



**Lardner/Klein Landscape Architects, P.C.**

**Memorandum:**

To: MCSB Advisory Committee and Representatives from Blue Crab Scenic Byway and Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway  
From: Jim Klein  
Date: 12/8/2011  
Subject: AC Meeting #7 – Draft Meeting Notes  
Michener's Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan

Plan Approval and Follow-up

The Michener's Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway Advisory Committee met on December 6, 2011 at the Chesapeake Bay Exploration Center from 3-5 pm. The Advisory Committee conditionally approved the Michener's Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan by unanimous vote as follows:

- Chapters 1-4 of the Draft Plan were approved with all revisions in the comment and response matrix (<http://www.lardnerklein.com/MCSB-CMPCommentsMatrix-wLKLAResponse112111r.pdf>), as modified and documented in the meeting notes that follow.

Additional Review Procedures:

- As the District Engineering staff that have participated in the plan were unable to make the meeting, a memo will be sent out to SHA representatives to confirm the approval of Chapter 4, Goal 5, Transportation Strategies by close of business on 12/14/2011, and pending no further comments, Chapter 4, will be considered officially approved as noted above.
- Similarly, any advisory committee member unable to make the meeting will be given the same opportunity to provide additional comments until 5pm on 12/14/2011.

Review of Chapter 5 and Final Plan (Proof Copy)

- Chapter 5 of the Draft Plan was further discussed and a recommendation was made and approved to collaborate on marketing and promotion, funding and financing for all three sections of the Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway from Chesapeake City to Crisfield. The revised Chapter 5 will be posted by 12/13/2011. Any additional comments or feedback on Chapter 5 will be requested by 12/20/2011. At that time the full proof copy of the entire document will be posted to the web site. Committee members will be able to check to see that the comments were all properly addressed in the proof copy of the document. To simplify the process, the email will indicate that if no comments are received by 12/30/2011, then the Plan will be considered fully approved. A second round of revisions will be sent out if needed. The goal will be to have a fully approved final plan for submittal with grants to the FHWA Division Office on January 6<sup>th</sup>.

Based on our process outlined above, and the approval of Chapters 1-4 along with a conceptual approval for the approach to regional management in Chapter 5, it would be safe to check the box on any grant application that we have an approved CMP.

**Meeting Summary -**

The following summary reflects the agreed upon changes to the plan referencing the yellow highlighted sections of the comment matrix discussed at the December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chapter 1, Page 4 (comment #76)

It was agreed to refer to heritage tourism, nature-based tourism, and agri-tourism, collectively as “heritage tourism” consistent with the Maryland Heritage Areas program terminology. This will be added to the goal text on page 5 as a footnote or parenthesis.

Chapter 2, Page 20 (comment #19)

The Chart will be moved to pages 98-99 and changed to incorporate the specific interpretive themes of the Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway.

Discussion of Relationship to Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway

It was agreed that the best approach to addressing CCNSB Alliance concerns that the Upper Shore portion is being left out of the plan is to provide clarification in the purpose statement at the beginning of the report on page 1. It will explain that one of the important purposes of this plan is to extend the National Scenic Byway designation from Centreville (intersection of MD 18 and MD 213)\* southward to Crisfield, and to build upon ten years of successful byway management efforts and investments to gain designation as a National Scenic Byway in 2002. Reference will be made to the Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan (<http://www.kentcounty.com/gov/planzone/byway-cmp.php>) for discussion of features and guidance on the management of the byway from Centreville north (and west to Stevensville). The map covering Centreville from the Appendix of the CMP will be included to show the location of the gateway sign on MD 213 and a note indicating the point of transition. The statement will also indicate that only those attractions and features located south of the intersection of MD 213 and MD 18 will be included in Michener’s Chesapeake Country CMP.

*[The following was not discussed at the meeting, but was added for additional clarification: The plan will note that Centreville is identified in the plan as a “Discovery Stop.”] Here is the text from the CCNSB plan (p57) that will be referenced in a sidebar:*

***Centreville Gateway—MD Route 213 from US 301.*** The short (1.5 mile) segment of MD Route 213 south of Centreville connects the interchange at US 301 and MD Route 213 to the Byway at the southern entrance to Centreville. Currently, visitors to the region are directed via brown “historic area” signs to follow MD Route 213 north to Chestertown’s National Historic Landmark District. With additional signage and supporting information in maps and guides, this gateway could serve as a point of entry for visitors traveling north from Routes 301 and 50, from tourist destinations in Talbot and Dorchester Counties, and from points further south.

*\*The official route description for the nomination to extend the National Scenic Byway designation will need to include all of MD 213 southward from the intersection with MD 18.*

Here is the official description of the CCNSB from [www.byways.org](http://www.byways.org) as approved on June 13, 2002 – referencing the MD 213 and MD 18 intersection:

National Scenic Byway      Jun 13, 2002

**Designated route description:**

The byway starts on State Hwy. 18/Main St. in Stevensville, MD. GPS point (38.979954,-76.316223)

Drive east on State Hwy. 18/Main St. to Nesbit Rd.

Drive northwest on Nesbit Rd. to U.S. Hwy. 301/U.S. Hwy. 50/Blue Star Memorial Hwy.

Drive northeast on U.S. Hwy. 301/U.S. Hwy. 50/Blue Star Memorial Hwy. to U.S. Hwy. 301/Blue Star Memorial Hwy.

Drive northeast on U.S. Hwy. 301/Blue Star Memorial Hwy. to State Hwy. 456/State Hwy. 18/Del Rhodes Ave.

Drive northwest on State Hwy. 456/State Hwy. 18/Del Rhodes Ave. to State Hwy. 18/Main St.

Drive northeast on State Hwy. 18/Main St. to State Hwy. 18/Main St./4-H Park Rd.

Drive northeast on State Hwy. 18/Main St./4-H Park Rd. to State Hwy. 213/Centreville Rd.

Drive north on State Hwy. 213/Centreville Rd. to State Hwy. 213/S. Commerce St.

Drive northeast on State Hwy. 213/S. Commerce St. to State Hwy. 213/Church Hill Rd.

Drive northeast on State Hwy. 213/Church Hill Rd. to N. Cross St. in Chestertown, MD.

Chapter 4, Page 62, (comment #110) – Strategy 1.6: Advocating on Behalf of the Byway

It was agreed that the Michener's Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway would follow the lead of the Chesapeake Country National Scenic Byway and not expressly advocate for or against land use or transportation changes along the Byway. Requests by local government or state agencies for comments about the potential impact of a project on the visitor experience of the Byway would be provided. Instead, the strategy will be changed to incorporate a positive, "best practices" approach and reference the examples in Chapter 2. Local jurisdictions would have the prerogative to testify on behalf of their jurisdiction about the impact of a project on the byway, but should make it clear that they are only representing their jurisdiction and not the entire Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway.

Chapter 4, Page 78, Comment #62

John Wilson, MDNR, noted that ultimately an MOU or MOA will be made between the site sponsor and owner/manager (in this case DNR).

Chapter 5, Page 131-133, Comment #101

Federalsburg representatives accepted the new language involving DNR and were appreciative of the efforts of DNR to attend a special meeting held in late September to discuss this issue.

**Additional Comments to be reflected in the approved plan:**

Chapter 4, page 107 (quote)

Frank Newton questioned the source of the italicized quotes on page 107 of the plan as to whether or not Michener actually wrote them, or if more likely an editor wrote them.

A statement of clarification referencing the actual source of the quote (and by inference, its reference to Kent Island) will be made or the quote will be removed. Further elaboration of the potential role of the museum in Doylestown will be made or the reference will be removed.

Mr. Newton also expressed a continuing concern that the plan should have been based more upon actual research into Michener and his portrayal of the Eastern Shore. Several committee members pointed out that the next phase, the funded interpretive plan, will emphasize Michener and the specific interpretive recommendations for how Michener's Chesapeake can be presented and interpreted along the Byway and at its related water access destinations. It was noted that the CMP has a specific set of requirements that must be met to nominate the route for National Scenic Byway designation.

General Comment #108 – regarding CMP approval (page 59, Strategy 1.1)

It was agreed that municipal governments would be asked to “reference” the plan in their comprehensive plan, rather than adopt the plan. A sidebar will be included on page 59, Strategy 1.1, to describe different ways that other jurisdictions have incorporated references to the plan into comprehensive plan updates, or by amendment language. The concern was for the amount of time and effort it would take to adopt the plan, versus referencing the plan as part of any comprehensive plan update.

General Comment #111 – regarding tagline for CCNSB

Chesapeake Country NSB, would like “Explore the Journey to Independence” to be the tag line used in conjunction with the Upper Shore region of the Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway (in lieu of “explore the Upper Shore” (referencing page 88, implementation step i.)

Bernadette Van Pelt, Director of Kent County Tourism and Economic Development, indicated that the CCNSB was a primary route for travel, and was used by leaders and messengers going to and from Philadelphia during the struggle for independence including ferry access at Rock Hall.

General Comment #112 – build upon CCNSB ten years of experience

This will be noted on pages 1-2 and more direct references to the CCNSB CMP will be made throughout the report where appropriate.

*[Clarification Note: An example might be to reference CCNSB goal on page 48*

- *Encourage regional cooperation, stewardship and economic development through Byway-related partnerships.]*

Chapter 5, Detail of Management Structure

Chapter 5 will be revised to reflect the recommendations of the Advisory Committee to pursue a collaborative approach to marketing, promoting, funding, and financing the entire Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway as one byway from Chesapeake City to Crisfield. The three Heritage Areas will take the lead in identifying and implementing areas for collaboration. Chapter 5 will provide further alternatives for consideration as to a phased approach for implementing the management framework for the nine-county Chesapeake Country Scenic Byway. Each of the three byway groups will continue to be responsible for their respective section of the Byway with regard to transportation, enhancement, preservation, and coordination of volunteers (as per handout now posted to website at [http://www.lardnerklein.com/mcsb\\_regionalbywaymanagement120611.pdf](http://www.lardnerklein.com/mcsb_regionalbywaymanagement120611.pdf)

Additional comments raised in discussion of management structure:

- The term “Byway Keeper” will be changed to “Byway Steward” or “Byway Manager”
- Reference will be made to the diminishing support for grant funding and the need to look at entrepreneurial approaches to funding and finance.
- Reference will be made to Cecil County in Chapter 5, which is included in the Byway but not the Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area – and including a Cecil County representation in the management framework discussion.
- A concern was expressed in regard to the creation of another management layer, while trying to work with existing organizations. Mention of the “alliance” approach was recommended and will be discussed in Chapter 5. Martin noted that funding for Resource Conservation and Development Districts was not included in the recently authorized Farm Bill, so that is no longer an option in the short term, and longer term would require a return to funding of those programs which is being pursued nationally.