



**Memorandum:**

---

To: MCSB Advisory Committee and Interested Stakeholders  
From: Jim Klein  
Date: 29 October 2010  
Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #4 – Meeting Summary (DRAFT)

The fourth advisory committee meeting for the Michener's Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway Management Plan was held from 11:30 am-2:00 pm on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2010 at the Choptank River Heritage Museum in Denton, Maryland.

Meeting Summary:

1. Jim Klein reviewed the byway planning process to date – the fourth Advisory Committee of seven. This meeting and the next are to discuss marketing and interpretation for the byway.
2. Carolyn Brackett from the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Heritage Tourism Program provided an overview of heritage tourism and the nature of the heritage tourism market in relationship to the byways and heritage areas of the Eastern Shore. The slide show and accompanying memorandum outlining the recommended marketing strategies can be viewed on the project website ([http://www.lardnerklein.com/mcsb\\_index.html](http://www.lardnerklein.com/mcsb_index.html)).
3. Carolyn's discussion questions focused the meeting on the Byway name, the Byway organizational structure, and visitor readiness criteria.
4. With regard to the byway name, it was generally agreed that the best course of action was to extend the "Chesapeake Country" brand and identity already established for the Upper Shore, while at the same time using tag lines and other techniques to give each subregion a unique identity (currently Michener's Chesapeake associated with the mid-shore region and Blue Crab associated with the Lower Shore, but this will continue to be discussed).
5. With regard to the organizational structure, there was extensive discussion about the complexities and potential benefits of having one umbrella or 'home room' for the nine county byway, with committees for each of the three regions. It was agreed that Jim Klein would incorporate a discussion of options into the CMP for Michener's Chesapeake, and discuss these issues with the adjoining byways as part of ongoing work with the Maryland Byways Strategic Planning effort that is going on now parallel to the CMP.
6. The question was asked if the Chesapeake Country NSB Alliance was in favor of this type of regional approach. Jim Klein indicated that he had met with most of the core management group and that they were in favor as long as the following basic principles applied
  - the existing investment in graphic identity (as well as other projects) was respected and built upon
  - that both the workload and investments were made and distributed in an equitable manner
  - that the potential partnership resulted in greater value than what could be accomplished on their own
7. Lisa Ludwig from the Lower Eastern Shore Heritage Council noted that they had met and enthusiastically agreed to separate out the Blue Crab Byway associated with the Chesapeake Bay and connect that portion of the Byway (Crisfield to Mardela Springs) with Chesapeake Country; and work on establishing a multi-state byway with that portion of the Blue Crab associated with the Atlantic side. The connection between would be maintained with the Beach to Bay Indian Trail, a National Recreation Trail. The Old Route 50 portion between Salisbury and

- Ocean City would be dropped. This will help them achieve their goal of National Scenic byway designations.
8. With regard to the graphic identity, it was agreed that the perimeter of the Chesapeake Country logo could be used for all three regions, and the interior could be modified to capture the regional emphasis of each section of the byway. Prior to the decision to split out the Blue Crab into two byways, this was difficult for Worcester County to accept since “Chesapeake Country” did not apply to the Atlantic Coastal beaches.
  9. It was noted that it would be difficult to organize and coordinate the nine-county umbrella for the three regions. Carolyn Brackett and Jim Klein both provided examples of different ways it could be done – either as an informal agreement or as a more formal organization. The Maryland Eastern Shore Resource Conservation and Development Council is one nine-county organization that could be approached to serve as the “home room” for such a cooperative network.
  10. The first step in establishing the network would be to identify the specific cooperative activities (for example, marketing, pooling together of grant applications to make them more competitive, and sharing of project management resources, etc.). The overall network could meet a couple of times a year, (especially in advance of any grant solicitation period) with the regional committees meeting more frequently.
  11. One way to finance the management is to incorporate administrative charges to all grant applications to cover the project management and coordination necessary to implement the grant project.
  12. Peter Benton, Interpretive Planner from the project team, provided a brief update on the work he is doing to develop the interpretive framework for the byway. Peter indicated that the interpretive framework would build upon the interpretive themes already in use by the Heritage Areas and the Chesapeake Country NSB. (Land, Water, and History).
  13. Carolyn and Peter talked about the how the visitor readiness of the sites would be described in terms of interpretation and marketing: Full service (such as Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum with full-time hours, interpretation, facilities, etc.); Limited Service (such as the several small museums with weekend hours and some interpretation); and, Self Guided (such as the many communities with interesting history and stories for those that want to explore.)
  14. With regard to the Michener Theme – there was continuing discussion from previous meetings about how this will be interpreted. Jim Klein reminded the group of the organization of the byway – a main spine called “Chesapeake Country” with themed itineraries following branches that provide a way for visitors to dig more deeply into a particular aspect of the byway story, with Michener being one of those themed itineraries associated with the Oxford-St. Michaels, Tilghman Branch of the Byway. Peter Benton indicated that some of the themes might be more of an “overlay” theme where the sites are distributed more widely through multiple branches of the byway.
  15. Jim Klein closed the meeting with a reminder that the next meeting will focus on interpretation and participants are asked to bring forward any ideas for themed itineraries for discussion at the meeting.