



Memorandum:

To: MCSB Advisory Committee and Interested Stakeholders

From: Jim Klein

Date: 22 July 2010

Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #2 – Meeting Summary (DRAFT)

The second advisory committee meeting for the Michener's Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway Management Plan was held from 2:00 pm-4:00 pm on July 15th, 2010 at the Robbins Heritage Center, Dorchester County Historical Society in Cambridge, Maryland.

Meeting Summary:

1. Jim Klein reviewed the byway planning process to date with a brief summary of the public informational meetings held June 22nd (Easton) and June 24th (Hurlock).
2. Jim Klein, Tom Scofield (historic and cultural resource consultant from John Milner Associates) and Shelley Mastran presented an overview of the significance of the intrinsic qualities and a brief synopsis of the tools available to preserve and conserve those qualities. The slide show can be viewed on the project website (http://www.lardnerklein.com/mcsb_index.html)
3. Dennis Haskins discussed SHA's ability to review and comment on byway issues through comprehensive plan clearinghouse review, access permits and SHA project activities along a byway. SHA comments has been working to make sure byways are referenced in Comprehensive Plans and, especially if they have a corridor management plan. All access permits are sent through the scenic byway program for review providing an opportunity for SHA to speak out on behalf of the byway and maintaining its character defining features. SHA project review also provides another opportunity. The approved CMP can be utilized by SHA in their comments to support use of context sensitive solutions, especially if such things as character defining features of the byway are clearly spelled out.
3. With regard to significance: Jean Fabi of Queen Anne's County wanted to be sure that we incorporated the agricultural significance associated with the several mill sites along tributaries and especially at Wye Mills. Amanda Fenstermaker suggested incorporating the significance statements for the Tubman/Underground Railroad Scenic Byway as noted in the National Park Service study.
4. Discussion followed indicating the group's interest in establishing historic districts, including rural historic districts:
 - Establishment of "Rural Historic Districts" – questions were raised as to whether there were any existing rural historic districts in Maryland, and whether that implies any regulatory or development review. *Similar to historic districts, rural historic district offer some protection from Federal actions (e.g. Section 106) but does not require any kind of regulation. There are several in Maryland that have been identified as eligible for the National Register including the Fincastle-Hewitt Rural Historic District in Queen Anne County near Price, MD. The CMP will give some examples of noted Rural Historic Districts in other places that have been listed on the National Register.*
 - Could existing historic sites be expanded to historic districts? – *Yes, such as expansion of Exeter (listed on the National Register) to a Historic District or a Rural Historic District incorporating the mill site and related areas.*
 - Could the unincorporated villages in Talbot County be designated as Historic Districts and listed on National Register? *If unincorporated, could be done*

through Talbot County as the Certified Local Government. The team will look at this in more detail.

- Local Historic Districts – already exist in Talbot County – these offer the County the ability to provide development guidance and review. A concern was expressed in Caroline County with regard to their ability to administer any kind of design review, as well as citizen concerns over design review.
5. Discussion of conservation and preservation priorities – the following were suggested as potential criteria:
- Lands not currently protected or given priority by other programs, but with significance for the Byway – e.g. areas around unincorporated villages
 - State lands with significant intrinsic qualities that are not currently well maintained but are important to the byway (e.g. DNR property at Exeter near the mill site – that could be a good interpretive site). It was noted that the CMP should address the management of state and federal lands along the Byway and the need to ensure that their management is consistent with the CMP.
 - Historic bridges – such as Central Avenue bridge in Federalsburg nearing its 100-year anniversary (not currently listed on the National Register, but CMP should recommend this and support effort to do so). *It was also noted that SHA is currently doing an inventory of bridges for National Register eligibility.*
 - Outreach to owners of historical properties should be a priority to provide information about preservation opportunities and benefits
 - Unprotected farmland should be a priority (e.g. Caroline County has a goal of protecting 135,000 acres of farmland by 2030 in their Comprehensive Plan). A suggestion was made to identify agricultural land along the byway corridor in each County’s comp plan as a conservation priority to help raise its priority in the state program (MALPF criteria)
 - Potential Rural Historic Districts – as discussed above and especially focusing on those areas that may not be identified as a conservation priority
 - Local Overlay Zones for the byway corridor – this is especially important for areas without significant resources especially at the edge of towns and unincorporated villages that are vulnerable to development or where development is likely as a means of guiding the development in a manner to help maintain the character defining features of the byway
 - Focus on helping farmers that are interested in diversifying agriculture through community supported agriculture, farm-to-table programs at restaurants and farmers markets, and through vocational-technical programs at high schools and colleges such as “culinary institutes”.
 - Focus on “working landscapes” – such as programs for sustainable forestry, working waterfronts, agriculture, traditional arts and culture
6. The following were identified as additional issues (challenges) that should be addressed in CMP not recorded at the first AC meeting or at the public meeting:
- Potential intrusions to the byway experience
 - Resource preservation and maintenance on state properties (DNR)
 - Address pressure for “de-accessioning” properties along the byway such as may occur for the Dover Bridge once the bridge is reconstructed what will be done with the excess land
7. Jim Klein closed the meeting with a reminder that the next meeting will focus on byway related enhancements and that committee members will be asked to provide a list of existing enhancement projects in need of support, as well as new ideas for enhancements along the byway based on the categories of funding listed on the last slide