

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Land Management**

Eastern States-Milwaukee Field Office

May 2002

Lower Potomac River
Coordinated Management Plan

Scoping Report

Prepared in cooperation with the
Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Introduction

As the initial step in formulating and adopting a management plan for the Lower Potomac River planning area in Charles County, Maryland, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-Milwaukee Field Office, the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and Charles County conducted a public scoping process from April 2001 through March 2002. The goal of the scoping process was to solicit from the public and agencies concerns, appropriate management direction, opportunities and potential impacts for the long-term management of the newly acquired Douglas Point tract (former PEPCO property), which is jointly owned by BLM and DNR.

The scoping process also took into consideration three other key properties in close proximity to the former PEPCO tract-ideas were solicited from the public regarding issues and potential opportunities for the Wilson Farm, a pending DNR acquisition, Purse State Park and the former Maryland Point Naval Research site, which also was just acquired by BLM. Last, input also was sought from the participants on how a voluntary public lands acquisition and conservation program could be developed and implemented on the Nanjemoy Peninsula.

The scoping program also included solicitation of comments via the formal filing of a Notice of Intent to prepare a Coordinated Management Plan (CMP)/Environmental Assessment (EA).

The scoping program included public workshops, attendance by government planners at community meetings to answer questions regarding Federal and state land management activities, and a written comment period, which was extended once, as requested by interested parties.

The BLM sponsored a Community-Based Partnerships and Healthy Ecosystems” workshop in La Plata, Maryland in April 2001. The workshop built a common understanding of the environmental and social issues between community leaders and residents and government officials regarding public land ownership, and helped build local capacity for “community-based planning and management” of public lands. Out of the workshop, local activists began a comprehensive “visioning” process that sought to build a local consensus on the role that land conservation can play in local economic development, social well-being and service delivery and recreation opportunities.

Section 1: Plan Objectives

This document reports the results of the scoping process conducted by the BLM, DNR and Charles County for the preparation of the Lower Potomac River CMP. A major component of the plan will focus on the Douglas Point property, because it is presently owned by BLM and DNR. BLM must complete a land use plan for the Douglas Point property to make basic land use allocations and set overall management direction for the property. BLM purchased a portion of the Douglas Point property with federal funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund

(LWCF) in concert with funds from the State of Maryland's GreenPrint Program.

It is important that the plan also address future uses and resource management strategies on nearby existing public lands and properties that are in the process of being acquired by the State of Maryland. In cooperation with DNR and Charles County, the plan also will examine the issues and opportunities associated with the Wilson Farm, the Maryland Point Naval research site and Purse State Park, and the relationship of these properties as one integrated public lands system on the Lower Potomac River. The pending acquisition status of the Wilson Farm will determine how the plan will address the resources assessment and planning issues for the property.

When completed, the plan will:

- Identify allowable land uses for the Douglas Point tract for public use and enjoyment of the many conservation, recreation and cultural resource values located on the Nanjemoy peninsula, while maintaining the ecological integrity of the region;
- Identify allowable land uses for the former Maryland Point Naval research site, which is under BLM's sole jurisdiction;
- Identify allowable uses for the Wilson Farm and Purse State Park;
- Develop criteria for future land acquisitions and other voluntary land conservation strategies that are consistent with the goals and objectives of the plan. These criteria will be used to evaluate possible acquisition proposals from willing sellers;
- Identify activities required for full implementation of land use plan; and
- Identify other resource management needs.

Section 2: Public Scoping Process

To begin the CMP, BLM and DNR initiated the public scoping process. The process is intended to solicit public and agency input about issues of concern, as well as ideas and proposals for long-term management.

Goal of the Scoping Process

Scoping is a term from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and its implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). As defined by the CEQ regulations, scoping is an:

. . . early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed [in a NEPA environmental document] and for identifying the significant issues related to the proposed action.

[40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Subpart 1501.7]

The primary goal of the scoping process is to solicit from agencies and the public their concerns, ideas, and proposals for long-term management of the newly acquired Douglas Point property and to help develop a set of acquisition criteria to evaluate future proposals for government land acquisitions.

The Scoping Program

The scoping process was initiated by publishing in the Federal Register a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare the Lower Potomac River Coordinated Management Plan and public notices in the Maryland *Independent* and Washington *Post* (Southern Maryland edition). BLM also provided a short article for publication in the Nanjemoy-Potomac Environmental Coalition newsletter. Staff from BLM, DNR and Charles County attended local forums in Nanjemoy throughout 2001 and early 2002 to answer questions and provide status updates.

The two public scoping workshops were designed and hosted by BLM, DNR and Charles County with the assistance of a private contractor, Shankland and Associates of Fairfax, Virginia. Agency staff also coordinated their public participation efforts with the Nanjemoy Community Vision Committee of Nanjemoy, Maryland. The Nanjemoy Vision Committee published the workshop notice on its web page, and sent the notice to approximately 70 local residents who were on its list server. The notice was also placed in the Washington *Post* (Southern Maryland Edition), and notices were sent to: the Charles County Delegation, the Administrator of the Commissioners of Charles County, the Charles County Parks Department, the Charles County Department of Tourism and the participants and organizational representatives (recreational, environmental, local businesses, mining and local residents) who attended the collaborative workshop in April, 2001.

The program was designed to give the public a range of input opportunities, including:

- Two official public workshops in Charles County (March 2002 in Nanjemoy and La Plata);
- A newsletter provided to all participants at the workshops describing the project; and

- A written comment period, which was extended once as requested by interested parties.

A nontraditional forum for soliciting input was used to focus the workshops. Individuals and representatives of interest groups met in small-groups discussions to facilitate in-depth dialogue about the issues and to solicit other concerns, and opportunities for management. All issues and concerns and opportunities expressed during the breakout sessions were recorded. These statements are provided below.

Public Workshops

The public workshops were held during consecutive weekday evenings at easily accessible locations, with ample parking, that provided comfortable space for many people. At each meeting, Tom Roland, Chief of Parks and Grounds from Charles County, welcomed the public, and provided some background to the project from the County's perspective as a partner. Mr. Roland was followed by Mark Spencer of DNR's Resource Planning Division, who described the acquisition and planning project. Following his presentation, Howard Levine, BLM planning team leader, described the BLM planning process. All three then answered questions from the public. Sherwood Shankland, serving as the workshop facilitator, described the meeting format and agenda. At both workshops, Ms. Kathy McClure, from the Nanjemoy Visioning Committee provided a brief overview of the community's visioning process and preliminary findings.

Following the presentations, the public divided into small groups, each with a facilitator from BLM or DNR. The groups' tasks were to develop a set of issue statements and a list of opportunities for public land management. The groups wrote these statements on sheets of paper which were put on a large adhesive board. Mr. Shankland then facilitated a group discussion on how to group and prioritize the statements, the results of which are found in section 3.

The innovative meeting format proved to be particularly successful in gathering key management ideas early in the planning process. Participants were supportive of the approach, and several participants expressed the view that the meeting format was an improved method of public involvement, especially appropriate for a planning process. Overall, approximately 100 people attended the public workshops.

Section 3: Compilation of Public Scoping Comments

As noted above, scoping comments were generated in several forms: workshops, written comment letters (e-mail and letters), and in person. All of these expressions were systematically analyzed and broken into discrete subject areas. The resulting summaries of comments by subject area are presented below in the summary section.

Summary of Comments from Individual Workshops

The workshops were held in Nanjemoy and La Plata, Maryland, on March 19th and 20th, respectively. Thirty-seven members of the public attended the Nanjemoy workshop and forty-eight signed in at the La Plata event. The issues, concerns and opportunities collected from the participants at both workshops are summarized below.

Nanjemoy, Maryland, March 19, 2002

Opportunities

Members of the public identified the following general public land uses and overall land management activities:

- Diverse recreation activities
- Protection and preservation of natural and cultural resources
- Water access and recreation
- Education – history, culture and nature
- Economic development

Issues and Concerns

The public also raised the following issues and concerns that the plan should address:

- What forms of economic activity will be appropriate or allowed?
- How can we reconcile incompatible recreational uses of the land?
- What will be the impact of the plan on zoning, taxes and property values?
- How will multiple agencies and parties work together successfully?
- How will these specific elements be included in the plan?
- How will agencies address safety and law enforcement?

Specific Opportunities

Under each topic identified by the public, the following ideas were generated:

Diverse recreation activities

- Designated hunting areas / safety zones
- Designated camping sites & facilities
- Low impact recreation (water trails, primitive camping)
- Multiple use trails (bike, equestrian, hikers)
- Manage recreational uses to avoid conflict

- Recreational utilization of natural resources
- Responsible multi-use recreation activities
- Environmental friendly trails (hiking, biking, walking, horse)
- Publicly-owned gun club (trap/skeet = potential \$\$)
- Fossil conservation and education
- Youth recreation fields (soccer, etc.)
- Amenities expressly designed for ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] use (trails and fishing pier)

Protection and Preservation of natural and cultural resources

- Maintain rural character
- Farm preservation
- Private property conservation
- Primitive facilities only
- Protect and conserve sensitive areas
- Regional watershed protection
- Not selling land to developers
- Long-term protection of the natural values of Douglas Point
- Any structures should be “green buildings”
- Active and proper management of natural resources (timbering and old agricultural field control)
- Development only at Maryland Point (~20 acre BLM plot) use the existing facility for astronomy / education
- No logging or mining

Water access and recreation

- Public access to and use of water
- Fishing for county residents
- River access for power boaters
- Boat access – daily fee
- Non-powered water access only
- Have a season for kayak and canoeing

Education – history, culture and nature

- Maritime museum with Civil War element
- Use “green” buildings for development
- Regional partnerships (fossils, etc.)
- Local Indian heritage education
- Pre-historic, archeological education
- Conservation education opportunities
- Educational and interpretive opportunities emphasized
- Educational programs for environment, ecology, history

- Educational value of natural/historical resources
- Something for all ages and all people

Economic Development

- Eco-tourism
- Fish spawning areas
- Provide water transportation (hydrofoil ferry)
- Job opportunities for local residents (rangers, food service, tour guides, outfitters)

Specific Issues and Concerns

What forms of economic activity will be appropriate or allowed?

- Commercial and private expansion
- Continuous and new mining – silt ponds overflow into fish spawning areas.
- No logging / harvesting – recapture logged areas (buy out logging)
- Commercial clear cutting
- Shuttle bus from Indian Head or more “infrastructured” areas to scenic areas / Nanjemoy
- Maintaining family farms
- Concern for continued water quality issues (drinking water, gravel runoff)

How can we reconcile incompatible recreational uses of the land?

- Incompatible recreational uses
- No Bass Tournaments
- Limited hunting / No hunting
- Boat ramp for commercial and pleasure boats of county residents only.
- Adequate public access to shoreline
- Limit use of Route 224 – for scenic roadway – biking / rural / natural character
- Ball fields – inland, cleared, environmentally appropriate land.

What will be the impact of the plan on zoning, taxes and property values?

- Limiting commercial development while still providing services
- Zoning compatibility – balance use and protection
- How Nanjemoy will benefit with loss of tax revenue; impact on adjacent properties?
- Protection of private property values

How will multiple agencies and parties work together successfully?

- Need for continuing county input / distrust of “Feds”/ who maintains, manages property?
- Coordinated seamless management
- Continue to expand partnership with Nanjemoy community (future / perpetual partnership)
- DNR enter as an aggrieved party on adjacent property land use proposals.
- How will these specific elements be included in the plan?

- Comprehensive wildlife and ecosystem study
- Detailed inventory of natural and cultural resources
- Include 263 acres in study area (extend study area – red line to include Liverpool [Point Road] – East of Route 224.)
- Buffer areas

How will agencies address safety and law enforcement?

- Safety on local roadways and traffic volume concerns.
- Overall law enforcement (poaching, ATV)

La Plata, Maryland, March 20, 2002

The community residents generated the ideas listed below on March 20th at the Charles County Department of Social Services Building in La Plata. Working in six table teams, ideas were listed, prioritized, and organized into categories of similar ideas. The categories are listed in order by size, largest first and smallest last.

Opportunities

- Diverse recreation activities
- Boating and water access
- Hunting and Collecting
- Protection and preservation of natural and cultural resources
- Education – history, culture and nature
- Economic Development

Issues and Concerns

- How can we reconcile incompatible recreational uses of the land?
- What forms of economic activity will be appropriate or allowed?
- How will multiple agencies and parties work together successfully?
- How will these specific elements be included in the plan?
- What will be the safety and law enforcement needs?

Specific Opportunities

Diverse recreation activities

- Diversified trail system (hiking, bikes, horse, nature)
- Outdoor music / picnic pavilion
- Camping – primitive and commercial
- Scouting and camping

- Nature-based recreation
- Boating and water access
- Large boat ramp with pier, parking and canoe rentals
- Public water access (fossil collecting, fishing, kayaking, power boating)
- Public restroom, trash facilities

Hunting and Collecting

- Ranges (archery, rifle)
- Public hunting
- Hunting – upland waterfowl; inland forested areas; water front
- Public duck blinds
- Fossil hunting

Protection and Preservation of natural and cultural resources

- Conservation of natural habitat
- Protection of natural resources
- Scenic corridor for Route 224
- Preserve shoreline, greenway (buffers and shoreline views)

Education

- Educational opportunities
- Interpret local history
- Educational opportunities based on regional resources
- Direct scientifically significant specimens to a museum

Economic Development

- Tourism development
- Eco-tourism, natural, cultural, historical tourism
- Economic development and county tourism

Specific Issues and Concerns

How can we reconcile incompatible recreational uses of the land?

- Traffic volume impact
- Habitat preservation
- Reasonable water access
- Fossil hunting and viewing cultural resources
- No fishing tournaments
- Maintain historic use – hunting / multiple use
- Hunters vs. hikers / birdwatchers
- Off-road vehicles (ORV's) control to protect land
- User conflicts (ball fields)

What forms of economic activity will be appropriate or allowed?

- Economic impact on Indian Head
- No user fees
- Out of state exploitation / access fees

How will multiple agencies and parties work together successfully?

- Coordination with Potomac Heritage Trail and other land systems (e.g., Chapman's)
- No exclusion of user groups
- Tolerance of user groups

How will these specific elements be included in the plan?

- Clarification of BLM's facility development
- Adequate public facilities (parking, restrooms)
- Delineating future public lands to maximize access

What will be the safety and law enforcement needs?

- Protection of ships and avoiding navigational hazards (liability issues)
- Trash and illegal dumping
- Need for security on public lands

Section 4: Issues Identified through Other Sources

In addition to the comments gathered at the workshops, BLM and DNR received information through e-mail, faxes and letters. BLM and DNR also solicited input from the Nanjemoy Community Visioning Committee which, in a parallel track, has developed a long-term economic, recreational, environmental and social strategy for the Nanjemoy Peninsula.

Nanjemoy Community Vision Committee

The committee focused its efforts on five topic areas: environmental, recreational, cultural, economic and social. Three of the topic areas are directly related to the CMP effort: environmental, recreational and cultural. A fourth topic – economic – is indirectly related in that governmental land ownership may provide economic benefits to the region by attracting recreational users and heritage tourists. The fifth topic (social) is beyond the scope of the plan. The CMP will incorporate relevant aspects of the community vision to develop a “community-based” alternative for analysis.

Ecosystem Management

Several groups have identified the Nanjemoy peninsula and the area around Nanjemoy Creek to be of significant ecological importance. For this reason, non-profit conservancy groups such as the Nature Conservancy, the Conservation Fund and Conservancy of Charles County have sought to protect thousands of acres to provide habitat for endangered or threatened plant or animal

species.

The Nanjemoy peninsula is within the Nature Conservancy's (TNC) *Chesapeake Bay Lowlands* "ecoregional" planning area, by virtue of its largely undeveloped expanses of intact forest and other ecological indicators. Adult great blue herons, which nest within the TNC-owned rookery along Nanjemoy Creek, rely on Potomac River shoreline for food. TNC has also purchased an option for 2100 acres along Nanjemoy Creek to protect the federally-listed dwarf wedge mussel (*Alasmidonta heterodon*). The Nanjemoy Creek location is one of only four known sites within Maryland and is currently the largest and most viable population in the state.

Based on these ecological factors, TNC offered several recommendations for possible uses of the Douglas Point/Nanjemoy area:

- No additional road building or clearing; any additional foot trails should avoid steep slopes and rare plant populations;
- Active recreational uses should be accommodated at forest edges or in already cleared areas;
- Focus on maintaining large "core" areas dominated by mature forest, expanding existing fragmented forest stands and create contiguous habitat;
- Reduce impacts from invasive species;
- Encourage hunting program which control overgrazing by deer populations.

Another not-for-profit conservation group, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) provided extensive comments during the scoping period. It recommended that BLM place a top priority on forest, wetland and underwater grass conservation and restoration on any lands within its jurisdiction along the Potomac River in southwestern Charles County (e.g., the planning area). CBF also recommended that BLM place a secondary priority on passive recreation and outdoor education. Finally, CBF recommended that BLM's plan provide for economic development based on the primary and secondary criteria noted above and to limit development within the area.

Section 5: Issues to Be Addressed by the Planning Process

SUMMARY OF ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

Based on the issues identified by the public, other Federal, state and local agencies and interest groups, and given existing legal and policy constraints, BLM and DNR have determined that the following issues/topics will be addressed by the coordinated management plan:

Ecosystem Protection

The CMP will focus on how to protect significant natural aquatic and terrestrial habitats, particularly the habitats for threatened and endangered species, while balancing the opportunities for appropriate recreational uses and support facilities. The Douglas Point tract was specifically

targeted for state and federal acquisition, because of its significant ecological attributes. Management of the tract's extensive forested areas will reduce forest fragmentation, link forest blocks into larger contiguous blocks of forest and help to control invasive and exotic species. The plan will also pay special attention and recognize protection of the State's Critical Area.

Cultural and Historic Resource Protection and Interpretation

The region's diverse and important cultural and historic resources will be protected under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. The information offered during scoping also recommended that the CMP should serve as a regional plan for the interpretation of the area's history and culture, often known as Heritage Tourism. Many participants identified the Wilson Farm as significant, because of its diverse cultural resources, including the sunken ships at Malloes Bay. Several participants recommended that the Wilson Farm or somewhere else in the Study Area serve as a cultural and environmental education facility with the Potomac River as its centerpiece.

Sustainable Economic Development

Although BLM and DNR programs do not aid local economies directly, it is widely understood that public land management activities can add significant economic value to regional economies. Plan alternatives will, therefore, address how government land management activities will benefit local and regional economies by developing opportunities related to public land management. The plan will determine the level of timber harvesting, if any, that will be allowed on Federal land.

Public Water Access and Recreation

Many participants requested that the plan determine how public access to the Potomac River could be increased either through the Douglas Point property, the Wilson Farm or elsewhere in the Study Area. Different types of water access such as motorized and non-motorized vessels, waterfowl hunting and fishing will be considered, as well as the potential impacts of these proposed uses on identified natural and cultural resources.

Land Access and Recreation

Considerable public comment focused on access to the Douglas Point tract. Interim use guidelines will allow casual use of the property until other more intensive uses can be analyzed. Therefore, the plan will identify recreation activities that can be supported with suitable support facilities, mitigate and preserve ecological integrity and that is consistent with the Land and Water Conservation Fund (see Section 6: Planning Criteria). Recreational activities that will be evaluated on the BLM and DNR owned portions of the Douglas Point tract will include: hunting, hiking, horseback riding, bicycling, picnicking, overnight camping, wildlife viewing, nature study, universal access, and interpretive activities. Low-impact trail systems to support these activities will be considered. The same range of recreational activities also will be evaluated for the Wilson Farm.

Off-road vehicles

All BLM public lands are required to have one of the following off-road vehicle (ORV) designations:

Open designations are used primarily for sites selected for intensive ORV recreation, where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts or public safety issues that limit cross-country use.

Limited designations are those which resource values demand seasonal or other use restrictions to protect natural resources or public safety.

Closed designations are defined as the permanent closure of the public lands to all forms of ORV use at all times.

In addition to required support facilities, control of human debris and waste from various recreation activities will be considered in evaluating potential impacts to ecological integrity. It is anticipated that some proposed recreation activities may require more than minimal support facilities or may compromise ecological integrity; such uses would therefore be limited to certain areas or excluded entirely.

Maintenance and Administrative Access

The plan will address maintenance strategies and access requirements for vegetation manipulation, fire suppression, security, restoration, monitoring, and research will be identified and evaluated.

Special Designations

The CMP will address the suitability of the BLM-owned land and possibly the state owned portion of the Douglas Point property for special management designations. Possible designation could include as a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System or as an area of critical environmental concern (ACEC).

Ecosystem Monitoring and Scientific Research

In order to support adaptive management, recreation, restoration, and research activity levels and effects on ecosystem integrity will be monitored. Concurrently, the uniqueness of the region may provide opportunity for scientific research by other parties. Management monitoring needs and processes for evaluating, permitting, and monitoring research will be examined and procedures will be established by the plan.

Planning Area Boundary

The planning area boundary will include both watershed sub-basins indicated in the NOI. Based on input from the citizens at the workshops, the planning area boundary has been adjusted to include the remaining 263 acres from the former PEPCO tract. This is consistent with the overall

goal of including all lands within the planning area that may affect or impact adjacent publicly owned properties along the shoreward portion of the lower Potomac River on the Nanjemoy Peninsula. (See map at end of this document for details.)

Management Budget and Funding

Measures to avoid or reduce management costs will be evaluated, appropriate levels of management funding will be examined, and potential funding sources will be identified. Potential benefits and impacts of establishing fees for recreation and/or research activities will specifically be evaluated.

ISSUES TO BE DEFERRED

The following issues, raised by some scoping participants, will not be addressed in the management plan for the reasons described below.

Acquisition of Additional Lands

Although the CMP will identify the types of land and circumstances under which land may be acquired in the future, no specific tracts will be identified in the plan. Other agencies or non-governmental organizations may negotiate with private landowners on behalf of the United States. Proposals for acquisition by the United States Government, however, will only be reviewed after completing the CMP and site-specific environmental assessment.

Section 6: Planning Criteria

In order to tailor its land use plans to relevant data and issues, BLM, through its public participation efforts develops a set of criteria at the beginning of the planning process. Planning criteria are based on applicable laws and regulations, Director and State Director guidance, and the results of public participation and coordination with other Federal agencies, interest groups, Indian tribes and state and local governments. Planning criteria can be changed throughout the process based on public suggestions.

The criteria only affect lands that are or may be managed by the BLM. It is BLM's intent to manage the Douglas Point property cooperatively with the State of Maryland, which may also affect land management. In no instance, however, can the Federal lands be used for purposes that conflict with the direction outlined in these planning criteria. At this point of the process, BLM has identified the following planning criteria:

Overall Planning Criteria

- Proposed uses for BLM land at Douglas Point will be consistent with the intent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act, Congressional direction in the appropriation acts which authorized purchase of the tract and the LWCF funding requests submitted to and approved by the Department of the Interior. Future acquisitions may provide for different

land uses and development opportunities.

- A primary goal of the plan will be to foster conservation of open space and protection of crucial wildlife habitat and cultural resources and to provide for low impact recreational opportunities. Only land uses that are found to be compatible with this goal will be considered in the plan.
- Development on the BLM portion of the Douglas Point tract will be limited to facilities that directly support the plan's goals. Examples of possible facilities include trails and trailheads, restrooms, primitive campgrounds and interpretive displays.
- The Maryland Point property, acquired by BLM from the Department of the Navy pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, may be considered for more intensive land uses and facilities development than other BLM properties acquired with LWCF funds.
- Public safety concerns at the Maryland Point property require that this property remain closed to the public until it has been determined to be safe for public use.
- The plan will be completed in compliance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and all other applicable laws (see Federal Laws and Executive Orders below).
- The planning team will work cooperatively with the State of Maryland, Charles County, other Federal agencies and all other interested groups and individuals.
- To the greatest extent possible, the plan will meet each partner's land use planning and management needs.
- The plan will be prepared under the principles of community-based planning and management and will offer many opportunities for meaningful public involvement.
- The plan will emphasize the natural, cultural and historical resources of the Nanjemoy Peninsula and Lower Potomac River shoreline.
- The plan will identify specific opportunities and priorities for recreational use and education related to the BLM and DNR Douglas Point properties. (The Douglas Point properties will be managed as a single Federal-State land management unit.)
- The plan will identify criteria for possible future acquisitions within the planning area. Any acquisitions would be dependent on the availability of willing sellers and funding.
- Federal land disposals will not be considered as they are prohibited by the terms of the

LWCF.

- Mineral leasing will not be considered as a viable use of the federal mineral estate below the BLM-owned tract at Douglas Point as this would be inconsistent with the mandate of the LWCF and Congressional intent in the appropriations acts.
- The plan will recognize the State's responsibility to manage wildlife, including hunting and fishing within all Federal and State-owned land units.

BLM Strategic Plan

All BLM lands are to be managed to meet the mission outlined in its strategic plan:

Sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations by:

- Serving current and future publics;
- Restoring and maintaining the health of the land;
- Promoting collaborative land and resource management; and
- Improving business practices and human resource management.

Federal Laws and Executive Orders

The following laws contain specific procedural activities or performance levels that BLM must undertake or achieve prior to finalizing land use planning decisions:

Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.
American Indian Religious Freedom Act, 42 U.S.C. 1996
Archaeological Resources Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. 470aa, et seq.
Clean Air Act, as amended, 43 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.
Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.
Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1451-1464
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9615
Emergency Military Construction Act of 2000 (Pub. Law 106-246, 114 Stat. 511 (July 13, 2000))
Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.
Executive Order (E.O.) 11990, Protection of Wetlands (5/24/77)
E.O. 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (2/11/94)
E.O. 13112, Invasive Species (2/3/99)
E.O. 11988, Floodplain Management (5/27/77)
Federal Land Policy and Management Act, 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.

Federal Noxious Weed Act (7 U.S.C. 2801-2814, January 3, 1975, as amended.)
Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 1344
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 U.S.C. 661-664
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, 16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through -11
National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.
National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.
Omnibus Interior Appropriations Act of 2000
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.
Rivers and Harbors Act, 33 U.S.C. 403
Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, 30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.
Wilderness Act, 16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.

Applicable Federal Regulations

36 CFR 800, et seq., historic properties
40 CFR 1500, et seq., NEPA regulations
43 CFR 1610, land use planning
43 CFR 2800, right-of-way corridors
43 CFR 2920, leases, permits and easements
43 CFR 8340, et seq., off-highway vehicle use

State Laws and County Ordinances

Under BLM's planning mandate, it is required to be consistent with state and local laws and ordinances to the maximum extent possible. Consistency will be determined through on-going dialogue with State and local officials and by conducting a formal Governor's Consistency Review towards the conclusion of the planning process as required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Appendix A: Summary Tables of Opportunities and Issues/Concerns

The numbers to the right of the categories show the number of ideas submitted at the workshops in Nanjemoy and La Plata on March 19th plus March 20th = Total. The categories of ideas are listed in rank order based on the number of ideas from largest to smallest.

Summary Table of Opportunities

Diverse recreation activities	18 + 18 = 36
Water access and recreation	10 + 9 = 19
Protection and preservation of natural and cultural resources	12 + 4 = 16
Education – history, culture and nature	10 + 4 = 14
Economic development	4 + 3 = 7
Totals:	54 + 38 = 92

Summary Table of Issues and Concerns

How can we reconcile incompatible recreational uses of the land?	7 + 9 = 16
What forms of economic activity will be appropriate or allowed?	7 + 3 = 10
How will multiple agencies and parties work together successfully?	4 + 3 = 7
How will these specific elements be included in the plan?	4 + 3 = 7
What will be the safety and law enforcement needs?	2 + 3 = 5
What will be the impact on zoning, taxes and property values?	4 + 0 = 4
Totals:	28 + 21 = 49