

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Public Involvement

This material summarizes and supplements the information in Chapter One, which discussed the planning process.

The mailing list of elected officials, agencies, organizations, and individuals contains approximately 500 entries.

Newsletters were used to explain the planning process, discuss various influences on that process, announce public meetings, report back to the public, and provide opportunity for comment.

Letters were sent to interested officials, agencies, and organizations announcing the planning effort and requesting issues to be included. Agencies included the Fish and Wildlife Service, USDI, and the State Historic Preservation Officers for Kentucky and Tennessee.

National Area staff has maintained regular contacts with local community organizations.

A total of 20 meetings for the general public were held in as many as nine local and regional locations. Four additional meetings were held in March 2003 after release of the *Supplemental Draft GMP*. The latter meetings were held in Huntsville, TN, Wartburg, TN, Allardt, TN, and Whitley City, KY.

The University of Kentucky, under contract, provided public comment from local persons who typically do not attend government sponsored public meetings.

Three focus groups were formed, and, in a total of nine meetings, provided input on a variety of topics, including desirable characteristics of a road and trail system for the National Area.

Comments received as a result of the newsletters and meetings included a wide variety of topics. The following list is a representative sample of comments.

Natural and Cultural Resource Related Comments:

- Plan should address how to maintain water quality. (*Water quality issues are included, addressed in proposed zoning and road/trail standards, and are a part of Required Management. Specific projects and studies are identified and more specifically addressed in the Water Resources Management Plan.*)
- Some of the tributary streams are seriously polluted. (*See comment above.*)
- Need more monitoring of the New River. (*See comment above.*)
- Apply principles of ecosystem management. (*This subject is included in both Required Management and in the proposed zoning strategy and would also be part of the Resources Management Plan.*)
- Should restore native plant species. (*Included in the proposal, addressed in Required Management, and would be part of the Resources Management Plan.*)
- Hunting is good for the ecosystem and no artificial enhancements are necessary. (*Addressed in Required Management and would be part of the Resources Management Plan.*)
- Restore the grassy woodlands. (*Same as above*)
- Identify the existing and potential resource threats and the level of risk. (*Addressed in Chapter 4, Affected Environment, and in Chapter 5, Environmental Consequences.*)
- Is there a need for boundary expansion to better protect resources? (*No related issues raised during planning. Considered and not included in proposal.*)
- Need to restore historic resources in some form in No Business, Station Camp, and Parch Corn areas for interpretation. (*Addressed in Required Management and in zoning for cultural landscapes. Specific actions will be the subject of later detailed studies*)
- Preserve areas of natural quiet and solitude. (*Addressed in zoning and in road/trail planning.*)

- Show how resources would remain unimpaired for future generations. *(Generally addressed in Required Management and also more specifically in zoning and in road and trail standards. Would be specifically considered during implementation planning.)*
- Need to identify resource carrying capacity and not just continue to allow use to increase. *(Addressed by zone management prescriptions in a qualitative manner, including identification of indicators and standards for monitoring, and would be a consideration in implementation planning)*
- Wilderness qualities should be enhanced and a portion of the area evaluated for designation. *(The selection of zone types considered providing for the availability of natural conditions and solitude. The zone management prescriptions address the desired resource conditions and visitor experience. An analysis was undertaken that resulted in a map, also in the appendix, that illustrates areas that should be studied when specific analyses concerning wilderness are undertaken.)*

Visitor Use Related Comments:

- Need more interpretation and programs in the south end. *(Addressed generally in alternatives, in identification of proposed satellite contact stations, and would be a specific subject for the Comprehensive Interpretive Plan.)*
- Should have more access and facilities. *(Addressed specifically by the alternatives)*
- Should not have any more large campgrounds. *(Addressed specifically by the alternatives)*
- Need to complete the trail connections between the south end and the rest of the area. *(Addressed specifically by the alternatives)*
- Need standards for trails. *(Included in the plan)*
- Overnight lodging should be available. *(Addressed specifically by the alternatives; none additional in proposal.)*
- Let the private sector provide lodging. *(Addressed specifically by the alternatives; private sector relied upon in proposal.)*
- Less wilderness and more recreation. *(Addressed by the alternatives)*
- More of a certain type of use/facility (or less). *(Addressed specifically by the alternatives)*
- Have more cultural sites available to the public. *(Addressed by zoning and development planning and would be a specific subject for interpretive planning and cultural resource studies)*
- Improve the O&W railbed for autos (or close it). *(Addressed specifically in the plan.)*
- A theme park should be developed. *(The direction provided by the establishing legislation and other laws and policy would not allow such development within the National Area.)*
- A museum should be provided. *(Museum collection management has been considered in the plan and would be considered in detail in the future.)*
- Why plan for more facilities when the NPS can't maintain what it has and the country has such a budget deficit?" *(The alternatives include the kinds and levels of development appropriate for the various zones considering the legislative purpose of the National Area and existing and expected use. Overall, there would be no change in the scale of development, although identified gaps would be filled in a conservative manner. The National Area requests funding for development and operations as a part of the budget process, which is subject to agency and congressional priorities.)*

Recipients of the Supplemental Draft Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Federal Agencies:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
 US Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District
 US Environmental Protection Agency
 US Fish and Wildlife Service
 US Forest Service, Daniel Boone National Forest

State and Local Agencies:

State of Kentucky

- Department of Agriculture
 - Division of Forestry
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Resources
- Department of Natural Resources
- Department of Parks
- Kentucky Environmental Quality
 - Commission
- Kentucky Heritage Council
- Kentucky Nature Preserves
 - Commission
- Kentucky Resources Council

State of Tennessee

- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Economic and
 - Community Development
- Department of Environment and
 - Conservation Environmental
 - Policy Office
- Division of Air Pollution Control
- Division of Natural Heritage
- Division of Recreation Services
- Division of Water Pollution Control
- Division of Wild and Scenic Rivers
 - and State Parks
- Tennessee Historical Commission
- Department of Transportation
- Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency

Pickett State Park

Pickett State Forest

Scott State Forest

Kentucky Farm Bureau

McCreary County Farm Bureau

Wayne County Farm Bureau

Tennessee Farm Bureau

Fentress County Farm Bureau

Morgan County Farm Bureau

Pickett County Farm Bureau

Scott County Farm Bureau

Fentress County Agricultural Extension Service

McCreary County Agricultural Extension Service

Morgan County Agricultural Extension Service

Pickett County Agricultural Extension Service

Scott County Agricultural Extension Service

Wayne County Agricultural Extension Service

University of Kentucky Wildlife Extension Service

East Tennessee Development District

Upper Cumberland Development District

Organizations:

Appalachian Bike Club

Appaloosa Horse Club

Big South Fork Bicycle Club
Big South Fork Hiking Club
Big South Fork Saddle Club
Big South Fork Trail Riders Association
Bluegrass Wildwater Association
Camper and Hikers Association
Chattanooga Arabian Horse Club
East Tennessee Development District
East Tennessee Whitewater Association
Eastern Professional River Outfitters
Elizabethton Trail Riders
Family Campers & RVers
Fentress County Chamber of Commerce
Friends of the Big South Fork NRRA, Inc.
Hill and Valley Saddle Club
Historic Rugby
Kentucky Horse Council
Knoxville Arabian Horse Club
Lake Cumberland Area Development District
Lakeview Hills Saddle Club
Laurel County Hiking Club
McCreary County Chamber of Commerce
McCreary County Horse Club
McCreary County Sportsmen
National Parks and Conservation Association
National Trail Ride Association
Paso Fino Association
Pickett County Chamber of Commerce
Pleasure Walking Horse Association of Tennessee
Ridge Riders
Save Our Cumberland Mountains
Scott County Chamber of Commerce
Sierra Club, Harvey Broome Group
Sierra Club, Tennessee Chapter
Sierra Club, Upper Cumberland Group
Smoky Mountain Trail Riders
Southern Kentucky Tourism Development Association
Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning
Tennessee Conservation League
Tennessee Eastman Hiking Club
Tennessee Horse Council
Tennessee Nature Conservancy
Tennessee Scenic Rivers Association
Tennessee Trails and Field Trials Association
Tennessee Trails Association
Tennessee Valley Canoe Club
The Wilderness Society
Upper Cumberland Tourism Association
Upper Cumberland Development District
Woodford County Saddle Club

Individuals:

The list of individuals is lengthy and is on file at the National Area.

CULTURAL RESOURCE CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

The following consultation requirements are subject to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. After the final plan is approved, NPS will negotiate a park-specific programmatic agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officers in Kentucky and Tennessee and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, as recommended by the 1994 Programmatic Agreement between the National Park Service, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Council of State Historic Preservation Officers. The latter document guides NPS compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. The chart below includes most of the categories of management actions proposed. Other, specific actions may require consultation.

ALTERNATIVE D MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTIONS	CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS
Possible actions include:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archeological surveying preceding any new construction and/or ground disturbance 	Programmatic Exclusion IV.B.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment, design, and construction of new trails or trail segments 	SHPO/ACHP review required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resurfacing/repair of present National Area trails or former road traces as new trails 	Programmatic Exclusion IV.B.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining National Area trails 	Programmatic Exclusion B.IV.A.6 for maintaining existing trails
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing formal trailheads or access sites with parking and signage 	SHPO/ACHP review required for new construction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Installing comfort stations 	SHPO/ACHP review required for new construction of comfort stations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructing any other facilities 	SHPO/ACHP review required for new construction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans and studies 	SHPO/ACHP review required