

The Mary Orton Company LLC

Ozark National Scenic Riverways Stakeholder Workshop

Havener Center, Missouri University of Science and Technology
Rolla, Missouri
February 24-25, 2010



**Conducted by
Mary Orton, Principal**  **The Mary Orton Company, LLC**

702.914-8066  mary@maryorton.com  www.maryorton.com

March 6, 2010

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Workshop Overview | 4 |
| Purpose and Goals | 4 |
| Invitees and Attendees..... | 4 |
| Description of the Process | 6 |
| Handouts..... | 6 |
| Workshop Products | 7 |
| Scenarios with Benefits and Drawbacks | 8 |
| Motorboat Use | 8 |
| Access to the River..... | 17 |
| Rating Scenarios..... | 30 |
| Motorboat Use | 31 |
| Access to the River..... | 36 |
| Additional Comments..... | 41 |
| Evaluation of the Workshop by Participants | 45 |
| Appendix 1: Discussion Notes, Day 2..... | 47 |
| Motorboat Use | 47 |
| A. Keep Things the Same | 48 |
| B. No Motors Zones | 48 |
| C. No Restrictions..... | 50 |
| D. Speed Limit, With or Without Horsepower Limits | 51 |
| E. Reduce Horsepower Limits | 52 |
| F. Increase Horsepower Limits..... | 53 |
| G. Limit Boats at One Time, Operational Instructions | 53 |
| Access to the River..... | 54 |
| Horses - Crossing..... | 55 |
| A. Use Designated Crossings Only | 55 |
| B. Historical Use/Existing Use Crossings..... | 55 |
| C. Resource Protection..... | 57 |
| Horses - Limits | 58 |
| D. No Limits | 58 |
| E. Trail / Place Limits | 59 |
| F. Limits on Numbers | 60 |
| Vehicles – Fords and Access..... | 62 |
| G. NPS Designated Places Only | 62 |
| H. Historic/Existing Places | 62 |
| J. Limit to Fewer or None | 62 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| I. Separate Concession Access and Private Access..... | 64 |
| K. Increase Options..... | 65 |
| Appendix 2: Handouts | 67 |
| Agenda..... | 68 |
| Purpose and Significance..... | 70 |
| General Management Planning Overview | 72 |
| Motorboat and Other ONSR Regulations..... | 74 |
| Definitions | 76 |
| Comment Card..... | 79 |
| Workshop Evaluation | 80 |

Workshop Overview

Purpose and Goals

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR or park) is updating its General Management Plan (GMP). The park sponsored a series of scoping open houses in September 2006, and then released its preliminary alternatives and held another round of open houses in June 2009. On February 24 and 25, 2010, ONSR held a stakeholders workshop for the purpose of bringing together representatives of different interest groups for some frank discussion and creative thinking about the park's potential future management. ONSR told its stakeholders that the workshop's results, as well as other information, would help the National Park Service as it reviews the draft alternatives for possible revision and selects a preferred alternative for the Draft GMP. The workshop was not designed for participants to come to consensus, nor was it a decision-making meeting; rather, it was designed to give the park more information about the comments already received and to allow stakeholders to hear each other's concerns.

The goals of the workshop were to:

1. Provide an opportunity for participants to explore recreation and resource management strategies that help preserve that which they value most about the Riverways.
2. Share with participants the limitations of law and regulation under which the NPS and this planning process operate.
3. Build trust and respect among participants and park staff.

ONSR leadership committed to consider what they heard during the workshop, though they did not guarantee that it would be included in the GMP. Park staff emphasized that they would consider other input, including, but not limited to:

- Comments received to date,
- Laws and policies,
- GMP guidelines, and
- Impacts on resources and visitor experience.

Invitees and Attendees

Following are the names of the people invited to participate in the workshop, with affiliations and attendance on Day 1 and Day 2.

| Day 1 | Day 2 | Name | Affiliation |
|----------|----------|------------------|--|
| Yes | Yes | Teresa Acord | Jacks Fork Watershed Committee |
| Yes | No | John Bailiff | Carter County |
| Yes | No | Tom Bedell | Park Concessioner |
| Yes | Yes | Denny Bopp | Wonders of Wildlife and MDNR ¹ , Missouri State Parks |
| Yes | Yes | John Mark Brewer | Voice of the Ozarks |
| Yes | Yes | Carol Chrisco | Eminence Chamber of Commerce |
| Yes | Yes | Dale Counts | Hunting Interests |
| Yes | Yes | Trisha Crabill | U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service |

¹ MDNR = Missouri Department of Natural Resources

| Day 1 | Day 2 | Name | Affiliation |
|------------------|------------------|----------------------|--|
| Yes | No | Mike Cullen | Camp Zoe |
| Yes | Yes | Wanda Cumins | Van Buren Chamber of Commerce |
| Yes | Yes | Carolyn Dyer | Horse Trail Riders/Operators |
| Yes | Yes | Susan Flader | Missouri Parks Association |
| Yes | Yes | Linda Garrett | Texas County |
| Yes | Yes | Kally Higgins | Non-Motorized River Use |
| Yes | Yes | Brett Howell | Horse Trail Riders/Operators |
| Yes | Yes | Greg Iffrig | L-A-D Foundation |
| Yes | Yes | Rick Johnson | Van Buren School |
| Yes | Yes | Angel Kruzen | The Sierra Club |
| Yes | Yes | Kat Logan Smith | Missouri Coalition for the Environment |
| Yes | Yes | Steve Mahfood | The Nature Conservancy |
| Yes | Yes | Dave Martin | Motorboat Use |
| Yes | Yes | Phil Moss | Scenic Easement Holder |
| Yes | Yes | Tony Orchard | Shannon County |
| Yes | Yes | Dennis Purcell | Dent County |
| Yes | Yes | Naureen Rana | National Parks Conservation Association |
| Yes | Yes | Allison Schottenhaml | Horse Riders – Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen |
| Yes | Yes | Phil Schroeder | MDNR, Water Protection Program |
| Yes | Yes | Mike Smith | Missouri Department of Conservation |
| No | No | Stacy Smith | Eminence School |
| Yes | Yes | Jerry Sugerman | Friends of Ozark Riverways |
| Yes | Yes | Michael Sutton | Cave Research Foundation |
| Yes | Yes | Shane Van Steenis | Park Concessioner |
| Yes | Yes | Kristine Swanson | USDA ² Forest Service, Mark Twain National Forest |
| Yes | Yes | Ray Walden | Ozark Natural and Cultural Resource Center |
| Yes | Yes | Doug Warren | Fishing Interests |

The following National Park Service staff members attended to answer questions as needed, provide support, and listen to the conversation:

- Reed Detring, Superintendent, ONSR
- Russ Runge, Deputy Superintendent, ONSR
- Patty Dorris, Assistant to the Superintendent, ONSR
- Dena Matteson, Public Information Officer, ONSR
- Ann Van Huizen, GMP Project Manager
- Ryan Sharp, GMP Project Staff

Mary Orton of The Mary Orton Company, LLC (TMOC) attended as lead facilitator. Also affiliated with TMOC were four small-group facilitators, Dave Gibbons, Shawn Grindstaff, Jim Reeves, and John Petersen; and Leanette Kearns, who took notes and provided support.

² USDA = United States Department of Agriculture.

Description of the Process

On the first day, after some introductory comments, the participants formed four small groups, each consisting of participants who represented a diversity of opinions and points of view. A professional facilitator managed the discussion of each small group.

The groups were asked to act as if they were the ONSR GMP planning team, charged with coming up with a full range of reasonable scenarios – different ways the park could be managed – for two issues: (1) Motorboat Use and (2) Access to the River (of both horses and vehicles). The National Park Service selected these two issues because of the number and diversity of comments received about them in the summer of 2009.

Each small group developed several scenarios, answering specific questions developed by ONSR to benefit their planning process. (See the specific questions and the worksheets used by the groups in Appendix 2.) The groups were asked to develop a range of scenarios so that each person in that group found at least one scenario to be acceptable to his or her interests. Participants also discussed the benefits and drawbacks for each scenario. Scenarios, benefits, and drawbacks were recorded by participants and posted on the wall for discussion, and each small group reported its scenarios to the full group.

During the evening of the first day, The Mary Orton Company staff compiled all the scenarios developed by the small groups, plus the benefits and drawbacks that were identified for each scenario. These notes were printed and copied for distribution to participants the next day.

On the second day, the full group discussed the scenarios. Specifically, they were asked how ONSR might address the drawbacks of each scenario without losing the benefits. Detailed notes of the discussion were taken. Those notes were projected on a screen as they were taken, and participants were invited to check those notes and make sure their comments were recorded accurately.

At the end of the meeting, participants were given the opportunity to submit the following:

- A rating of how well each scenario satisfied their interests.
- An evaluation of the workshop.
- Any other comments or scenarios that did not get captured during the workshop.

This report will be posted on the ONSR and PEPC websites (www.nps.gov/ozar and www.parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar).

Handouts

Please see Appendix 2 for the following handouts from the workshop:

1. Agenda
2. Purpose and Significance
3. General Management Planning Overview
4. Motorboat and Other ONSR Regulations
5. Definitions
6. Worksheet – Motorboat Use
7. Worksheet – Access to the River
8. Comment Form
9. Evaluation Form

Workshop Products

Workshop products include: scenarios with benefits and drawbacks from the small groups, scenario ratings from individual participants, additional comments, and workshop evaluations. These four follow in this section. The final workshop product, the notes from the discussion on Day 2, is in Appendix 1.

Scenarios with Benefits and Drawbacks

In four small groups, the participants created scenarios that answered specific questions asked by ONSR. The small groups were asked to ensure that everyone in the small group could identify at least one scenario from that group's list that met his or her interests. Participants were then asked to identify benefits (+) and drawbacks (-) of each scenario. "Other" comments – those made by participants that didn't fit into any other column – were captured, as well.

Each small group chose its own name. The groups were named Deer Leap, Hellbenders, Quo-da-Riva, and Shawnee Creek.

Motorboat Use

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions ("what") | Seasonality/Timing ("when") | Zones ("where") | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| 1 | No horsepower (hp) restrictions but speed limits; set speed limits to river usage | Speed limits apply Memorial Day to Labor Day, no hp restriction or raise from 40 hp to 100 hp | The use of the river would set zones – water levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough hp for family – safety issues, 25 hp | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +Decrease # of boats/trips on the river +Fewer boats or trips to haul some loads, no hp. Higher or hp +Fewer boats? +Reduce speeds in high use area if use speed with hp +Zones set by usage, fewer conflicts + If speed limits are enforced and the number of boats are limited, there could potentially be fewer motorized boats on the rivers + Rangers would have to be on the river - Rangers would have to be on the river - More speeding - Speed hard to determine/enforce - Difficult to enforce - Speed limit too hard to regulate speed and size of boats - Current uses of the rivers may not be adequately protective of natural resources |

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions ("what") | Seasonality/ Timing ("when") | Zones ("where") | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| 2 | Impose limit on number of motor boats allowed at one time | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Could decrease visitor conflict and congestion - How do you limit and who is told "no"? - Not visitation friendly at all - Too hard to regulate out of state people, could be put out when arriving - Economy - Hurt the economy, who will count boats?, not fair |
| 3 | Keep the same option, no change. Follow current ONSR regulations, 7.83 restrictions | Seasons as outlined in ONSR regulations for motorboat | Zones the same as in ONSR Regulations S 7.83 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 99% of local people would be for no change + Enough regulations – enforce current rules to provide wide spectrum of recreation for all visitors + Seems to be working except for the lower hp. + Most public understand + Doesn't allow for excessive speeds - Doesn't reduce the number of boats on the river - Does not bring other considerations - Nowhere for a primitive, non-motorized river experience - If we cut jet boats, it will affect local economy which is a big part of tourism in the county |
| 4 | Speed limits good, but hard or impossible to enforce. Need to be in addition to hp limits. Noise restrictions (is that possible?) | Need some season where canoeists have upper rivers to themselves | No motorboat zones at least above Akers and Alley. Need at least some all-season non-motorized zone, above Akers? | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + HP restriction + Areas available with less disturbance + Having some non-motorized zones would allow some visitors and wildlife the benefits of natural "soundscapes" + Allows for more primitive/non-motorized experience + No-motor zone would appeal to river users just as hp does to boats - Not for any part of the river to be non-motorized, river limits itself - Miles per hour (MPH) restriction - Would limit activity during fall and winter months - Non-motorized area - Low water levels sets usage - Local economy |

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions ("what") | Seasonality/ Timing ("when") | Zones ("where") | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| 5 | Speed limit, but leave hp limit | Speed limits (if observed and enforceable). More restrictions (lower speed) during times of high use | No motor zone/ perhaps seasonal | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + No need for speed limit if hp limit stays the same + No-motor zone offers another use option + More protection for natural resources during times of high use - Speed limit, too hard to regulate speed and size of boats - No-motor zone - Too confusing to the people, speed and hp limit - Lower speed, more dangerous |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions ("what") | Seasonality / Timing ("when") | Zones ("where") | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| 1 | MPH limits with hp maximum limit | Peak floating – increase restrictions | Upper vs. Lower | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement of speed and drug use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Has never been a fatality boating accident in ONSR + Safety for the swimmers and canoers + Floater safety and better river experience + Zones would allow visitors to choose the type of use or experience - MPH is not measurable in the boats by drivers - Define zones, how are they designated? - Lower carrying capacity - Hellbenders (Sept.-Oct.) - Noise, safety - Visitor experience - More hassle from law, hard to enforce - Increase restrictions means more manpower and hours - MPH is very hard to enforce - Horsepower limit. Different things occur on water that cause reaction - MPH – boats don't have equipment and enforcement |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions ("what") | Seasonality / Timing ("when") | Zones ("where") | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| 2 | HP – current restrictions | Weekdays vs. weekend (more important enforcement) | Lower Jacks and Current River – current restrictions fine | • Behavior | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + All good + Law enforcement poor behavior + No change required in management plan + Locals are happy + Everyone gets to enjoy the river... campers, tubing, floaters, canoes, swimmers, boaters, within laws and reason + More law enforcement on peak days (weekend) strict fines on violations, visitors will be happy also. + Economy is better - Expense of additional law enforcement, how to pay? - NPS understaffed for weekends - Noise/intrusiveness - Canoes, etc. stay away - Visitor experience degraded |
| 3 | No horse power restrictions, common sense with law enforcement | October through April, no need of heavy law enforcement | In zones with lots of people, have more park service law | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + More law enforcement and manpower means better experience over all + Better economy for small towns + Less confusion about restrictions - No hp restriction means <u>disaster</u> to natural resources and visitors. People won't keep speed low. - Law enforcement will <u>not</u> be adequate (wishful thinking) - Boats too large – wakes - A lot more law enforcement expense - Not everyone has common sense! - No horsepower restrictions will cause <u>some</u> to push the matter beyond reason |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions ("what") | Seasonality / Timing ("when") | Zones ("where") | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| 4 | Leave current restrictions in place | More congestion, more law enforcement on Saturdays, Memorial Day to Labor Day | More law! Waymeyer to Van Buren Gap | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law enforcement is lax, stricter! | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Everyone gets to enjoy the river... campers, tubing, floaters, canoes, swimmers, boaters, within laws and reason + Maintains larger motors below Big Spring + Large boaters, local boaters will use fewer congested areas! So leave current motor restrictions alone + No-action approach + Strict law enforcement + Locals happier + Economy is better - Very little place for those who think big motors are inappropriate - Expense of law enforcement, how to pay, where is the money? - Does not address weekend overcrowding and natural resource damage |
| 5 | 10 hp (except staff) | All year | Above Round Spring and Alley Spring | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Benefits to natural resources + A portion of the rivers left for quiet enjoyment and wildlife + Allows users for quiet enjoyment a portion of the riverways + Bigger motorized boats don't use these stretches anyway + Makes more river non-motorized. Visitors have more river in primitive condition + Peaceful use + Less traffic + Would help economy + That will give a stretch of river for mostly floaters and more natural activities + Need a quiet zone + Will bring back people who like non-motorized experience - Prevents family use because of limited weight capabilities - Current restrictions are working in that area because of water levels |

Group: Quo-da-Riva

| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
|------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Leave same, more law enforcement, more education | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows continued access and parking to prevent congestion for current user numbers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Economic certainty + Keep families in the same boat + Proven + Less/no disruption to current users + Safety issue - Current noise is maintained - Consistency problems - Current concerns continue |
| 2 | Lift restriction between Van Buren Gap and Big Spring | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Boats can go from the gap – 40 hp+ to below Big Spring to eliminate congestion with tubes and canoes + Economic certainty + Ease of enforcement + Ease parking issue at Big Spring + Safety Issue - User conflict - Parking Congestion @ Van Buren |
| 3 | Require ONSR operational instruction before boat use | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase more state water patrol (State issue possibly) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Safety + Economic development, entrepreneur training - Administration serves as barrier to access - Infringes on rights of people |
| 4 | Raise horsepower in current 40 hp zone to 65 hp | | Change 40 hp zone to 65 hp on Jacks Fork and Current | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More uniformed and friendly park personnel, alleviate user conflicts for easy transition to larger HP motors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Allows elderly & handicapped to truly experience ONSR natural resources + Increased accessibility to more boat owners + Minimize wakes of boats with 4 people in the boat and help alleviate congestion in boats and canoers + Safer experience - Current hp restrictions proven - Safety (speed) - Existing user conflicts remain |

Group: Quo-da-Riva

| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
|------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 5 | No motorized boats | | Upriver of Cedar grove | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptions – trolling, water patrol | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Allows user group previously excluded + Wildlife non-disturbance + Quiet - Doesn’t allow handicapped and elderly people use and enjoyment of natural resources - Against basic premise of enabling legislation, enjoying natural beauty for all, not just a select few - Economic disruption |
| 6 | Unlimited and unrestricted motorized boat usage | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Keeps ONSR in line with being a recreation-oriented riverways + Economic - Safety issue on certain part of the river - Decreased water quality - Economic - Safety, resource degradation |

Group: Shawnee Creek

| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality / Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | No change in current regulations | No change in current regulations | No change in current regulations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement? • Are seasons correct? • Educate canoes, motorboats on courtesy. • No wake area. | <p>+ Benefits boat owners, because they are already accustomed to these regulations</p> <p>+ The upper part of these rivers are smaller so the 25 hp limit is more in tune with the river size</p> <p>+ Benefits family recreation</p> <p>+ Number of boats are fewer now because larger motor can pull more weight</p> <p>+ Emergency help for all river users in the event of accidents</p> <p>+ Known limits on hp</p> <p>+ Local support (higher %)</p> <p>+ Purpose of the park is for recreation and preservation</p> <p>+ Benefits floaters because there are fewer boats in the upper parts with 25 hp limit</p> <p>+ Promotes the sales of motorboats the economy as far as lodging restaurants, food sales. A very important part of an emergency situation</p> <p>+ Traditional</p> <p>- Purpose of the park is for recreation and preservation</p> <p>- Degrades natural soundscape</p> <p>- Introduces safety risk for swimmers, especially children</p> <p>- May increase turbidity of the river</p> <p>- Doesn’t completely benefit family recreation seeking non-motorized “fun”</p> <p>- No “speed” limits</p> <p>- Increased turbidity may adversely impact aquatic fauna and flora</p> <p>- Wake may adversely affect novice canoe paddlers</p> <p>- May conflict with purpose for which the park was created</p> <p>- Jet boating is not a traditional use of the river</p> |

Group: Shawnee Creek

| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality / Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
|------------|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2 | Section of rivers that is non-motorized | Memorial Day to Labor Day | 10 hp and 25 hp areas would become non-motor only | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions may shift use/pressure elsewhere (+ or -) | + Benefits non-motorized family recreation + Benefits economy and promotes rentals + Recognizes motorized recreation + Sound + Aquatic fauna - Staff needed to enforce will increase - Higher human impact |
| 3 | Max 10 hp limit on ONSR | All year | Both rivers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control the frequency of occurrence of motor boats | + Captures cultural tradition and park mandate on purpose - Propeller impacts environment and safety - Increased number of boats on the river |
| 4 | Keep current hp regulations with new regulations on congested areas | Memorial Day to Labor Day | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorized and open access points | |
| 5 | No hp limits with speed limits | | | | - Safety |
| 6 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any need for visibility on river weather conditions? | |

Access to the River

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 1 | Locations currently designated or established by historical use | No limit on horses | Locations currently designated or established by historical use | Locations currently designated or established by historical use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Needed for people to get to the river. More access means less congestion. + Benefit gives all users chance to recreate + Local economy + Gives everyone the same opportunity to the rivers - No way to route trails to avoid problems |
| 2 | At designated river crossings currently in place | No limits | At designated crossing, current numbers | Vehicle's access designated gravel bars at designated access points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit number of commercial riders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Gives all users chance to recreate |
| 3 | Designated crossings only | Minimize trails running parallel to the river | | Limit # of access points and limit to designated spots | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Gives canoe campers better chance of an undisturbed night + Gives control over potential erosion problems - Re: minimize trails running parallel to the river – there are few designated trails now parallel – this would not be the experience visitors want <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They are already limited - More public access points - Would limit emergency vehicle access |

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 4 | | Set reasonable limits on number of horses allowed on riverside trails | | Close all unofficial river access roads | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you control limits on horses? Not many riverside trails. People come to enjoy the river scenic area by horseback | + Gives canoe campers better chance of an undisturbed night + Closing unofficial river access points will reduce negative impacts to natural resources (riparian areas, water quality) - Need more designated access points - More public access points |
| 5 | Designated crossing | No limits | Designated crossing | Do not close any gravel bars, do not close access points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hard to restrict access when legal access points are not known | |
| 6 | Horses cross at designated crossings | Design a trail system on park and other properties away from riparian corridor? | No vehicle crossings at river | Reduce present access – too many, reduce by 1/2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No major human disease outbreaks have been attributed to the contacts humans have had with horses | + Recognized system easier to maintain and enforce + Protects resources of park for all users - NPS time and commitment - Locals have to drive many miles to go around |

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 7 | Horse trails designed to minimize erosion and ground-water pollution | How many is too many? Some limits on number of horses at one time | | Close ATV trails to gravel bars | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The E. coli reference center (ECRC) is the largest repository for E. coli strains with over 70,000 strains gathered over 50 years. 619 strains from horses; none had the 157:h7 type with Shiga toxin that is dangerous to humans. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ATV users are entitled to recreation area uses - To limit horses would open the door to later limit campers and floaters |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 1 | Use existing river accesses | Current restrictions? Left in place. | No vehicle fording except at NPS designated | Separate concessioner access and private access | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greatest access disturbance from private vehicles for floating! Don't know roads or proper use of access. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Increased access by doing public access and concessioner and keeping them separate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current restrictions on horses doesn't address impaired waters listed on 303(d) list. - Too many undesignated crossings used by horses – decrease to only designated crossings. - Does not deal with the fact that there are too many horses and resource damage. - Vehicles have a detrimental effect on water quality. |
| 2 | Historic fords – existing developed bridges crossings | Maintained trail system only – organized events under NPS permit only – group size restrictions | Use maintained roads only – cross river at bridges only – no fords. | Vehicle access to gravel bars by maintained roads only | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If primitive campground, no motor homes should be there. Parties vs. dropping off people. Local access to gravel bars – should there be time limits? Define primitive re: no bathroom and walk-in – no vehicles When designated parking areas of campsites are full, access is restricted until spaces empty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Limiting horse use will improve the natural resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +Eliminates vehicles from river water - Less access will mean more congestion - Too easy to proclaim roads are “maintained” - Gravel bars: vehicles are not scenic – radio noise. - Any limitation will cause problems in other areas activities. - If no parking areas, where will they park? - Parking violations enforced, not enough staff. |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 3 | Designate crossing at horse trails | Weekend limit monitored by NPS for impact | Only at designated fords or no fords – approximately 5 miles apart | No vehicles on or near gravel bars – <u>scenic river</u> . | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles 200 ft from river. • Create off-gravel bar campsites and parking. • Access for elderly or handicapped so they can enjoy. | <p>+ Limiting access protects the natural resources – maybe need to reduce # of visitors.</p> <p>- Difficult to utilize resource if access is limited.</p> <p>- People will drive until they get to river! Brings us back to not enough designated parking.</p> <p>- Taking away access to locals causes them to either not go to the river or add to congestion of already over-crowded areas. Locals tried to use accesses and stay out of the way, but things are closed.</p> |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 4 | Designated crossings and trails and river accesses | Limit horses in high concentrated areas. Re: swimmers, floaters, campers. | Designated roads to ford the river or none at all. | Designated gravel bar access in some areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce non-permitted horse events • NPS must be able to restrict horse numbers congregating within 5 miles of NPS land • If we limit horses only in concentrated areas, that doesn't help with new horse trails operations. • Large numbers of horses using NPS land needs to be reduced. Either lottery system or through permits to visitors. • In high concentration areas, safety is an issue as well as resources in conjunction with high-traffic areas. Some horses don't do well in crowds, noise, etc. | - Limiting horses in areas of concentration does not deal with <u>overall</u> number of horses using NPS land. |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 5 | Only authorized crossings | 15/group, 100 in any area per day (about 15 river miles) (includes as concessioners any within 5 miles of ONSR) | Ford only on NPS authorized bridges/roads | None on gravel bars or within 100 feet of bank except at authorized put-ins or campground | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No vehicles in primitive camping areas (32) or unauthorized accesses (33). Total is 65 - restore vegetation. • Relocate horse trails away from riverbank. • Additional authority for NPS to close roads and prohibit vehicles within ONSR. • Put numbers on horses to better identify. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different types of permits for horse trail businesses and new ones wanting to start up. • Have specific horse zones with permits as a requirement. • Implement a permit system for horses by day to limit number of horses by zone. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a concessions system for horses like canoe contract. | <p>+ Horses cross at designated times?</p> <p>+ Attempts to reduce horse numbers within river protects natural resources better than doing nothing.</p> <p>- Negative economic impact.</p> <p>- Permitting horses causes people to want swimmers permitted and tubers permitted, etc.</p> |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 6 | | | | | (Applies to 1-5, above) • Annual or semi-annual meeting with NPS, city, county officials, concessionaires, and other interested parties to better plan for maintenance issues, access issues, law enforcement issues, etc. Look for ways to make things better. | |

| Group: Quo-da-Riva | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 1 | At designated horse crossings | | | | • Better trails/crossings • Mutually beneficial to horseman/park • Could be more crossings • Monitor designated access for impact | + Prevent erosion + Supports current level of use + Reduce conflict + More fish |

| Group: Quo-da-Riva | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Scen- ario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 2 | | | | At designated access points | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Allows primitive experience + Environmental improvement + Decrease number of people on non-designated gravel bars - Change behavior - Prevents cultural and traditional activities: picnicking, camping and basic recreational activities - Increased numbers and impacts on designated areas |
| 3 | | | Ford river at all traditional locations and improve conditions | Access gravel bars at all traditional points and improve condition of access | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Allows people to visit family gravesites and access old home places and natural wonders especially for handicapped and elderly. Access to resources for all. - Reduces primitive experience - Increased maintenance cost |
| 4 | | Have designated trails on upper Current River | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate people about horses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +Relieve areas currently heavily used + Helps control pollution + Allows closer monitoring and management of trail use - Limits riding |
| 5 | | | Reduce current access points by 1/2 | Reduce current access points by 1/2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restore banks/vegetation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Water quality and wildlife + Increase primitive access - Closes off access to cultural and natural resources for most people - Safety and emergency management services become hindered |

| Group: Quo-da-Riva | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 6 | | | Double all road and trail accesses to river | Double all road and trail accesses to river | | + Help people to more fully experience the true beauty in nature of ONSR and improve visitor experience + Improve access for handicapped, elderly and emergency management - Reduce primitive experiences - Increased costs - Increased pollution |

| Group: Shawnee Creek | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 1 | | | Close vehicle access at 65 points along the riverways | Put in/take-out points only as designated by NPS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horse/vehicle use may overlap • Close vehicular access to 32 primitive areas and 33 unauthorized vehicular river access points • Dispute about county road or not / jurisdiction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + This will reduce or eliminate the incidence of unwelcome visitors to river campers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Resources will benefit + Preserve riparian corridor + Restore riparian corridor + Closes the fragmentation of the riparian corridor + Eliminates the occurrence of motorized vehicle on the banks of the river. + This scenario is responsive to the park's mandate to restore degraded resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limits user experience and availability. - Will give park service total control of county roads and river access and river crossings within park boundaries. - What about denying road access and river access to the physically handicapped people? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accesses will limit the available emergency use. |

| Group: Shawnee Creek | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 2 | Reroute horse trails to protect riparian corridor | Minimize river crossings | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crossings are already limited. • Paid scenic easements for land use. • Official trails controlled by NPS | <p>+ Park superintendent needs to take greater responsibility for managing the resources and the activities that affect the resources.</p> <p>+ Properly selected boundary modifications or negotiated use easements will greatly expand the options for trail routing and for avoiding excessive river crossings.</p> <p>+ Helps to restore the degraded riparian corridor by removing horse trails from the natural locations of riparian habitat.</p> <p>+ Places first priority on resource protection and adapts the horse trail to the needs for greater resource protection.</p> <p>- Reroute option may be limited</p> <p>- Will affect the number of horse riders; in turn will affect the economic impact of the community around</p> <p>- Damages the user experience</p> <p>- The superintendent of the park needs more freedom to work with (or) less restriction to work with local organizations and local governments to fix problems</p> <p>- Use experience will impact economy</p> |
| 3 | No change from current GMP. | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cleaner water than city water after trail rides. • River changes after a flood. | <p>+ Leave it as it is – will satisfy locals.</p> <p>- Disputed interpretation / implementation.</p> |

| Group: Shawnee Creek | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | | Other (not required) | Benefits (+) and Drawbacks (-) |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| 4 | Grandfather existing traces, trails, and roads. | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At “x” point in time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the decision criteria? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + May satisfy current users. + Good local PR for NPS. +/- No further development - Too many unauthorized access points. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenic quality issues - The belief the park has authority over roads, river crossings, and river access. - There is a great excess of roads criss-crossing the park. Many are redundant or have no appropriate function related to the park. Grandfathering the existing network would severely limit resource protection options. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bad PR non-local |
| 5 | | | | | <p>Applies to 1-4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the decision criteria? Park service update roads, trails, and environmental assessment | |

Rating Scenarios

Participants were invited to rate each scenario created by the small groups on a scale of 1 to 5 in terms of how well it satisfied their interests. The rating scale was:

- 1 = definitely not
- 2 = somewhat not
- 3 = don't care
- 4 = somewhat yes
- 5 = definitely yes

Some participants rated scenarios or groups of scenarios; others rated individual components of scenarios. Some rated certain scenarios or elements but not others; some did not submit any ratings. A total of 26 ratings were received for Motorboat Use and 28 for Access to the River.

In the tables below, for those who rated the full scenario, the results are indicated under the column "Scenario #." If the person rated an element of the scenario, the results are indicated in that cell. The rating (1-5) is the first number, and the number of people who chose that rating follows in parentheses after a colon. For example, "5:(7)" means that 7 people rated that scenario or scenario element as 5; that is, they felt that definitely yes, it satisfied that person's interests.

The ratings were not a vote; rather, they gave information to the park regarding the preferences of the participants, providing deeper understanding of the discussion at the workshop and the comments received before the workshop. The ratings do not statistically reflect the community as a whole.

Motorboat Use

| Group: Deer Leap | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) |
| <p>1</p> <p>1:(6)</p> <p>2:(3)</p> <p>3:(4)</p> <p>4:(7)</p> <p>5:</p> | <p>No hp restrictions but speed limits; set speed limits to river usage</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:(1)</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:</p> | <p>Speed limits apply Memorial Day to Labor Day, no hp restriction or raise from 40 to 100 hp</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:(1)</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:(1)</p> | <p>The use of the river would set zones – water levels</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:</p> |
| <p>2</p> <p>1:(13)</p> <p>2:(5)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(2)</p> <p>5:(4)</p> | <p>Impose limit on number of motor boats allowed at one time</p> | | |
| <p>3</p> <p>1:(6)</p> <p>2:(2)</p> <p>3:(1)</p> <p>4:(5)</p> <p>5:(9)</p> | <p>Keep the same option, no change. Follow current ONSR regulations, §7.83 restrictions</p> <p>1:(2)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:(1)</p> | <p>Seasons as outlined in ONSR regulations for motorboat</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:(2)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:</p> | <p>Zones the same as in ONSR Regulations §7.83</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:(2)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>1:(3)</p> <p>2:(3)</p> <p>3:(5)</p> <p>4:(3)</p> <p>5:(3)</p> | <p>Speed limits good, but hard or impossible to enforce. Need to be in addition to hp limits. Noise restrictions (is that possible?)</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:(3)</p> <p>4:(2)</p> <p>5:</p> | <p>Need some season where canoeists have upper rivers to themselves</p> <p>1:(2)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:(2)</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:(2)</p> | <p>No motorboat zones at least above Akers and Alley. Need at least some all-season non-motorized zone, above Akers?</p> <p>1:(4)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:(2)</p> |

| Group: Deer Leap | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) |
| 5 | Speed limit, but leave hp limit | Speed limits (if observed and enforceable). More restrictions (lower speed) during times of high use | No motor zone/ perhaps seasonal |
| 1:(5) | 1:(1) | 1: | 1:(2) |
| 2:(3) | 2:(1) | 2:(1) | 2: |
| 3:(3) | 3:(1) | 3: | 3:(1) |
| 4:(4) | 4:(2) | 4:(1) | 4: |
| 5:(3) | 5: | 5: | 5:(3) |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) |
| 1 1:(3) 2:(2) 3:(3) 4:(5) 5:(3) | MPH limits with hp maximum limit 1: 2: 3:(1) 4:(3) 5: | Peak floating – increase restrictions 1:(2) 2:(1) 3: 4:(1) 5: | Upper vs. Lower 1:(1) 2:(1) 3: 4: 5:(1) |
| 2 1: 2:(7) 3: 4:(7) 5:(5) | HP current restrictions 1: 2: 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(3) | Weekdays vs. weekend (more important enforcement) 1:(1) 2: 3:(2) 4: 5:(1) | Lower Jacks and Current River – Current restrictions fine 1:(1) 2: 3: 4:(2) 5:(2) |
| 3 1:(8) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(6) 5:(5) | No horse power restrictions, common sense with law enforcement 1: 2: 3: 4: 5:(2) | October through April, no need of heavy law enforcement 1:(1) 2: 3: 4: 5:(2) | In zones with lots of people, have more park service law 1: 2: 3:(2) 4: 5: |
| 4 1:(1) 2:(4) 3:(1) 4:(6) 5:(6) | Leave current restrictions in place 1: 2: 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(2) | More congestion, more law enforcement on Saturdays, Memorial Day to Labor Day 1:(1) 2: 3: 4:(1) 5:(2) | More Law! Waymeyer to Van Buren Gap 1: 2: 3: 4:(1) 5:(3) |
| 5 1:(10) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(4) 5:(4) | 10 hp (except staff) 1: 2: 3: 4:(1) 5: | All year 1: 2: 3: 4: 5:(1) | Above Round Spring and Alley Spring 1: 2: 3:(1) 4: 5:(1) |

| Group: Quo-da-Riva | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) |
| 1 1:(3) 2:(3) 3:(2) 4:(6) 5:(10) | Leave same, more law enforcement, more education | | |
| 2 1:(5) 2:(1) 3:(4) 4:(5) 5:(8) | Lift restriction between Van Buren Gap and Big Spring | | |
| 3 1:(3) 2:(2) 3:(6) 4:(10) 5:(3) | Require ONSR operational instruction before boat use | | |
| 4 1:(8) 2:(1) 3:(2) 4:(3) 5:(8) | Raise horsepower in current 40 hp zone to 65 hp 1: 2: 3: 4:(2) 5: | | Change 40 hp zone to 65 hp on Jacks Fork and Current 1: 2: 3: 4: 5:(1) |
| 5 1:(11) 2:(3) 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(4) | No motorized boats 1:(2) 2: 3: 4: 5: | | Upriver of Cedar Grove 1: 2: 3:(2) 4: 5: |
| 6 1:(13) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(2) 5:(4) | Unlimited and unrestricted motorized boat usage | | |

| Group: Shawnee Creek | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Scenario # | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) | Zones (“where”) |
| 1 1:(3) 1.5:(1) 2:(2) 3:(1) 4:(4) 5:(10) | No change in current regulations 1: 2: 3: 4: 5:(1) | No change in current regulations | No change in current regulations |
| 2 1:(2) 2:(1) 3:(3) 4:(3) 5:(6) | Section of rivers that is non-motorized 1:(2) 2: 3:(1) 4: 5:(1) | Memorial Day to Labor Day 1: 2:(2) 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(1) | 10 hp and 25 hp areas would become non-motor only 1:(4) 2: 3: 4:(1) 5: |
| 3 1:(8) 2:(2) 3:(2) 4:(2) 5:(4) | Max 10 hp limit on ONSR 1:(1) 2: 3: 4: 5: | All year 1: 2: 3:(1) 4: 5: | Both rivers 1: 2: 3:(1) 4: 5: |
| 4 1:(1) 2:(6) 3:(5) 4:(4) 5:(3) | Keep current hp regulations with new regulations on congested areas 1: 2:(1) 3: 4: 5: | Memorial Day to Labor Day 1:(1) 2: 3: 4: 5: | |
| 5 1: (10) 2:(2) 3:(2) 4:(3) 5:(1) | No hp limits with speed limits | | |

Access to the River

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? |
| 1 1:(14) 2:(2) 3: 4:(2) 5:(7) | Locations currently designated or established by historical use (horses) 1: 2: 3: 4:(2) 5: | No limit on horses 1: 2: 3: 4:(1) 5:(2) | Locations currently designated or established by historical use (vehicles) 1: 2: 3: 4: 5:(1) | Locations currently designated or established by historical use - 1: 2: 3: 4: 5:(1) |
| 2 1: (6) 2:(1) 3: 4:(7) 5:(2) | At designated river crossing currently in place 1: 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(4) | No limits 1: (2) 2: 3: 4: 5:(4) | At designated crossing, current numbers 1:(1) 2:(2) 3: 4: 5:(2) | Vehicles access designated gravel bars at designated access points 1:(1) 2:(1) 3: 4:(3) 5:(1) |
| 3 1:(2) 2:(2) 3:(1) 4:(4) 5:(10) | Designated crossings only 1: 2: 3: 4:(3) 5: (3) | Minimize trails running parallel to the river 1:(1) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(2) 5:(1) | | Limit # of access ports and limit to designated spots 1:(4) 2:(1) 3: 4:(1) 5: |
| 4 1:(9) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(2) 5:(9) | | Set reasonable limits on number of horses allowed on riverside trails 1:(1) 2:(1) 3: 4: 5: | | Close all unofficial river access roads 1: 2:(1) 3: 4: 5:(1) |

| Group: Deer Leap | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? |
| 5 1:(6) 2:(3) 3:(3) 4:(1) 5:(4) | Designated crossing 1: 2: 3: 4:(3) 5:(2) | No limits 1:(1) 2: 3: 4:(1) 5:(2) | Designated crossing 1: 2: 3: 4:(1) 5:(3) | Do not close any gravel bars, do not close access points 1: 2:(1) 3: 4: 5:(6) |
| 6 1:(2) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(5) 5:(7) | Horses cross at designated crossings 1: 2:(1) 3: 4:(1) 5:(4) | Design a trail system on park and other properties away from riparian corridor? 1:(1) 2:(1) 3: 4:(1) 5:(2) | No vehicle crossings at river 1: (6) 2: 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(1) | Reduce present access – too many, reduce by ½ 1:(5) 2: 3:(1) 4:(1) 5: |
| 7 1:(4) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(3) 5:(7) | Horse trails designed to minimize erosion and ground-water pollution 1: 2:(1) 3: 4:(2) 5:(4) | How many is too many? Some limits on number of horses at one time 1:(3) 2: 3: 4: 5:(3) | | Close ATV trails to gravel bars 1:(4) 2:(1) 3:(1) 4:(1) 5:(1) |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? |
| <p>1</p> <p>1:(3)</p> <p>2:(5)</p> <p>3:(5)</p> <p>4:(3)</p> <p>5:(4)</p> | <p>Use existing river accesses</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(3)</p> <p>5:(2)</p> | <p>Current restrictions? Left in place.</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(2)</p> <p>5:(2)</p> | <p>No vehicle fording except at NPS designated</p> <p>1:(3)</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:(1)</p> | <p>Separate concessioner access and private access</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:(4)</p> |
| <p>2</p> <p>1:(4)</p> <p>2:(3)</p> <p>3:(2)</p> <p>4:(6)</p> <p>5:(3)</p> | <p>Historic fords – existing developed bridges crossings</p> <p>1:</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:(1)</p> <p>4:(2)</p> <p>5:(3)</p> | <p>Maintained trail system only – organized events under NPS permit only – group size restrictions</p> <p>1:(3)</p> <p>2:(2)</p> <p>3:(2)</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:</p> | <p>Use maintained roads only – cross river at bridges only – no fords.</p> <p>1:(6)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:(2)</p> | <p>Vehicle access to gravel bars by maintained roads only</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:(2)</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:(2)</p> |
| <p>3</p> <p>1:(3)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:(1)</p> <p>4:(7)</p> <p>5:(6)</p> | <p>Designate crossing at horse trails</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(2)</p> <p>5:(2)</p> | <p>Weekend limit monitored by NPS for impact</p> <p>1:(4)</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:(1)</p> | <p>Only at designated fords or no fords – approximately 5 miles apart</p> <p>1:(4)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:</p> | <p>No vehicles on or near gravel bars – <u>scenic river</u>.</p> <p>1:(6)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>1:(3)</p> <p>2:(2)</p> <p>3:(4)</p> <p>4:(4)</p> <p>5:(5)</p> | <p>Designated crossings and trails and river accesses</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:</p> <p>4:(3)</p> <p>5: (3)</p> | <p>Limit horses in high concentrated areas. Re: swimmers, floaters, campers.</p> <p>1:(2)</p> <p>2:(1)</p> <p>3:(2)</p> <p>4:(1)</p> <p>5:(1)</p> | <p>Designated roads to ford the river or none at all.</p> <p>1:(5)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:(1)</p> <p>4:</p> <p>5:(1)</p> | <p>Designated gravel bar access in some areas.</p> <p>1:(1)</p> <p>2:</p> <p>3:(3)</p> <p>4:(2)</p> <p>5:(1)</p> |

| Group: Hellbenders | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? |
| 5 | Only authorized crossings | 15/group, 100 in any area per day (about 15 river miles) (includes as concessioners any within 5 miles of ONSR) | Ford only on NPS authorized bridges/roads | None on gravel bars or within 100 feet of bank except at authorized put-ins or campground |
| 1:(5) | 1: | | 1:(3) | 1:(4) |
| 2:(1) | 2:(1) | | 2: | 2: |
| 3: | 3:(4) | | 3:(1) | 3: |
| 4:(4) | 4:(1) | 1:(4) | 4:(3) | 4:(1) |
| 5:(7) | 5:(1) | 2:(1) | 5:(1) | 5:(3) |
| | | 3:(1) | | |
| | | 4:(2) | | |
| | | 5: | | |

| Group: Quo-da-Riva | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? |
| 1 1: 2:(5) 3:(3) 4:(8) 5:(9) | At designated horse crossings | | | |
| 2 1:(2) 2:(5) 3:(3) 4:(6) 5:(8) | | | | At designated access points |
| 3 1:(9) 2:(4) 3:(1) 4:(2) 5:(8) | | | Ford river at all traditional locations and improve conditions 1: 2: 3: 4:(1) 5: | Access gravel bars at all traditional points and improve condition of access |
| 4 1: 2:(2) 3:(3) 4:(10) 5:(8) | | Have designated trails on upper Current River | | |
| 5 1:(10) 2:(1) 3:(4) 4:(3) 5:(7) | | | Reduce current access points by 1/2 1:C (1) 2: 3: 4: 5: | Reduce current access points by 1/2 |
| 6 1:(17) 2:(2) 3:(2) 4: 5:(5) | | | Double all road and trail accesses to river | Double all road and trail accesses to river |

| Group: Shawnee Creek | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Scenario # | HORSES | | VEHICLES | |
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? |
| 1 1:(9) 2:(1) 3:(2) 4:(2) 5: (7) | | | Close vehicle access at 65 points along the riverways 1:(3) 2: 3: 4: 5: | Put in/take-out points only as designated by NPS 1: 2: 3:(1) 4: 5: |
| 2 1:(3) 2:(2) 3:(1) 4:(8) 5:(6) | Reroute horse trails to protect riparian corridor 1: 2:(1) 3:(1) 4: 5: | Minimize river crossings 1:(2) 2: 3: 4: 5: | | |
| 3 1:(6) 2:(4) 3:(2) 4:(2) 5:(8) | No change from current GMP. | | | |
| 4 1:(8) 2:(3) 3:(1) 4:(2) 5:(7) | Grandfather existing traces, trails, and roads. | | | |

Additional Comments

Participants had the opportunity to submit any comments they wished during and at the end of the workshop. The following comments were submitted.

- I would hope that you will reconsider the structure of the GMP alternatives and include traditional and historic equestrian uses as appropriate in the primitive zone, and in any area recommended as wilderness. It is difficult to imagine that those responsible for introducing wilderness legislation did not intend that wilderness would perpetuate primitive travel with horses or mules.
- I started to evaluate each of the proposed scenarios. I stopped. There is too much undecided / unstated to pick a winner or loser at this time. I suspect your preferred alternative will be a hybrid of several and may include components that were not discussed during the workshop.

This workshop did provide an excellent forum of the area residents to identify their issues and perspective. That was very helpful to me.

- New scenario: No-motor zones during high season. 10 hp all year above Two Rivers and Alley Spring (no jet boats), except in / during no-motor zones / seasons. Benefits: Leave part of the riverways as originally intended.
- Start all planning with preservation / restoration of resources and ecosystems uppermost. Very frustrating not to have this be part of the discussion. This should be NPS policy – leave unimpaired.
- Strictly limit horse use by numbers / days / zones. Horse trails redesigned away from river. No vehicles or vehicle camping in primitive areas or on gravel bars (except perhaps a very few areas.)
- Where should horses access the river? Only at minimal / necessary crossings. What limits on horses should be imposed? Park should set some limits – max 15.
- Where should vehicles ford the river? Only at minimal / necessary # of crossings. Where should they access gravel bars? Minimal.
- Having a “no wake area” is a great idea – use it more!
- *Deer Leap Motorboat Use Scenario #1 – No hp restrictions, but speed limits, set speed limits to river usage:* Difficult to do.
- *Deer Leap Motorboat Use Scenario #4: Speed limits good, but hard or impossible to enforce. Need to be in addition to hp limits. Noise restrictions (is that possible?):* Agree that it is hard or impossible to enforce. Need a careless wreckless clause.
- *Hellbenders Motorboat Use Scenario #1 – MPH limits with hp maximum limit:* Suggest MPH limits based on hp maximum limit.
- *Quo-da-Riva Motorboat Use Scenario #1 - Leave same, more law enforcement, more education:* I like the education component!
- *Shawnee Creek Motorboat Use Scenario #2 – Section of rivers that is non-motorized:* Everyone wins in this scenario.
- *Shawnee Creek Motorboat Use Scenario #2 - Section of rivers that is non-motorized, Memorial Day to Labor Day:* Or longer.
- *Shawnee Creek Motorboat Use Scenario #3 – Max 10 hp limit on ONSR:* Concerns about propeller impacts.
- *Deer Leap Access to the River Scenario #2 – Horses – limit number of commercial riders:* Already in place.
- *Deer Leap Access to the River Scenario #3 – Horses access the river at designated crossing only:* Leave it alone.
- “Historical” and “traditional” need to be defined.
- Riverside trails are not good.
- Rating scenarios: One person rated groups of scenarios from 1 (most important/preferred) to the least important/preferred in the group, as follows:

MOTORBOAT USE:

A. Keep things the same *Rating: 1*

- *Deer Leap 3*
- *Hellbender 2, 4*
- *Quo-da-Riva 1*
- *Shawnee Creek 1*

B. No motors zones *Rating: 3*

- *Deer Leap 4, 5*

- *Quo-da-Riva* 5
- *Shawnee Creek* 2
- C. No restrictions **Rating: 4**
 - *Hellbender* 3
 - *Quo-da-Riva* 6
- D. Speed limit, with or without horsepower limits **Rating: 6**
 - *Deer Leap* 1, 4, 5
 - *Hellbender* 1
 - *Shawnee Creek* 4, 5
- E. Reduce horsepower limits **Rating: 5**
 - *Hellbender* 5
 - *Shawnee Creek* 3
- F. Increase horsepower limits **Rating: 2**
 - *Quo-da-Riva* 2, 4
- G. Limit boats at one time, operational instructions **Rating: 7**
 - *Deer Leap* 2
 - *Quo-da-Riva* 3

ACCESS TO THE RIVER:

Horses - Crossing

- H. Use designated crossings only **Rating: 2**
 - *Deer Leap* 2, 3, 5, 6
 - *Hellbender* 3, 4, 5
 - *Quo-da-Riva* 1
 - *Shawnee Creek* 3
- I. Historical use/existing use crossings **Rating: 1**
 - *Deer Leap* 1
 - *Hellbender* 1, 2
 - *Shawnee Creek* 4
- J. Resource protection **Rating: 3**
 - *Deer Leap* 7
 - *Shawnee Creek* 2

Horses - Limits

- K. No limits **Rating: 2**
 - *Deer Leap* 1, 2, 5
- L. Trail / place limits **Rating: 1**
 - *Deer Leap* 3, 6
 - *Hellbender* 1, 2, 4
 - *Quo-da-Riva* 4
 - *Shawnee Creek* 2
- M. Limits on numbers **Rating: 3**
 - *Deer Leap* 4, 7
 - *Hellbender* 3, 4, 5

Vehicles – Ford and Access

- N. NPS designated places only **Rating: 2**
 - *Deer Leap* 1, 2, 3, 5
 - *Hellbender* 1, 4, 5

- *Quo-da-Riva 2*
- *Shawnee Creek 1*
- O. Historic/existing places **Rating: 1**
 - *Deer Leap 1, 5*
 - *Quo-da-Riva 3*
- P. Separate concessionaires and private access **Rating: 4**
 - *Hellbender 1*
- Q. Limit to fewer or none **Rating: 5**
 - *Deer Leap 4, 6, 7*
 - *Hellbender 2, 3, 4, 5*
 - *Quo-da-Riva 5*
 - *Shawnee Creek 1*
- R. Increase options **Rating: 3**
 - *Quo-da-Riva 6*

Evaluation of the Workshop by Participants

Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop by noting one thing that they liked about the workshop, indicated below with a plus symbol (+), and one thing they would change or improve, indicated with a delta symbol (Δ). Below are the results of this exercise. The check mark (✓) indicates that another person had the same comment. Twenty-four responses were received; some had more than one item as a plus or a delta.

| + | Δ |
|--|--|
| + Meeting other stakeholders. | Δ Fewer officials from DNR, Forest Service, etc. More <u>users</u> . |
| + Being able to assemble with people of opposite views. | Δ Composition of group <u>much</u> too tilted toward <u>local recreationists</u> . |
| + Bringing <u>very, very</u> diverse views together to try to help the ONSR. | Δ Include more scientific/land management professionals. |
| + Chance to meet and talk about issues with range of people. | Δ I would invite more elected officials – cities and counties. |
| + Different people telling how and why they feel the way they do about different issues. | Δ I know that park personnel were in the room to answer questions, but I think they should really join in the conversation. |
| + Conversation with people from all points of view. | Δ Have Park Service explain why they do or do not allow certain things. Explain what they would like to accomplish in the next 10-20 years. |
| + A chance to have an open and frank conversation with people who have totally different opinions than yourself. I have to be honest, I didn't think this was a very good idea, but I found it refreshing. It worked!! | Δ Issues too constrained to recreation – what about preservation and restoration of natural and cultural resources? <u>Very</u> frustrating not to be able to discuss protection and restoration of natural and cultural resources – the <u>prime</u> purpose of NPS management. |
| + Open dialogue. | Δ Natural resource conditions were not taken into account when talking about these issues, which seemed to be a missing component. |
| + The ability that everyone was able to voice their true concerns. | Δ Although the purpose of the workshop was to provide clarification for the NPS, some questions and topics were slanted toward the restrictive perspective when presented to workshop groups. |
| + While not formally planned, there were a couple good educational discussions, i.e. (1) outboard motor horsepower / noise, (2) current access sites (planned, social, etc.). | Δ More divisions would be helpful with the scenarios. I.e., horse access should have been separated from vehicle instead of falling under the same scenario. |
| + Everyone had comment time. Sincere discussion. Hopefully will have impact on the GMP. | Δ Change up am/pm sessions (i.e., mix up the people after the first exercise). |
| + Good input from the different interest groups – helps to develop a more balanced perspective of the river resources. | Δ Workshop session I participated in did not work as well as I suspect others did. |
| + Conversation was informative, better than expected for the most | |

| + | Δ |
|---|---|
| <p>part.</p> <p>+ Worked out well – no bloodshed.</p> <p>+ People worked together well.</p> <p>+ I did find out that there is common ground with most people. It was easier to reach than I thought.</p> <p>+ The truth coming out on a lot of issues.</p> <p>+ The organization of the workshop.</p> <p>+ The transparency of the operations during the workshop.</p> <p>+ The structured allowed (encouraged) open communication, avoided debates, yet allowed full discussion of ideas.</p> <p>+ The small group breakouts were conducive to productive discussion because people felt more comfortable talking and were perhaps less “attacking” because of the intimate setting.</p> <p>+ Small group work was effective.</p> <p>+ Well managed.</p> <p>+ Facilitated very well.</p> <p>+ Good facilitation to keep workshop on schedule.</p> <p>+ Mary Orton – great job.</p> | <p>Δ Sometimes the conversation was cut off prematurely. Large group discussion of scenarios was a bit cumbersome and difficult to follow at times.</p> <p>Δ You did, they didn’t in most cases. Challenge participants to consider the universe of possibilities rather than posturing for “their” position.</p> <p>Δ Need to share “facts” first to improve knowledge and discussion.</p> <p>Δ Some discussion of the current condition of natural resources at the park would have been <u>very</u> helpful – it is very difficult to assess the need for improvements when the current condition is not defined.</p> <p>Δ Public comment meetings should generally be preceded by a thorough presentation of actual resource conditions in the park.</p> <p>Δ More background on issues. (I.e., why are we discussing horsepower?)</p> <p>Δ Do not like the ending rating for scenarios – too confusing, may be misleading.</p> <p>Δ The scenario numbering.</p> <p>Δ I would not have had this workshop. I would have gone off the comment cards like they said they would.</p> <p>Δ Coffee service would have been nice.</p> <p>Δ Snacks and coffee.</p> <p>Δ I thought it went well.</p> <p>Δ (Nothing noted.) ✓</p> |

Appendix 1: Discussion Notes, Day 2

The purpose of the discussion on Day 2 was to determine if there were ways to eliminate the drawbacks of each of the scenarios developed on Day 1, without losing the benefits.

Mary handed out the scenarios that the small groups had developed on Day 1, along with the benefits and drawbacks they had identified for each one. She also handed out a list showing the scenarios as she had grouped them for discussion, so similar scenarios could be discussed together. She invited the participants to let her know if any of the scenarios should be grouped in a different way.

As the following notes were taken, they were projected on a screen in the meeting room, and participants were invited to correct the notes on their comments if they were not recorded accurately. These notes were lightly edited for clarity.

Motorboat Use

The first issue discussed was Motorboat Use, and the groupings Mary proposed were as follows:

- S. Keep things the same
 - Deer Leap 3
 - Hellbender 2, 4
 - Quo-da-Riva 1
 - Shawnee Creek 1
- T. No motors zones
 - Deer Leap 4, 5
 - Quo-da-Riva 5
 - Shawnee Creek 2
- U. No restrictions
 - Hellbender 3
 - Quo-da-Riva 6
- V. Speed limit, with or without horsepower limits
 - Deer Leap 1, 4, 5
 - Hellbender 1
 - Shawnee Creek 4, 5
- W. Reduce horsepower limits
 - Hellbender 5
 - Shawnee Creek 3
- X. Increase horsepower limits
 - Quo-da-Riva 2, 4
- Y. Limit boats at one time, operational instructions
 - Deer Leap 2
 - Quo-da-Riva 3

A. Keep Things the Same

- Just like we discussed earlier, get more law enforcement to enforce it. The problems we have should take care of themselves.
- In our group we talked about law. They shouldn't be hidden in the brush. They should be out in the river for people to see them.
- We talked about park service and water patrol, writing tickets and enforcing the laws. In the legal system there's been some breakdown. There needs to be buy-in. We've seen people tear up tickets, and judges throw them out. They're not trivial if people are acting irresponsibly, with bad behavior. We haven't had fatal accidents, but having one child die is not worth the risk. Enforce the law and also work with local entities in the judicial system to make sure they stick.
- It's a proven fact that the outboard jet boats are one of the safest modes of recreation on the river. A lot of people don't know, for example, that the intake on an outboard jet is nearly level with the bottom of the boat. You can be run over and not get any more than a scratch on your head. A lot of people don't realize that, there is a difference in the safety of this jet engine vs. a propeller, and it's much slower too.
- Expand on law enforcement to address the drawbacks of these scenarios.

B. No Motors Zones

- One thing we discussed was just having no motorboats from Alley Spring up towards Buck Hollow and Round Spring up toward Cedar Grove. It would be good for the economy because you have a lot of canoeists who have left because of noise. It would be a motorboat-free area. You have the motorboats, the same restrictions, and both worlds would be happy.
- We talked about it too; there are parts into the year when we do use motorboats in that area - during gigging season.
- There are no canoes after Labor Day.
- Because of weather or because they are not allowed?
- We had that discussion and we should add zones to current restrictions.
- From Memorial Day to Labor Day we should have no motorized boats. During canoe season we don't have people going up in that area in motorboats.
- All the drunk partying that was going on: It was in all the press and now it's reduced. I'll say this for the NPS, they've put the work in to do something about it. Family people will begin to come to the river again. How many have read the news clippings about harassment on the river?
- One thing about all the river visitors, a little bit of common courtesy goes a long way. As far as limitations on sections of the river from Alley Spring, you can't even run a boat up there in the summer and later you can't run a canoe even up there because there is not enough water.
- As someone who canoes the Upper Current after Labor Day and before Memorial Day, we haven't had any conflicts with boats.
- We were talking about regulations and laws we can't enforce now. The canoes are about all that uses that area anyway. Why add more regulations that we can't enforce?
- Let's put a marketing spin on this. You say it doesn't happen anyway. But what if we said, "Canoe the upper part of the Current where there are no boats." Then you have people coming in and saying, "I'm going to canoe this stretch because there are no motorboats." That is a marketing idea, non-motorized, no oil spills; use it as a marketing tool, where there are no motorized boats from May until whenever.

- You want to do it safely and you want to get families back. That there are no parties, it's safe because there are no boats and there are good rangers, if that's the perception.
- If you market that, I think you have to market it in shoulder seasons too: spring and fall. It shouldn't just be the three summer months.
- Once the plan is chosen, I agree with the marketing strategy. I do that at my bed and breakfast (B&B). I ask my guests, do they want to canoe? Hike? Tube? Go swim and picnic? I know where to tell them where to go. Do you want to be with others or do you want seclusion? It's about educating them about where to go. Those places are out there.
- My wife and I own a convenience store on the Jacks Fork River. We have a lot of people coming in and asking us about canoeing. We ask what kind of experience they want. If we want to advertise that upper river for canoeing, we need some help from the National Park Service. Some canoe rentals can't go on the upper because they have two-day float trips. That would hurt some concessioners. Each concessioner has an area to put boats in. If they are on the Jacks Fork, they have to have at least a two-day float trip.
- We have 21 concessioners that provide floating service in different locations on the river. There is some zoning. There are number limitations on how many canoes and tubes and so forth can be out at any given time. That's another aspect.
- I think your point is that if you change this, it's time to take a look at the rules.
- If you do it the way he suggested, it could hurt some lower concessioners.
- Doesn't it protect Akers?
- It might protect some concessioners more than lower concessioners.
- But either way it's part of the economy.
- But we want to be fair.
- On the marketing idea, there is nowhere a canoeist can go in Missouri to be on a motorboat-free stream. That has potential to be a really good draw.
- I'm in the canoe renting business, but if you limit stretches of river to canoes only, don't forget that local people use the river too. I don't know if that is a good idea. It looks like a conflict of interest. Local people can't put their motorboats in, but canoes can be put in.
- That is something to consider, this is very discriminating. One of the points of the ONSR enabling legislation is that people can do various activities. This specifically discriminates against elderly and handicapped people, keeps them from seeing something they could see in a motorboat. Jetboats and motorboats don't typically go up when the water is low. It's a non-issue. Part of this thing about zoning is that it is an urban planning idea. A rural plan is about experiencing nature without rules and regulations, not like they do in the cities because there are so many people
- People are moving to the Van Buren area because they have access to the river for motorboats, for visitors to come in, families to visit, for fishing. It's economic. In our area, motorboats are very important.
- I've heard a lot about canoeists not wanting motorboats. It's safe to say I'm on the river in a boat more than anyone in this room, and I've helped many canoeists. They're turned over, or I'm hauling kids back up to the landing. The motorboats are out there and they help people.
- As a motorboater, everyone says no one wants restrictions. Especially for the locals, having a no-motorized zone in the upper reaches in summer is a no-brainer. We can't run up to those parts

in the summer. So why not say this zone is motorboat-free? Very few people can go up there. I think it's a compromise that both motorboaters and canoeists can live with. In the fall there is not much conflict up there. I think this is something we can all grab hold of and all live with. We're supposed to think outside the box here. We can't ignore it; things can't stay the same.

- We had some discussion in our group to allow trolling motors, even in the restricted zone. That is something for people to think about. Also, water patrol and law enforcement.
- The reason we have more zoning in cities is because of more people. Trying to get that to work based on common sense and courtesy doesn't always work. There is a reason we talk about zoning. It is not just about locals; you have visitors who don't always know how to act. That's why you have rules and regulations. I can say that because I have a landowner who gave me an interesting story about tourists who did some wrong things and destroyed their property.
- I think motor use in emergency situations would be very appropriate. Make that allowance.
- Exceptions: trolling and water patrol.
- I think if they want canoes only up here on the upper end, then they ought to lift restrictions on lower end.

C. No Restrictions

- I'm not a tuber. I know it is important. I wonder if [lifting] those restrictions will make people less likely to tube?
- Part of tubing is riding the wave.
- I am a tuber and my dad ran a motorboat. When I got done tubing he could take me back – that was the best part. The second best is riding the waves. On Jacks Fork and Current River, boats don't scare me.
- What about bigger boats? No hp limitations.
- That wouldn't scare me either. How they drive, that's an issue.
- Whether it is 40 hp or 100 hp, it's behavior.
- I have a lot of friends that recreate in the Doniphan area. There are no horsepower limits and safety is a big concern with high-powered boats when the river is congested with tubes. It's a problem.
- By raising this, even though people might see this as raising cost for the law. That needs to be done anyway. You can say it is positive or negative. If you provide education for tubers, kayakers and canoeists, that would be one way this would be manageable. This would also have economic stimulus for the people in the area and be in line with the enabling legislation.
- On the Doniphan area: The problem from what I understand from the Chamber, it is not congestion, but the type of people, because it's the people we don't actually want. I had the person sarcastically thank me that they now have all the people we don't want because we have the Park Service in our area.
- Regarding rivers congested with tubers, I've been from Two Rivers and Van Buren all the way down. That is the only place that you will run into tubes. There are not very many tubers on there below the Current River. A lot of them around Two Rivers.

D. Speed Limit, With or Without Horsepower Limits

- I think speed limits are a good idea in theory but nearly impossible to implement. For one thing the boats don't have speedometers. The amount of law needed with a radar gun? What are you going to do when someone flies past you? It's a good idea in theory but I don't think it's viable.
- I agree; I don't think it can be enforced. They don't have the right equipment. Another way we can think about it is in congested areas. Say Waymeyer, boats come down, there's a sign, a no-wake zone. A boat has to shut down and maneuver just like canoes. We know what floating looks like, that is enforced. That is the only way to make it enforceable and work for everyone.
- Speed limit was addressed when they set the horsepower limits. So that's been taken care of. A lot of people might not know it, but they put regulations on the motorboats prior to several years ago. It's regulated right now due to horsepower.
- Dave said it best earlier in the group session. When he puts a boat out, the top end speed is 20 mph even if your throttle is down as hard as you can go. With one person, you're in the low 20's (mph). It won't run very fast.
- Say you have 25 horsepower motor, you can go fairly fast, but if you take your family, you can't go very fast. That's why they want higher horsepower.
- Are there ways to mitigate concern with speed?
- I liked his idea, no wake zone.
- More presence of law enforcement, that's the main thing.
- Water patrol.
- We talk about law enforcement, but the only thing the law can enforce is law and restrictions. They aren't a substitute.
- They are saying the restrictions are in place, but they just aren't enforced.
- I float the river every year. My wife and I float the upper Current and upper Jacks Fork. It's flows faster. We'll motorboat maybe once in the summer down below from Round Spring to Two Rivers or from Two Rivers down a bit. Very rarely in the last 15 years do you see a visible law enforcement officer on the river. Last year my wife and I floated from Alley Spring to Eminence. I have a lot of friends who are park rangers and water patrol. We stopped just above her parents' place. A bit later the water patrol came into the store and he said they saw us. They were within 50 steps of us. I didn't see them. They were in the bushes. If you're on the highway and you see a patrol car, you let your foot off the gas. If you don't see them you aren't doing that. On the river you need to be able to see them.
- You've already got the people there; just make them visible.
- I think he is right. A lot of it is just visibility, not money.
- Are there any advantages about restricting miles per hour vs. horsepower?
- Yes, with no-wake areas.
- Take a 40-horsepower boat and put four people in it, it's going to go 18 mph. Take a 100 hp boat, and it can go a speed that hangs with the rest of the river. They are not slowed down. There used to be half as many boats in the river then.
- We have friends here. They bring a boat down so they can go with their friends because they can't get it up the river in only one boat.
- Is it easier to run the river in a jet boat as opposed to a propeller?

- They had to go get the other half of the family to get to one place. It does put limitations on them. They're doing double the number of trips.

E. Reduce Horsepower Limits

- We didn't have many objections; it was mostly benefits. The reason I suggested 10 hp is that would be traditional use with johnboats in the Ozarks. Not just canoes.
- With the 10 hp, you're going to have to have a propeller. There's not a jet to go on a 10 hp boat. It won't work. If you put a 10 hp propeller, it'd be like having a 25 hp with a jet, it's about the same. If you're trying to keep the speeds down, it's a problem.
- I also see propeller impacts, both environmental and on safety.
- With a jet boat, the propeller is in a case with blades in it. You can put your hand in the water and nothing will happen. A 10 hp boat would mean a propeller is spinning below. It limits the depth of water you can go in, and is more dangerous.
- I don't know if everyone knows what a jet is. It sucks water underneath and pushes it out the back. The water coming out the back pushes the boat forward.
- People who want slow motors don't realize we have gravel. The river used to be dug out and deeper, but it's not anymore.
- So what happens if you put a 10 hp in that river?
- It gets bottomed out.
- I'm not aware of conflicts from Round Spring up with motorboats. I see no need for additional restrictions. I think it's working.
- One of the questions I asked was, how many people are breaking the current restrictions? How many tickets are being written? Are people adhering to current restrictions? My theory is, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Are they obeying the rules? Do they need more? (Reed Detring noted that he is not aware of many situations of people who aren't adhering to restrictions.)
- For 10 hp, it would benefit natural resources. But that would be a propeller.
- The jet is better for natural resources.
- The propeller probably does more damage. It's out and it will hit things.
- What's the argument for the smaller hp being better for natural resources?
- I can tell you why 10 hp was suggested. It is for historical reasons. Historically, the johnboat was developed in the Ozarks. By the time the park was created, it was in use. It seemed consistent with the purposes why the park was created. It was consistent with the way things were done. It was a cultural thing, not a resource thing. On the Buffalo National River, that's all they have, 10 hp boats. I have a question I would like to know. We're being asked to make judgments on the size of motors related to speed and so on. At what speed do you start having fun? And at what speed do you start not having fun? I heard the motors are self-limiting. If you have a 40 hp motor and can go 20 mph, would you rather go 90 mph? If you're forced to go 10-15 mph, are you not having fun?
- There is a safety issue. With the 10 hp, you have to get enough speed to get it up on the water to see over the boat. If you have a 10 hp, you can't flatten it out to see canoers or floaters.
- In 1963, I had a 40-hp Mercury propeller motor on the river. I would run it every weekend. I wasn't the only one. My neighbor had one. That's historical.

- I think to answer the questions about fun: someone was saying there are motorboat people who want to race, but that isn't safe for our rivers. Someone else is saying it is difficult to creep over a shoal without tearing your boat to bits. Sometimes they are running in very little water. They need enough speed to maneuver the shoals.
- Can you get over a shoal at 15 mph?
- If you want to dig rocks out of your jet.
- With this river, is all we're looking at historical stuff? Should we all drive Model T's? We have better technology now. The farm I lived on had no running water, but I don't want to go back to that.
- I think it goes back to behavior. I have not seen a boat operator who doesn't wait for me to get over the shoals. I try and get out of their way if they have already started. People need to be educated. They need to know that he can't stop and shut it down. He also knows that if he sees me, he should pull over and wait. It's common courtesy, but some people push the envelope.

F. Increase Horsepower Limits

- You wouldn't need as many boats to carry the same amount of people.
- Can someone explain the parking problems?
- There is a horsepower limit from Big Spring up to the Van Buren gap, and below Big Spring there is no horsepower limitation. So in a small stretch of river below the Van Buren gap there is hp limitation. The idea is you could lift the hp restriction, and the bigger boats could put in at Van Buren instead of having to go to Big Spring. So my side is that Van Buren is a huge place with lots of parking. But where do you take out if you are a larger boat? At Big Spring there is parking. You could go down without parking limitations. This is a heavily used stretch.
- The parking congestion at Van Buren is because of people putting in at Waymeyer and taking out at Van Buren, plus all the people who live in the Van Buren gap. If they want to put a larger boat in, they have to go down to Big Spring and put in, as opposed to putting in at their house.
- People have boats that adhere to the current horsepower restrictions. Are all these people going to go buy new boats if the horsepower limits are increased?
- Some will.
- Are new boats really expensive? What will they do with new boats?
- They don't have to buy a new boat.
- About lifting the hp limit on the gap ... some areas above Van Buren are congested. If we lifted the limit, you would have a lot of people in Van Buren who would buy bigger boats and go to Doniphan from their homes. I think it would relieve congestion up river. They will get bigger boats and go downriver.
- I wanted to make one point on congestion and parking. If there were a developed parking area at Waymeyer for boats, and improved boat access, it would relieve congestion in that heavily traveled area with canoers and tubes. People would go upriver from there.

G. Limit Boats at One Time, Operational Instructions

- Doesn't Missouri require boating education and a driver's license?
- Yes, but only for younger kids.
- Education is never a bad thing.

- My daughter took a class. Is it something like a driver's license that you have to carry with you?
- At 13 or 14 you have to have that. It's not required by NPS, it's required by the state.
- The water patrol does that program. They go into schools. You can go online and take a boater safety course. If the requirements stay the same, at less than 14 years of age you can run.
- It's if you are born after a certain date.

Park staff: We asked the district ranger. This is a new law in the state of Missouri. His reading is that there is an exception for the Jacks Fork River and Current River.

- I think they geared it more towards lakes in Missouri. When my son took it that seemed to be what it was about. This is something I would like to see. I am big on education. I read all these negative articles from the St. Louis Post and all the bashing and I think, just educate people a little bit more. The Watershed Committee did that; they put a map on the front door of the restrooms, and put river etiquette on the back. It's how to be respectful and get out of the way. But I never see the media educating people. All I see is finger pointing and name-calling. But if you educate people who have never been here, just educate them . . .
- We talked about some of the same things. Does the park have a hyperlink on its website you can click on to get information on river use? Links that have river etiquette? It would be good.
- The Jacks Fork Watershed Committee developed it and it is a good thing. It applies to everyone, not just locals and tourists.
- Urban people may have a more aggressive personality, but they also have access to high speed Internet. If we give them that information on the web, they might use it.
- Back to the economy, we want the tourists. They know we have great recreation. Let's think about things we do extremely well.
- I know where she's coming from regarding etiquette, and I wish everyone would do that. If you are in a motorboat, and you see a canoe or a float boat or whatever, he is not sure you can see him. However, if you pull back on the throttle you acknowledge him. You acknowledge that you see him there. You're not doing him a favor by doing that because of the wake, but you at least let him know that you know he is there. With an outboard jet you can turn and go around him and you'd be surprised how much they appreciate that.
- We should put a safety video on YouTube on river etiquette. This is important as a river state.

Access to the River

Next, the group discussed the scenarios for Access to the River. Again, Mary Orton asked the group to focus on how to keep the benefits while doing away with the drawbacks. Her proposed groupings were as follows:

Horses - Crossing

- Z. Use designated crossings only
 - Deer Leap 2, 3, 5, 6
 - Hellbender 3, 4, 5
 - Quo-da-Riva 1
 - Shawnee Creek 3
- AA. Historical use/existing use crossings
 - Deer Leap 1
 - Hellbender 1, 2

- Shawnee Creek 4
- BB. Resource protection
 - Deer Leap 7
 - Shawnee Creek 2

Horses - Limits

- CC. No limits
 - Deer Leap 1, 2, 5
- DD. Trail / place limits
 - Deer Leap 3, 6
 - Hellbender 1, 2, 4
 - Quo-da-Riva 4
 - Shawnee Creek 2
- EE. Limits on numbers
 - Deer Leap 4, 7
 - Hellbender 3, 4, 5

Vehicles – Ford and Access

- FF. NPS designated places only
 - Deer Leap 1, 2, 3, 5
 - Hellbender 1, 4, 5
 - Quo-da-Riva 2
 - Shawnee Creek 1
- GG. Historic/existing places
 - Deer Leap 1, 5
 - Quo-da-Riva 3
- HH. Separate concessionaires and private access
 - Hellbender 1
- II. Limit to fewer or none
 - Deer Leap 4, 6, 7
 - Hellbender 2, 3, 4, 5
 - Quo-da-Riva 5
 - Shawnee Creek 1
- JJ. Increase options
 - Quo-da-Riva 6

Horses - Crossing

A. Use Designated Crossings Only

B. Historical Use/Existing Use Crossings

- I think there are current designated crossings in place. They could be located in an area that could cause less impact. I'm not sure what the impact actually is. I think that limiting to designated crossings is moot because they are already limited. It's about regulating, like motorboats. There are a lot of people who ride and they aren't all guided in the Jacks Fork area. It's hard to regulate.
- This wasn't my idea, but I've heard it: boats and canoes have numbers on the side, so you can turn people in if they do something wrong. They have stickers they put on cattle. If horses had a number, and I saw someone doing something bad, doing stupid stuff, I could call you and say,

“Hey, is this number in your group?” You guys can take a proactive approach and deal with it. You don’t want troublemakers at your business. Is that feasible?

- For commercial riders?
- It could be a private thing, where they come into town and have to get their numbers.
- The park has to have some sort of regulatory thing where you have to go get your permit. There are some high-level, expensive horses they show and they don’t want stickers on them.
- I don’t know if you’ve ever peeled one off a cow. It’s a piece of paper with glue you slap on the animal.
- It’s like putting a bumper sticker on a Ferrari.
- Could they number the people?
- I don’t know this for a fact, but we’ve had people come to our place who say that in Illinois, to ride in a forest you have to have a permit. That is a government deal. If they come to an establishment like ours, they have to go get a permit. That is also for the individuals. We have people riding in our area that aren’t from our place. They pull in and ride out. Just because you see someone doing something bad, just like riverboats – it’s education and respect.
- I don’t know how you could monitor the numbers. You have people from the north and south going to Big Creek to ride. They have bridle tags but you can’t read them, they are too small. The point is that you pay.
- It’s hard to say, “It was a black horse and this kind of saddle.” By the time the law tracks them down they are gone.
- At a horse campground, should we feel responsible for what people do when they leave our facility? For organization events, they have to follow our guidelines on guided rides. That’s not the majority of people that visit with us. It’s not different from a regular campground like Jacks Fork where people come to camp with them and float the river. But the campground doesn’t get a call that their floater is doing something wrong. I don’t think you can make a private business responsible for that.
- Correction on horse crossing, we’re saying the parks already have designated places. “Currently” makes a difference and should be added.
- Deer Leap 2 said “keep it as it is, don’t change it.”
- I was told an incident where someone came to her and reported one of her riders because he was trying to get a horse to jump off a bluff. So I was suggesting some way to number them to make it easier for her when she is trying to police them. I wanted to give her a tool, not to bash her.
- I agree with her, it’s like me policing guests at the B&B. If I want to turn in a boat that has run over people, I have a number to give the water patrol, but we don’t have that with trail riders. It’s more an ID thing. If I see something really bad, I don’t have any way to identify the person.
- Maybe with some of these conflicts, you should approach the person and try and discuss the issue at that time.
- If you were to have the NPS in public and not in the bushes, this might address some concerns with trail riders. You could also have park rangers on horseback. Russ told us he really wanted to ride a horse. I think that’s what he said.
- About naming the horses, we have a whole lot of people that have moved in with horses. I have three or four neighbors who will get their own group together and ride on their own. They

didn't move down there to get tagged. You can't tell if it's an individual or group. They have to take care of themselves.

- At the convenient store we see a lot of people with their horses. They may go down to Shawnee or other places and ride all over and may not be affiliated with either place. It's not just the park rangers that are in the bushes; it's the water patrol and the conservationists.
- It may not be those groups; may be individuals. They come down on their own and do this.
- I get that; I'm not opposed to it. The park can manage it. Let the park be in charge of patrolling, and permit horses. I'm talking about individuals.
- If people quit going because they had to buy a permit, there could be an economic impact.
- Even if they didn't have to pay for it?
- We're required to have a commercial use authorization to guide through the park. We spend minimal time in the park. If they required a permit, there would be some people who would balk at it, just like anything. I don't think it would be a huge detriment, but it would be difficult to police. We use armbands to tell our customers. They're all numbered. You can tell if they are from us. You'd have to get close to see it but that's how we address an issue, if something happens and there's a problem. We get their number and go right to them. How to expand that? I have no idea.
- When you're at a commercial trail ride, it is easy to get a permit. We do a lot of volunteer work and I don't think it's right for them to need a permit. You have one station where all these huge rigs come in and wait to get permits and what happens when permits run out? You have people with horses who drove in and there are no more. What do they do?
- We're talking about crossings, where they cross the river. There are about half a dozen?

Park staff: I'd have to look at that. Jacks Fork and Current have about 6 or 7 within the park.

C. Resource Protection

- The crossings need to be maintained and monitored so they minimize erosion. That needs to happen. National Rivers Conservation Society (?) has standards on how to do that. You create something that won't erode.
- The way you develop the crossing can protect the banks.
- I think we talked about this in our group. How do we identify crossings? I'm looking at resource protection as it's time to make some changes. That's my position. We want to see some trails redesigned to minimize impact on the riparian corridor. We can't know where crossings are going to be until we know where trails are going to be. If you want to know where crossing are, can we redesign horse trails? If we are using the same ones, that is a different question.
- We are looking for what types of crossings, not necessarily where each one should be.
- I presume you want to cross at a natural ford area, a shallow area. I've seen where you can cross in deeper water where the horse is floating if you want. But the best way is to cross natural fords. It may be that if you cross at a ford, you may have great adverse impact on aquatic habitat. If you float across the river you won't have an impact. It's my hunch that you want to cross at a natural ford, but maybe you want to protect the fauna. It can be very complex. It's an engineering problem and a wildlife problem, as to where you put the trail. That will define where you cross. I also believe that the park should be looking at the options of either making some boundary changes or acquiring some use easements just for horses in order to be able to avoid the river altogether. At the boundary of the park, you may be next to private land and have to

cross the river to continue. Maybe you can negotiate some use easement for the horses to get around private areas and then you could avoid having to have more river crossings. Those are some guidelines on how you can adjust for river crossings.

- In response to the physical way to cross the water, not very many horse people want to swim across a crossing. Bareback is kind of fun, but I don't want my saddle getting wet. The way we lay out our crossings outside the park is at a natural ford, a natural shoal where there is a good exit point. You don't want to climb a 10-foot bank even if there is a shoal there. Some of this comes back to common sense. I'm not saying there aren't areas that are eroded from poor use or from the wild horse herd. They cross wherever they want. If they use it frequently it comes to look like a trail. This is not the sole reason, but there are times when that is what happens. People see it and start using it even if it is not authorized.

Horses - Limits

D. No Limits

- With all of the people that have horses and trail riders, how would you limit horses? How can you do that when they park in different places?
- We're losing sight of the fact that we are discussing the general management plan of the park. The discussion has moved to everyone in the area, outside the park. There is a huge difference. It would probably be easy for the park to set limits, it would require regulations and enforcement, but that won't change the riders in the area.
- That would be easy?
- They could do it by ticketing, just like fishing. You're required to have a permit. If you don't have one, guess what? Cough up the money. The problem is that the three trails in the park are in the minority of the amount of trails in the area. The park is severely limited as to horse use in the area. I'm sure they are concerned about the resource, but the management . . .
- Our concern is water quality. I'm not a participant, but that is one aspect. As far as where folks from your groups ride, we don't have authority over that. We want you all to come together in partnership and look at the area regionally and come up with some trails that do cross different areas and are designated, so you can disperse horse activity and incorporate engineering. It's possible. In Tennessee we've protected mussels by providing crossings where horse don't crush mussels. You can both protect natural resources and enjoy riding.
- I know you're limited because the waters are listed as an outstanding resource. Does this limit what you can do at crossings?

Park staff: We can't build abutments, but on each end of each bank we can put impermeable sheeting.

- That's just exit and entry.

Park staff: That would cut down on erosion. As far as this shoal, if there are mussels being crushed, you have to delineate part of the path so they don't go up and down doing additional impact. Hopefully we can come together and do those kinds of things.

- One of the things I was wondering about the limits. You could have daily, monthly, or hourly limits. Some days are prettier and everyone wants to go ride. How do you put limits on where it's going to be?
- I don't think it would be easy.
- That would be costly, wouldn't it?

- From my business standpoint, I don't want to be required to make sure everyone has one. We can make it available for people, but I don't want to police it.
- Land Between the Lakes has a permit system that is effective.
- We didn't get permits when we rode there. That's at Wrangler's Camp.
- We've had two issues, water quality and limiting horses. On limiting horses, if we could magically say there is a way to limit them, we don't know what limits should be placed on them to prevent resource degradation. Even for the rider, you want to know that the trails will be useable in the future. That is where some scientific studies need to be done to determine how horses impact the trail, the numbers, or what other factors are there. We can't just arbitrarily say how many horses by day or hour or month unless we have data. But with data, the park could certainly create a restriction so riding would have to be on designated trails. On water quality, this man is an expert and he could tell us why water quality is affected in and out of the park, and why that is important.
- If you get a lot of manure in one place, from humans or horses or whatever, it will enter the groundwater. That's true for the Ozarks. Trail routing should take that into account. For instance, if you route the trail on a perennial stream, you'll probably have fewer problems with pollution than you would along an intermittent or seasonal stream. It's all about additional nutrients getting into the groundwater. They're bad for cave life and other types of ecology.

E. Trail / Place Limits

- As a manager of private property adjacent to the park, there are some designated horse trails. There's a map of those, but there are also a lot of other trails and I know that they are not designated. One of the things that is not mentioned in the information on these sheets that we'd like to see, we're all for horses and trail systems, but at the same time we need to make a commitment to take away all the other trails. There are just as many undesigned trails. We are really concerned about that.
- Thoughts on group size: in federally designated wilderness areas (USFS) we have a limit of 10. That limits numbers and the amount of use we get in a particular wilderness area. I manage motorized trails where you need to have a daily or annual pass and it's worked well. It generates revenue, 95% of the money it goes back to the Forest Service to maintain the trails that visitors are paying to use.
- Someone asked how do you control daily, weekly, annually. You control both daily and annually with permits. It's not a method of controlling numbers at this point. We never had to control numbers.
- Someone explained karst topography and wilderness and stuff getting into water resources. I'm concerned about the level of phosphates and nitrates. I work with the Ozark Hellbender, and while there are a number of factors thought to contribute to their decline, we think that elevated levels of nitrates may be one of those factors. Several studies have indicated that high nitrate levels can impede amphibian development. It'd be nice to put together a study on how many animals are in the area, how close they are, and what are the nutrients getting into that system. I don't know how many people are on that trail, but that is one of the first steps to addressing that issue. We should look at the numbers and minimize areas parallel to the river, meaning riparian zones and the idea of waste getting into that area. That could, of course, be human waste as well.
- This whole topic goes back to the purpose of ONSR. There is definitely a commitment to the environment and quality of the resource. There should also be a commitment to the experience

of a rider. Experiencing nature on a horse, getting close to nature. Some of the people from the area have experienced this nature up close and personal and have relocated here. They want to go out in the woods or maybe out on designated trails. It's about that "close to nature" experience. Before I hear about detriment to the ecosystem, I want to see facts and figures and how the tests are done. There have been some tests that have been very questionable. And as for taxes on horse riders to pay for trails, the taxpayers already pay for that. They shouldn't have to pay twice.

- Are your permits for hiking, or strictly motorized?
- There are no permits, just a limit on the size of the group, ten.
- If you had a group with 20 people, is there a space problem? Because I can see that becoming an issue.
- We haven't had to specify those limitations.
- I could see that becoming an issue. There may be 100 people, but we're not in a group together.
- Most horseback riders don't want to ride in a group of 10 or 20.
- The majority of horse riders wants to ride in groups of 6 or fewer. It's hard unless you're at a facility like theirs. If you have 20 horse trailers, they can't get in a parking lot. We want that solitude experience.

F. Limits on Numbers

- Horses get picked on with regard to water quality. I don't necessarily agree with everything because I own horses, but it's good to point out the issues of human waste. The watershed committee is doing a project on repairing septic tanks. But you also have wildlife: deer and raccoons. In our area we are blessed with an abundance of wildlife. We can't point a finger because it might be a fraction of all of those things. It's not just horses and all of that does end up in the groundwater.
- Water quality has been mentioned a few times. I thought I'd offer some standards for the Ozark. I'm with the Department of Natural Resources, Water Quality. We have numbers, standards, to ensure beneficial protection of standards of water. On the Current River and Jacks Fork, the standards are higher than just for swimming or horse riding. The standard is called anti-degradation. It's especially an issue here. The standard for Jacks Fork is what it was in 1974. When we go out and take tests and analysis, we ask, how does that compare with water quality back in 1974? We're not looking at nutrient levels that would affect animal life or human health, but we're looking to see if they are same as 1974. These are very specific standards.
- With regard to water quality, it seems like the horses are pointed at and I'd like to suggest people go to envirohorse.com to check it out and not just believe fear-based propaganda. Some people had notices on their websites saying there were signs on the river saying it was dangerous to swim because of the horses. I called Russ and he said it is not true. If you research, there are many kinds of E. coli. Horse E. coli doesn't have the Shiga toxin that is harmful to humans. People need to realize that when they see this horse manure pile and think this is dangerous to us, I think those are fear factors. E. coli from horses is in the water studies, but it is not necessarily dangerous to humans.
- Wildlife manure is generally dispersed. The concern is with concentrated manure from leaky septic tanks and concentrated horse manure.
- The week when there are 3,000 to 5,000 horses in an event...

- There may be 2,700 to 2,500 people. At the most there are 1,700 horses total.
- Nevertheless, 1,700 horses using a fairly small area will have an impact.
- You are testing on the river. How are they doing?
- The case here is in bacteria and we are seeing increases, not ambient levels, past ambient levels of bacteria whether it's from users or horses. But this is about public health, yes, but also elevated levels of pollutants, period. The ambient level we have judged to be is 25 colonies per 100 milliliters of water. We haven't equated that yet to E. coli. The E. coli standard is 126 colonies, but it would probably be much less for ambient. We're seeing violations because we are seeing elevated levels of a pollutant.
- The 1974 quality of the water – if we could stay in the parameters of that river, would that be a good quality to stay at?
- Whatever the condition was, the law was set, and most cases you don't go retroactively back to before the law was set. We don't have a lot of data for what the levels were like back then. What we look at today is the best representative at what the conditions were back then.
- If you were rewriting the law, would you be comfortable that 1974 was a good year to set the standards?
- I don't have enough information to tell you what the standards were back then. Appropriate to the law is looking at conditions that existed back then in 1974 judged against the samples we taken today. We set that at 25 colonies of fecal coliform. It is debatable if 25 is the right number.
- Do we measure turbidity?
- Do you see changes?
- Periodically. Not every change caused by human activities is a violation. It could be temporary if there is road construction or repairing a bridge, some disturbance. As long as there are good management practices to prevent runoff, then that temporary discharge to the water is OK as long as it doesn't cause impairments of the use.
- I'm wondering if you have sampling data that you are comparing current samples to.
- A lot of data goes back to before that. The difficulty with bacteria samples is that you can't use one sample; it is based on a geometric mean. You take at least four samples over a period of time. You average them and develop the mean. If it exceeds the criteria, then the concern becomes real. A lot of samples taken earlier may not have sufficient numbers to compare to the current geometric mean. We are cautious of samples taken because of runoff. You don't know the conditions under which those samples were taken, so you have to be cautious in interpreting those readings.
- It doesn't sound like you have enough data from 1974. So what are you comparing to?
- We felt at that time that we had sufficient data to derive the standard of 25 as an appropriate number. We didn't discuss TMDLs.
- How does it line up with other rivers in the state?
- It's a lot cleaner for a lot of pollutants than other rivers. Not because of the management necessarily, but because there's a lot less development, a lot less erosion issues.
- What about purification from running through the gravel?
- That may be true. It is more the watershed and what comes off it, and not so much the riverbed, but that may have some effect.
- Do your samples take into account how much water is coming in above it?

- Of course, water includes all the water that is above.
- What was coming in with those samples, there was a mention of sediment, but there was no weight put to what was coming in. My business caught a lot of heat from that document and what we were putting in because the sample that was hot was a mile below our campground. I don't feel like that's true, but that's what that document put forth.
- Sample interpretation is always open to debate. There's the quality of the sample and where it's taken.
- I'd be interested about talking to you afterwards about that.

Vehicles – Fords and Access

G. NPS Designated Places Only

H. Historic/Existing Places

J. Limit to Fewer or None

- I think the word “currently” needs to be added.
- I was agreeing with her. A lot of places they are putting up signs that say no vehicles, at gravel bars. In fact we could go back a few years.
- I failed to say anything about vehicles crossing at fords. I think that in no cases should a vehicle cross the Current or Jacks Fork Rivers. There are vehicular crossings across creeks, but as far as crossing the river, if we do not have river crossings, people may have to drive farther. But I don't think that in an area that is being protected as a part of the national park, we should have vehicles crossing.
- You talked a lot about cultural and traditional uses. There are a number of traditional county fords. Those were the ways that they got across the park, from farms. I can see limiting them. I don't think from a cultural aspect you can say that none would be acceptable.
- Those places are no longer farms. It is now part of a national park, a unit of the national park system. Certainly an activity in farming area is not the same as a national park. A national park imposes some changes in the stewardship of the area.
- I would argue from the cultural aspect that we as a local community and a local county did not enjoy those changes.
- Let's talk about culture and history here. We don't have just johnboats. You have old homes, school buildings and gravesites spread throughout the area, a culture that is not just cultural demonstrations three weeks a year at Van Buren. Whether people are educated or not, culture is not just your last name or where you come from, but it's also what you do. Just because someone is from a different culture, it doesn't mean they should discount a different culture: who they are and what they do. In St. Louis, part of the culture might be to go to the art museum in Forest Park. It's a beautiful park, but built right over a stream that totally degrades the water quality of St. Louis. You may want to go to Blueberry Hill or to the St. Louis Basilica. And the things that the people from south central Missouri do, we're different, but we came because we want to do those things. Just because the NPS has a park there doesn't mean we can't figure out ways to access those sites. I heard the NPS would give a ride to people who want to access gravesites. There is a man who was supposed to be here, and someone else came in his spot. He sent a brief letter that talks about his daughter who is an avid outdoor person. She is handicapped; she has spina bifida. She can't go in a canoe very easily or at all. There are certain activities we need to keep in mind for the elderly, very young, and handicapped. It's not just

about young people who are healthy. There are phobias about the degradation of access to roads, or those analyses and interpretations are questionable. I would say that people like her need access to these cultural resources.

- I would like to talk about the idea of no river crossings. I don't know where he lives, but say he has to go to the store. Let's take out 4th, 5th, and 6th Street and then he has to drive around and go to the store. Here, there is no bridge. They would have to go 30 or 40 miles to go to the same place when they could cross right there. If the NPS has money to put a bridge in, that'd be great.
- When my parents got elderly, they lived on a rural county road and we would drive together to Big Bluff that ends in a gravel bar. Typically that is a historic place to cross. I've heard a lot of people say no parking on gravel bars. And what I see with my dad is that he doesn't visit the river anymore. He lived on the river; he walked to school. I think he feels like culturally this is where he grew up, he would love to show my children the old house sites, old graveyards, but he doesn't feel like they are accessible to him anymore. He feels like he's given up a part of himself and that's sad. He never tore up anything or destroyed anything. He's a very conscientious man, but with the restrictions he felt like they were taken away from him. That's culture. If I can't go do those same things that my dad and granddad did, I lose a part of myself. We need to see that not everything we do is bad. Some people say to just park in the big road at Big Bluff. What if I want to cross and go up to Summersville? I'd have to go back and go 40 or 50 miles where I want to end up. I'm out there viewing the scenery, enjoying the view, and I'm going to cross to go see old homesteads and gravesites. To say no would take away part of my culture
- In response to culture and history, I'm a generational local, my grandfather floated logs down the river. Culturally, I understand the importance and it is sad when you can't get to home places and those kinds of things. I don't think we're talking about closing off access to gravesites, home places, or old school buildings. If we're talking about culture and individual rights, when I was young we could float and boat and in most places you could pull over (from the river) for lunch or set up camp and never had to worry about cars/trucks or ATVs driving on to the gravel bars to party. There has to be balance between access to the places that are truly important, yet still have access from the river to places that you can go camp or lunch and not get harassed. I don't think we should discredit history in that there were far more places to go that you could be undisturbed when the Park was established. Talking about the culture of St. Louis, part of the culture there for many people is to come to the river with their families. And just because people leave the (ONSR) area to go to St. Louis for work or college doesn't mean we're not still attached to here.
- To those of you who spoke, I had no intention of being disrespectful to people and if I did offend you, I apologize. I hope you don't see me as an oddity or freak because I grew up in St. Louis. I have friends who say "Missoura" and we're still friends. These times that you were talking about, when this was a farming area, you didn't have 200,000 people a year coming down to the river. If these fords are available...if we were back in those times, it's a sparsely populated area and you had ways of living. You understood each other and didn't get in others' way. We're now in a national park with hundreds of thousands of people. What if they start crossing these fords in their cars? If it were just the locals I don't think it would be an issue. I'm wondering whether people want there to be a national park presence in this area. Would you say yes to keep it here? Or no, let's go back? And if you tried, you wouldn't be able to. The economy wouldn't support that. I hope I am being respectful.
- I don't want to be disrespectful to anyone in this room, period. Please don't take offense. I can't remember when the park started in the 1960's. I would say if 95% of the people had had more

meetings like this, there wouldn't have been a national park if they knew some of the things that were going to happen. I know that's what would have happened with my ancestors. I know it was not as populated then as it is now. Cattle and horses all ran open range. My dad grew up there. There was nothing in the water that bothered him. He's healthy as a horse.

- There are some emergency reasons for crossings. It would save distance if you crossed with an ambulance or fire truck. Also, we have raccoon hunters; you need to go get that dog.
- Most of your river crossings are connected to county roads and as long as they are, we will keep them open. Not just for leisure reasons, but also for emergency reasons.

I. Separate Concession Access and Private Access

- We discussed the need for this in congested gravel bars where concessioners are trying to put in and take out. Zoning for swimmers, private parties, and concessioners. Our group was in agreement that that would be a good idea. We discussed Waymeyer, but at Two Rivers they have done that, somewhat. They have separated boats and canoes.
- But you have problems with canoers floating down to the motorboats' take-out area and you can get some really bad fistfights. Canoeists feel they shouldn't be pushed away and I've seen a lot of stuff happen. Big Spring is an example of a separate boat ramp for motorized boats and a separate area for canoes.
- I know the park is opposed to signage, but it's hard to drag a canoe back up the river when people don't know what landing they're at. They expect the trailer to come get them. They don't want to go back up. Are those marked?
- Yes.
- Two Rivers, the park has a nice boat ramp at the lower landing to keep canoers and boaters away from each other.
- The places where it's been implemented seem to reduce chaos and confusion, but it's been difficult for me. I moved away and came back. The places I used to take out changed somewhat and I noticed private places they had stopped using. As a local, I'm confused, so I can imagine how hard it is for tourists. Also, there is not enough parking. We need signage and adequate parking. People think they are out of the way and I can't even get around them. We don't want to be trampling grass and wildflowers and trees just to get into those access areas. The congestion can be crazy. I will go somewhere else, but other people will just pile in.
- This Waymeyer area, can you split it or would you have to make new areas?
- It can be done.
- At Spring State Park, we've parked with the concessions area. The average person can go there, but groups are encouraged to go there. It does work well if you can split those up and the private person can split that up. They like to go in groups of three or four.
- One place that is really congested is William's Landing. They put in motorboats and canoes. You get in there and you can't get out. There's a little parking between this road and that road. It needs a bigger landing and a loop there. Both the road and the river need work.
- It's a perfect one-day trip on the river, everybody uses it, and it's such a small landing. A little bit of work would be tremendous.
- Waymeyer and Raft Yard: those two areas are so congested with the concessioner buses and vans that it causes a lot of problems. There's not a lot of parking and people bring their own tubes, rafts, and kayaks.

- The concessioners come down and have all their canoes lined up, but the customers might be an hour away. So what is left is a tiny spot for private use to unload our canoes. Have some common sense or respect for other users.

K. Increase Options

- I just want to ask folks if there is an interest in separating vehicle access for shopping or coon dogs, and then there is the all terrain vehicle (ATV) access. It's the elephant in the room or people don't want to talk about it. I haven't been hearing a big use conflict in trucks, but it's about ATVs plowing through campsites. We didn't explore that issue. There may be a solution different than closing vehicle access.
- With the ATVs this goes back to no more regulations, let's just follow the rules. As stated, ATVs are only allowed on designated roads. If they are out there, they need to be arrested. I've reported these people, but there's a conflict on jurisdiction. They all say they don't have anything to do with that.

Park staff: The use of ATVs in the park is pretty clear. We adhere to Missouri state law. The use of ATVs and UTVs is legally allowed only on unpaved state and county roads. When they are off of those areas, we cite them. Any kind of joyriding or problem like that, the park does have jurisdiction. If it is within the park boundary, please let us know and we will respond. There is no problem with ATVs in the park; we're fine abiding with the state law. You do need a flag and some other equipment. There is one exception: on one of our prime campgrounds, ATVs can go from the campground to the legal county road; that is the only place they are allowed off the county road.

- It is just respect, the same with horses, boats, and 4WD people. The park service had some experience with people tearing it up. You can get some information to most of them and they will do their best. I've lived there most of my life and I've had trouble with canoeists. I've had bad experiences myself. Get a name, get something, get anything, and get it to the park ranger. They can find them, if you can get any information at all.
- I'd like to know where these things are happening with ATVs running through camps.
- I do know two individuals at different times that had it happen. One person was asleep at night and they came like Indians circling a wagon, whooping and hollering and back up the hill. And I know a local that had a problem, too.
- I've heard these rumors but haven't heard where it happens.
- For me when I talk about problems camping, it's people coming in and partying at night. It may not even be locals. And I have been canoeing in the fall around Two Rivers, and they came flying in the gravel bars.
- I can give you an example. In October 2006, I was on a float trip from Round Spring to Two Rivers. We camped overnight across from Twin Rocks. Every gravel bar we saw on that trip had ATV tracks. I didn't see the ATVs, but I saw the tracks. That means they were there. Those weren't county roads; those were gravel bars. We stopped before taking out on Two Rivers, and suddenly ten of them came out of the woods. They had come in from Eminence and we wondered what they were doing driving on a gravel bar. We were just stopped to eat lunch and suddenly they came out.
- We camped at Big Creek down from Round Spring. When we got up that morning there was a young couple with a three-year-old child. They said that night a group of drunken people on

ATVs came out and ran them off of a gravel bar, and they had to find a quick place to camp. I hope those things don't happen often.

- I want to credit the park service for policing. It could be more, there's no doubt. And a suggestion for canoeists to enjoy gravel bars without problems with ATVs: maybe the park could provide a map that indicates which gravel bars have vehicle access. Then people can choose to have lunch where there is no vehicle access.
- To all these things being said, the rules are already in place; they just need to be enforced.
- That was my point, too.

Appendix 2: Handouts

The National Park Service distributed the following items at the beginning of the workshop:

1. Agenda
2. Purpose and Significance
3. General Management Planning Overview
4. Motorboat and other ONSR Regulations
5. Definitions
6. Worksheet – Motorboat Use
7. Worksheet – Access to the River
8. Comment Form
9. Evaluation Form

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways
General Management Plan Stakeholder Workshop
Havener Center, Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, MO**

February 24 – 25, 2010

Agenda

| WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2010 | |
|---|---|
| 8:30 am – 9:00 am | Registration Outside Ozark-Missouri Room |
| 9:00 am – 9:10 am Ozark-Missouri Room | 1 Welcome – Reed Detring, Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways |
| 9:10 am – 9:25 am | 2 Introductions – Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company, LLC, Facilitator |
| 9:25 am – 9:45 am | 3 Where we are in the planning process – Ann Van Huizen, National Park Service |
| 9:45 am – 10:15 am | 4 Overview of process and detailed directions – Mary Orton |
| 10:15 am – 10:30 am | Break (Ozark/Missouri room divided) |
| 10:30 am – 12:45 pm Ozark, Missouri, Meramec & Gasconade Rooms | 5 Scenario development in small groups – Motorboat Use <i>(participants in role of ONSR GMP planning team)</i> |
| 12:45 pm – 1:45 pm | Lunch break (Ozark/Missouri room united) |
| 1:45 pm – 2:15 pm Ozark-Missouri Room | 6 Reports from small groups – Motorboat Use |
| 2:15 pm – 2:30 pm | Break (Ozark/Missouri room divided) |
| 2:30 pm – 4:30 pm Ozark, Missouri, Meramec & Gasconade Rooms | 7 Scenario development in small groups – Access to the River <i>(participants in role of ONSR GMP planning team)</i> |
| 4:30 pm – 4:45 pm | Break (Ozark/Missouri room united) |
| 4:45 pm – 5:15 pm Ozark-Missouri Room | 8 Reports from small groups – Access to the River |
| 5:15 pm | 9 Adjourn for the day |

| THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2010 All sessions held in Ozark-Missouri Room | |
|--|--|
| 8:00 am to 8:20 am | 1 Reflection on yesterday's activities (participants will have all the scenarios, benefits, and drawbacks from yesterday) |
| 8:20 am to 10:00 am | 2 Discuss as many scenarios as possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there additional benefits and drawbacks? ▪ How could the park address the drawbacks without losing the benefits? |
| 10:00 am to 10:15 am | Break |
| 10:15 am to 12:00 noon | 3 Discuss as many scenarios as possible (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there additional benefits and drawbacks? ▪ How could the park address the drawbacks without losing the benefits? |
| 12:00 noon to 12:20 pm | 4 Participants work independently to do the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use a scale of 1 to 5 to rate each scenario as to how well it satisfies your interests. The scale is: 1=definitely not, 2=somewhat not, 3=don't care, 4=somewhat yes, 5=definitely yes (use second copy of scenario list) ▪ Add any additional scenarios to submit to the park (use a blank worksheet) ▪ Evaluate the workshop (use evaluation form) ▪ Submit any additional comments (use comment card) |
| 12:20 pm – 12:30 pm | 5 Wrap up, next steps, and adjourn – Reed Detring |

Purpose and Significance

The purpose and significance statements of Ozark National Scenic Riverways serve as the foundation for park planning and management. These statements establish why the park is so special that it has been set aside for the nation by Congress and the president in perpetuity. The purpose and significance of the park identify the park's importance and qualities that are to be protected and maintained.

General management plan (GMP) alternative approaches to future management should ensure that the park's purpose can be achieved and its significant qualities can be maintained and protected into the future.

The information presented below was developed from the park's enabling legislation and legislative history, research and reports on resources in the park, the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916, and staff experience and expertise.

PURPOSE OF OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

Purpose statements are based on the park's legislation and legislative history and NPS laws and policies. The statements reaffirm the reasons for which Ozark National Scenic Riverways was set aside as a unit of the national park system and provide the foundation for the park's management and use.

The purposes of Ozark National Scenic Riverways are to:

- Preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled setting derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, springs, caves, and their karst origins;
- Provide for and promote opportunities for the scientific and public understanding of the natural and cultural resources;
- Offer opportunities for understanding and appreciation of the human experience associated with the Ozark Highlands landscape;
- Provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation opportunities consistent with the preservation of the national riverways resources.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENTS

Significance statements capture the essence of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways' importance to our country's natural, cultural, and recreational heritage. Significance statements do not inventory park resources; rather, they describe the park's distinctiveness and help to place the park within its regional, national, and international contexts. Significance statements answer questions such as why are the Ozark National Scenic Riverways' resources distinctive? What do they contribute to our natural, cultural, and recreational heritage? Defining the park's significance helps managers make decisions that preserve the resources and values necessary to accomplish the park's purpose.

Ozark National Scenic Riverways is significant for the following:

- The impressive hydrogeologic character of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways' karst landscape supports an amazing variety of natural features, including a world-class spring system that is unparalleled in North America. The park features the largest spring in the national park system, six first-magnitude springs and spring complexes, and more than 350 other springs. The cave system is equally impressive with more than 338 recorded caves – one of the highest densities of any national park system unit.
- The national riverways contains 134 miles of clear, free-flowing, spring-fed rivers. These include the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, which are two of only three Outstanding National Resource Waters in Missouri.
- The ancient Ozark Highlands is an important center of biodiversity in North America, including more than 200 endemic species. The large variety of species found within Ozark National Scenic Riverways is due to the rich array of aquatic, terrestrial, and subterranean habitats concentrated within its river corridors.
- The national riverways features archeological sites, historic structures, objects, and landscapes that reflect more than 12,000 years of people living along, adapting to, and interacting with these Ozark Highland rivers.
- The complex and dynamic natural resources and systems of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways provide for outstanding, high-quality recreational experiences on and along free-flowing rivers.

General Management Planning Overview

WHY HAVE A GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN?

A general management plan (GMP) will provide a vision for the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways (the park). It is the guiding document that describes for the public and for Congress how the park will be managed. With an approved management plan, Congress knows what the park needs. When requests for funding and staff positions are presented, they are more likely to be supported. The process helps the park define and minimize safety issues, establish high quality visitor experiences, and prioritize preservation goals, allowing the park to focus on resolving key issues.

The purpose of the environmental impact statement, which is part of the GMP process, is to discuss potential environmental effects and disclose those potential effects to the public.

WHY NOW?

Every park in the national park system is required by law to have a current plan. The park's last plan was done more than 25 years ago, in 1984. Many conditions have changed since then, and management issues that were identified by the public and park staff in early scoping meetings confirmed that a reevaluation of the park's future management is needed. The new management plan will help guide decisions at the park for the next 15 to 20 years.

WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED SO FAR?

1. The planning team identified the purposes and significance of Ozark National Scenic Riverways by examining the park's legislation, scientific data, and other documents. This information helps establish the foundation for planning. [See *Newsletter #1*.]
2. The team held meetings and open houses with park staff and the public to identify ideas and concerns about the park's future. The team summarized public comments and collected and analyzed relevant data about the park to understand current conditions and management issues. [See *Newsletter #2*.]
3. The team developed a range of preliminary alternative futures for the park and presented them in *Newsletter #3* and at public open houses.
4. The team collected and summarized public comments on the alternatives.

All of the newsletters and the public comments are posted at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar>. The projects are listed in alphabetical order; look for "General Management Plan."

NEXT STEPS AND SCHEDULE

The next major step in the planning process is to prepare a *Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/Environmental Impact Statement* (GMP/WS/EIS). This document will present the planning alternatives in detail, including the National Park Service's preferred alternative. It will include analysis of impacts on the park's natural and cultural resources, the visitor experience, and the socioeconomic environment (both inside and outside the park).

The following outlines the next steps and timeframes:

- **Reevaluate/Analyze the Alternatives.** The planning team will reevaluate the preliminary alternatives, based on the public's comments and stakeholder workshop results, and modify them as necessary to ensure there is a reasonable range of alternative actions.

Winter 2009 –
Fall 2010

This is where we are now.

The National Park Service will conduct an initial analysis of the environmental impacts of the revised alternatives.
- **Develop a Preferred Alternative.*** The planning team will identify a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative may be one of the alternatives in the existing alternatives, it may include elements from several of the alternatives (including the no-action alternative), or it may be an entirely new alternative.

Winter – Spring
2011
- **Prepare/Print a Draft Plan.** A Draft GMP/WS/EIS will be prepared to present the draft alternatives and environmental impacts.

Spring 2011
– Fall 2012

The director of the NPS Midwest Region must approve this document before it is distributed to the public.
- **Invite Public Comment.** The public will be invited to review and comment on the draft plan. The public may comment at public open houses, through written comments, and through the NPS PEPC website.

Fall 2012
– Winter 2013
- **Prepare/Print a Final Plan.** The team will analyze public comments on the draft document, prepare responses to substantive comments, and make appropriate revisions to the draft document. The Final General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/Environmental Impact Statement will then be distributed to the public.

Winter – Fall 2013
- **Implement the Approved Plan.** A “Record of Decision” will be issued to adopt the approved management plan. The approved plan will then be implemented as funding allows. The findings of the Wilderness Study will be transmitted, as appropriate, to the NPS director, secretary of the interior, president, and Congress.

Fall 2013
and beyond

*** The NPS Preferred Alternative.** The preferred alternative is the alternative that the National Park Service believes would best fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, based on the planning team's NEPA analysis and a value analysis that considers the expected results compared to the estimated costs of the alternatives. Draft alternatives, including the recommended preferred alternative, are presented to the NPS regional director. Final approval of the alternatives, including selection of the NPS preferred alternative, is the responsibility of the regional director.

Motorboat and Other ONSR Regulations

The following are the existing regulations for motorboats and other activities at Ozark National Scenic Riverways. They are from “Title 36: Parks, Forests, and Public Property” of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). You will find it in Part 7 – Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System.

§ 7.83 Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

(a) Restrictions for motorized vessels.

- (1) On waters situated within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the use of a motorized vessel is limited to a vessel equipped with an outboard motor only.
- (2) For the purposes of this section, horsepower ratings on a particular motor will be based upon the prevailing industry standard of power output at the propeller shaft as established by the manufacturer.
- (3) The use of a motorized vessel is allowed as follows:
 - (i) Above the Big Spring landing on the Current River and below Alley Spring on the Jacks Fork River with an outboard motor not to exceed 40 horsepower.
 - (ii) Above Round Spring on the Current River and above Alley Spring on the Jacks Fork River with an outboard motor not to exceed 25 horsepower.
 - (iii) Above Akers Ferry on the Current River from May 1 to September 15 with an outboard motor not to exceed 10 horsepower.
 - (iv) Above Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork River from March 1 to the Saturday before Memorial Day with an outboard motor not to exceed 10 horsepower.
- (4) Operating a motorized vessel other than as allowed in §7.83(a) is prohibited.

(b) Scuba Diving.

- (1) Scuba diving is prohibited within all springs and spring branches on federally owned land within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways without a written permit from the superintendent.
- (2) Permits. The superintendent may issue written permits for scuba diving in springs within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; Provided,
 - (i) That the permit applicant will be engaged in scientific or educational investigations which will have demonstrable value to the National Park Service in its management or understanding of riverways resources.
 - (ii) [Reserved]

- (c) **Commercial Activities.** The activities listed herein constitute commercial activities which are prohibited within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways, except in accordance with the provisions of a permit, contract, or other written agreement with the United States. The National Park Service reserves the right to limit the number of such permits, contracts or other written agreements, when, in the judgment of the Service, such limitation is necessary in the interest of visitor enjoyment, public safety, or preservation or protection of the resources or values of the Riverways.

- (1) The sale or rental of any goods or equipment to a member or members of the public which is undertaken in the course of an ongoing or regular commercial enterprise.

- (2) The performance of any service or activity for a member or members of the public in exchange for monetary or other valuable consideration.
- (3) The delivery or retrieval within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways of watercraft or associated boating equipment which has been rented to a member or members of the public at a location not within the Riverways, when such delivery or retrieval is performed by a principal, employee or agent of the commercial enterprise offering the equipment for rental and when these services are performed as an integral part, necessary complement, or routine adjunct of or to the rental transaction, whether or not any charge, either separately or in combination with any other charge, is made for these services.
- (4) The performance, by a principal, employee, or agent of a commercial enterprise, within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways of any other service or activity for which a fee, charge or other compensation is not collected, but which is an integral part, necessary complement, or routine adjunct of or to any commercial transaction undertaken by that enterprise for which monetary or other valuable consideration is charged or collected, even though such transaction is initiated, performed, or concluded outside the boundaries of the Riverways.
- (5) The solicitation of any business, employment, occupation, profession, trade, work or undertaking, which is engaged in with some continuity, regularity or permanency for any livelihood, gain, benefit, advantage, or profit.

(d) Fishing.

- (1) Unless otherwise designated, fishing in a manner authorized under applicable State law is allowed.
- (2) The superintendent may designate times and locations and establish conditions under which the digging of bait for personal use is allowed.

(e) Frogs, turtles and crayfish.

- (1) The superintendent may designate times and locations and establish conditions governing the taking of frogs, turtles and/or crayfish upon a written determination that the taking of frogs, turtles and/or crayfish:
 - a. Is consistent with the purposes for which the area was established; and
 - b. Will not be detrimental to other park wildlife or the reproductive potential of the species to be taken; and
 - c. Will not have an adverse effect on the ecosystem.
- (2) Violation of established conditions or designations is prohibited.

[38 FR 5851, Mar. 5, 1973, as amended at 41 FR 23959, June 14, 1976; 49 FR 18451, Apr. 30, 1984; 50 FR 43388, Oct. 25, 1985; 56 FR 30696, July 5, 1991; 56 FR 37158, Aug. 5, 1991]

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways
General Management Plan Stakeholder Workshop
February 24 – 25, 2010**

Definitions

The following definitions may be helpful as you fill out the worksheets and develop scenarios.

All-terrain vehicle: Any motorized vehicle manufactured and used exclusively for off-highway use which is fifty inches or less in width, with an unladen dry weight of one thousand five hundred pounds or less, traveling on three, four or more nonhighway tires, with a seat designed to be straddled by the operator, or with a seat designed to carry more than one person, and handlebars for steering control.¹

Gravel bar: As it is used on the worksheet, “gravel bar” refers to that area of gravelly beach that comes off of the bank of the river, and not the gravel islands that occasionally occur on the river.

Motor vehicle: Any self-propelled vehicle not operated exclusively upon tracks, except farm tractors.³

³ From Missouri Revised Statutes, Chapter 301, Registration and Licensing of Motor Vehicles.

Scenario Development Worksheet - Motorboat Use

GROUP NAME: _____

ONSR GMP Workshops
February 24 and 25, 2010

| Scenario Number | Motorized Boat Restrictions (“what”) ⁴ | Seasonality/ Timing (“when”) ⁵ | Zones (“where”) ⁶ | Other (not required) | Benefits and Drawbacks |
|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Example | 20 mph speed limit | Memorial Day to Labor Day | Waymeyer south to Van Buren Gap | Lower speed limits in congested areas | <i>Note regarding this example: This example addresses only one reach of the river. Your scenario may include different restrictions for different reaches of the rivers.</i> |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |

⁴ This could include speed, horsepower, sound, etc.
⁵ This could include days of week, seasons, etc.
⁶ This could include different areas that could have different restrictions at different times of year or seasons; it could also include where motorboats are able to put in and take out.

Scenario Development Worksheet - Access to the River

GROUP NAME: _____

ONSR GMP Workshops
February 24 and 25, 2010

| Scenario Number | HORSES | | VEHICLES ⁷ | | Other (not required) | Benefits and Drawbacks |
|-----------------|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| | Where should they access the river? | What limits on horses should be imposed? | Where should they ford the river? | Where should they access gravel bars? | | |
| Example | Only at designated horse trail crossings | Daily limit of 100 horses/per mile/day | Only at designated fords, 5 miles apart | No vehicle access | Keep gravel bars as places for floaters and boaters to stop and picnic | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | |

⁷ This includes private and commercial vehicles, including ATVs. All vehicles must be legally licensed or permitted.

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways
General Management Plan Stakeholder Workshop
February 24 – 25, 2010**

Comment Card

Describe your new scenario or indicate which scenario number you are commenting on (use the back of this page or attach another if you need more space):

What are the benefits of this scenario? Why?

What are the drawbacks to this scenario? Why?

How might the benefits be kept while the drawbacks are removed? Please be as specific as you can be.

Optional:

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|------------|
| NAME | ADDRESS | |
| PHONE | EMAIL | FAX |

PLEASE TURN THIS IN BEFORE YOU LEAVE THE WORKSHOP – THANK YOU!

**Ozark National Scenic Riverways
General Management Plan Stakeholder Workshop
February 24 – 25, 2010**

Workshop Evaluation

What is one thing you liked about the workshop?

What one thing would you change or improve?