for Narrows, VA and Flat Top, Forest Hill, Lerona, Peterstown, and Hinton, WV. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. 2005. Glen Lyn, Virginia streamflow gage data. Internet web site. <http://waterdata.usgs.gov/va/nwis/uv?03176500>.

Virginia Canals & Navigation Society. 2003. *The New River Atlas*. Virginia Canals & Navigation Society, Palmyra, VA.

Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Undated. Fish species occurring in Giles County, Virginia. Printout from database. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Blacksburg, VA.

Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Undated. *Virginia Birding and Wildlife Trail – Mountain Area* [Guidebook]. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Richmond, VA.

Virginia Secretary of Natural Resources. 2005. Natural resource agencies' mission statements. Internet web site. <http://www.naturalresources.virginia.gov/Agencies/agency.cfm>

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources. 1996. Rules governing public use of West Virginia state parks, state forests, and state wildlife management areas under the Division of Natural Resources. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Charleston, WV.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources. 2004. *Annual Report 2003-2004*. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Charleston, WV.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program. 2003. Rare, threatened, and endangered species data base list for Summers and Mercer counties. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, Elkins, West Virginia.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section. 2001. A guide to wildlife management areas in West Virginia. Public information document. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Charleston, WV.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section. 2001. Bluestone Wildlife Management Area, annual management plan, 2001-2002 fiscal year. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Charleston, WV.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section. 2003. Wildlife Resources Section activities on Bluestone Lake Wildlife Management Area. Unpublished report presented at the Interagency Work Group meeting, Pipestem State Park, December 2, 2003. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Charleston, WV.

West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section. 2003. Bluestone Wildlife Management Area, advanced management plan, 2003-2004 fiscal year. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Section, Charleston, WV.

Wieboldt, T. F. 1989. Early botanical explorations and plant notes from the New River, Virginia section. *Proc. New River Symp.* 8:149-160.

Applicable Federal Laws

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et. seq.)

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321-4370a)

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287)