



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail
410 Severn Avenue, Suite 314
Annapolis, MD 21403



January 31, 2011

Dear friends,

The National Park Service (NPS) is pleased to offer this response to public comments on the *Draft Comprehensive Management Plan/Environmental Assessment* for the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail. The purpose of the CMP is to provide a vision, a plan of action, and a decision-making framework for development of the Trail over the next 20 years. The CMP addresses management issues relevant to the future management of the trail, as identified by our partners, in public workshops, and through public comment.

We extend our sincere appreciation for your comments. The interest shown by many organizations and individuals demonstrates the depth and breadth of support for, and interest in, the Trail's ability to provide quality Chesapeake experiences, promote stewardship of the Bay and rivers, to protect valuable cultural and natural resources, and to renew the human spirit.

The NPS and its many partners - the Trail's Advisory Council, the Chesapeake Conservancy, federal and state agencies, American Indian tribes, communities throughout the region, non-profit organizations, and private entities - will work together to develop the Trail. Now, with your attention and comments, the Trail's management plan guiding this development is strengthened and ready for our collaborative action. Thank you!

Sincerely,

John Maounis
Superintendent

The Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Assessment Response to Public Comments

Introduction

The *Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Assessment* (CMP/EA) for the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO) was made available for public review from October 6, 2010 – November 5, 2010. The availability and invitation to review the draft CMP/EA was announced via postcards mailed to over 1,000 individuals and organizations, announcements on the trail websites and the NPS Planning, Environment & Public Comment website (PEPC), press releases, and multiple email alerts. Throughout the review period, the draft CMP/EA was available for download via the National Park Service (NPS) PEPC website. In addition, print and CD copies of the draft CMP/EA were distributed to stakeholders, as identified in Chapter 6 of the plan, distributed to others upon request, and made available at the trail office. The review period formally closed on November 5th, however the NPS accepted and considered all correspondence received prior to the publication of this response.

In the CMP/EA, the NPS identified Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative to guide long-term management of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail. Selection of Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative is based on the analysis and findings of the CMP planning team, public comment received through the entirety of the planning process, and consultations with partners and stakeholders. Through the planning process and extensive public engagement, we determined that Alternative 3 would fulfill the NPS statutory mission and responsibilities for the trail. We also determined that this alternative would offer a greater overall advantage with respect to the following factors: protection of trail-related resources; interpretation, education, and understanding for visitors; public use and enjoyment of the trail; and effective development and management of the trail.

Public Comment

During the comment period, the NPS received comments from individuals, private organizations, American Indian Tribal contacts, and local and state governments, all of whom have interest in the development and management of the trail. NPS received correspondence through the PEPC website, email, US mail, and fax.

The following pages contain a summary of topics raised by the public during the comment period and provide the NPS response to each of these topics. In addition to the topics detailed below, the NPS also received many helpful comments that did not significantly affect the policies or impacts of the CMP, but rather reflected editorial corrections and clarification within the text. These comments have been considered and incorporated into the CMP, however to save considerable printing and shipping costs, there will not be a full reprint of the CMP/EA. A summary of these changes is described in the Errata & Amendments section of this document.

This document, in conjunction with the completion of the Finding of No Significant Impact will complete the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail comprehensive management planning process. This document will be made publicly available via the trail's

websites, and this and all other documents relevant to the CMP/EA will be properly maintained and housed as part of the administrative record at the NPS Chesapeake Bay Office at 410 Severn Avenue, Annapolis, MD.

The National Park Service planning team expresses its gratitude to all who took the time to share their views on the development of the CMP/EA, including public officials, organizations, and private individuals. Over the course of the entire planning process, this engagement provided an important contribution to the decision-making process, guiding the long-term management decisions for the development, protection, and public use of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail. Due to the long-term goals and vast geographic area addressed in the plan, the successful completion of the CMP/EA is very much a reflection of the strong partnerships that will make the development of the trail a success.

Of the more than 170 pieces of correspondence received, the overall response reflected broad support for the plan and the NPS preferred alternative. Much of this support was expressed in three form letters that were received from an array of individuals and organizations. These form letters strongly endorsed the plan and the preferred alternative, putting a particular emphasis on “prioritizing great rivers,” “conserving treasured landscapes,” “establishing connecting trails,” “developing partnerships,” and “providing tools and funding.”

Formal correspondence regarding the draft CMP/EA and that expressed support for implementation of the plan and support for the NPS preferred alternative included the following agencies and organizations:

- Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
- The Annapolis Maritime Museum
- Archeological Society of the Northern Chesapeake
- Baltimore National Heritage Area
- Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT Advisory Council
- Cecil County Department of Planning and Zoning
- Cecil County Office of Economic Development
- Charles County Planning
- Chesapeake Bay Foundation
- Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum
- Chesapeake Conservancy
- Citizens Advisory Committee to the Chesapeake Executive Council
- City of Annapolis
- City of Havre de Grace
- City of Norfolk
- City of Virginia Beach
- The Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Historic Resources
- The Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Natural Resources
- The Commonwealth of Virginia, Office of the Governor
- County of Charles City
- County Council of Harford County

- DC Environmental Film Festival
- Delmarva Low-Impact Tourism Experiences
- District of Columbia Daughters of the American Revolution
- District of Columbia, District Department of the Environment
- The Eastern Shore Land Conservancy
- Friends of Concord Point Lighthouse
- Friends of Dyke Marsh
- The Garden Club of America
- James River Association
- Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation
- Living Classrooms Foundation
- Maryland Academy of Sciences
- Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs
- The Maryland Fisherman's Annual
- Maryland Historical Trust
- Maryland Legislative Sportsmen's Foundation
- Maryland Recreation and Parks Association
- Mid-Shore Regional Council
- The Mount Vernon Ladies' Association
- Nanticoke Historic Preservation Alliance
- Nanticoke Watershed Alliance
- The Nanticoke Watershed Preservation Group, Inc.
- The National Aquarium
- National Parks Conservation Association
- Northern Virginia Conservation Trust
- Occoquan Regional Park
- Pennsylvania Environmental Council
- The Potomac Conservancy
- The Rural Maryland Council
- The Seaford Museum
- Shank's Mare Outfitters
- Southern Delaware Tourism
- The State of Delaware, Office of the Governor
- The State of Maryland, Office of the Governor
- The State of Maryland, Department of Natural Resources
- Town Commissioners of Perryville
- The Town of Vienna
- Upper Shore Regional Council
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Virginia Tourism Corporation
- Virginia Living Museum
- Waterfront Partnership of Baltimore, Inc.

The NPS also received letters from Maryland State Senator Barry Glassman, and the following members of the Maryland House of Delegates: J.B. Jennings, Pat McDonough, Wayne Norman, David D. Rudolph, Richard Sossi, and Mary Roe Walkup. These letters expressed support for the trail's CMP/EA and expressed support for the identification of the Lower Susquehanna Heritage Greenway as a priority segment of the trail. These letters all expressed support for the implementation of the plan and ongoing partnerships with the NPS.

Original copies of all correspondence received and reviewed are on file in the NPS Chesapeake Bay Office at 410 Severn Avenue, Annapolis, MD.

Public Comments

To provide a comprehensive response to the comments received during the public review period, the NPS has organized public comments into the following general topics: the preferred alternative; partnerships; American Indian tribes and descendent communities; funding; unit status; implementation and management; trail route and connecting trails; heritage tourism and eco-tourism; and modes of transportation and access. Under each general topic, the range of public comments relevant to the particular topic is summarized with brief topic statements, which are followed by the NPS response to these topics. Example quotes, which have been excerpted directly from correspondence the NPS received, are also included under each topic statement. These quotes were chosen from comments from a variety of correspondence, and are reproduced here to indicate the richness and range of comments represented by the topic statement.

The Preferred Alternative

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing support for the NPS preferred alternative, Alternative 3: Chesapeake Region in the 17th Century.

Example Quote: “Most importantly, from our perspective, [the preferred] alternative is best suited to fulfill the promise of the trail to increase public awareness – to ‘experience, envision, come to understand, and care to protect’ the Bay and its tributary rivers.”

Example Quote: “I believe that the National Park Service’s recommended alternative detailed in the management plan offers the best opportunity to educate the public about the Bay region’s extraordinary natural and cultural history and to conserve those landscapes that are of historical and cultural significance to the region and the nation.”

NPS Response:

We appreciate the widely expressed support for the NPS preferred alternative, “The Chesapeake Region in the 17th Century.” The planning process for designing and selecting the preferred alternative involved input and feedback from the public and stakeholders during the last several years. The process included input from internal and external scoping efforts in 2008 and 2009 and a series of public workshops in the fall of 2009. Combined with analysis and findings of the CMP planning team, we worked to develop the alternative that best fulfills the interests of the public and our partners. After defining the alternatives and receiving feedback from the public, the NPS chose alternative 3 as the preferred alternative. Because of the vast area that the trail serves, the NPS believes this alternative will provide the greatest advantages for the protection of trail-related resources; interpretation, education, and understanding for visitors; public use and enjoyment of the trail; and effective development and management.

Partnerships

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing a desire to develop or continue a partnership between the NPS and trail-related sites or organizations.

Example Quote: “The Museum is proud to be one of the partnerships along the Trail. Like many of the great National Parks and Trails, the John Smith Chesapeake Trail has the potential to attract tens of thousands of visitors each year, conserve treasured landscapes evocative of the 17th Century, and expand the public's appreciation of nature and history.”

Example Quote: “We agree that using public-private conservation partnerships is important to trail implementation and hope you will involve us in all future activities.”

Example Quote: “As a historic site located on the Trail, and a potential future partner, we believe the Trail’s plan will expand opportunities for tourism, conservation, and recreation and offer visitors and residents alike a National Park-like experience.”

NPS Response:

The success of the trail depends on building long-term local partnerships that engage communities and sites along the trail. As described in the plan, the trail will have local, regional, and trail-wide partners with which the NPS will collaborate. The Chesapeake Conservancy is the trail’s primary non-governmental trail-wide partner or “friends group,” however given the complexity of the issues and demands of managing a 3,000 mile trail a “group of friends” is essential. This “group of friends” will include existing and future partnerships with sites and organizations throughout the Chesapeake. We will continue to maintain the partnerships with sites that have signed formal agreements with the trail and we look forward to forming new partnerships with additional sites and organizations in coming years. In addition, management of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT will build on existing Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network partner agreements. These agreements allow local partners to develop the trail with technical and financial assistance from the NPS office.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments from states and several state agencies that specifically expressed the desire to continue to cultivate partnerships with the NPS, in addition to their support for the plan and preferred alternative.

Example Quote: “While I understand that the NPS Chesapeake Bay Office would have overall responsibility for trail planning, management, and development, I urge you to ensure that this occur in coordination with relevant federal and state facilities along the trail. It is very important that federal and state agencies actively work to promote trail activities and that trail management be integrated with management of the other parks, refuges and trails that are in close proximity to the Captain John Smith NHT.”

NPS Response:

The NPS has enjoyed working closely with the states and state agencies throughout the trail planning process. We fully intend to continue work with states as lead governmental partners for the implementation of the trail through formal agreements. In addition to our key relationships with the states, Executive Order 13508 also stresses the importance of federal interagency

coordination; the NPS plans to work in conjunction with other federal agencies, including the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing widespread support for the trail management framework, yet concern as to how exactly the trail will be implemented at the site specific level.

Example Quote: “We hope that NPS will involve the Friends of Dyke Marsh and other area conservation organizations in the plans for the trail in the vicinity of Dyke Marsh.

NPS Response:

The trail management framework was developed as a means to create a trail experience that is uniform, connect sites and segments across the length of the trail, and yet allow for a trail experience and resource protection unique and appropriate to each trail segment. The CMP is a long-term plan and the specifics of implementation or resource protection for the trail will be described during the development of segment plans. Segment plans will allow stakeholders and partners within each segment to add their knowledge and expertise to develop the trail at the local and site specific level. We will continue to cultivate partnerships along the trail route and all site specific work will involve local participation and coordination.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing support for the emphasis on partnerships as key to successful implementation and development of the trail, including support for the Chesapeake Conservancy to continue as the primary non-governmental partner.

Example Quote: “Finally, I completely agree that partnerships are central to the plan’s success and support fully the Chesapeake Conservancy serving as the primary non-governmental partner in the plan’s implementation.”

NPS Response:

We appreciate the emphasis on partnerships and recognize how fundamental they are to success of the trail. In particular, the Chesapeake Conservancy and its predecessor, the Friends of the John Smith Trail has been an essential partner since the initial efforts to designate the trail . We look forward to continuing to work with the Chesapeake Conservancy in the coming years as we implement the plan and develop the trail together. The NPS has a cooperative agreement with the Chesapeake Conservancy and we regularly meet and discuss long-term goals and short-term actions. As stated in the plan, the ultimate success of the trail depends on strong partnerships. We will continue to partner with the Chesapeake Conservancy as the primary non-governmental trail-wide partner. In addition to this partnership with the Chesapeake Conservancy, full realization of the trail’s potential will require strong partnerships with other governmental and non-governmental organizations, including a network of partnerships along individual trail segments.

American Indian Tribes and Descendent Communities

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing support for the extent to which the CMP addresses American Indian heritage and the interests of current tribes and descendant communities.

Example Quote: “We believe that the experiences and stories of American Indian tribes are intricately entwined with many of the resources and storylines associated with the trail. We also feel that it is essential to continue to engage contemporary tribal representatives and descendant communities in developing, providing, and participating in programs and visitor opportunities along the trail, including the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs.”

Example Quote: “In particular, I applaud your articulation and application of concepts I have not encountered elsewhere: "indigenous cultural landscape" and "evocative landscape." With successful implementation of these concepts, the John Smith Trail will surely attract lovers of history, travel and the outdoors from all over the world.”

NPS Response:

Considering the primary themes of the trail, we strove to emphasize a careful approach to interpreting American Indian histories and cultures when developing the plan. Our planning process included outreach to many American Indian tribes and descendent communities, including representation on the trail Advisory Council. Participation and representation of American Indian tribes and descendant communities is vital to the trail. The NPS looks forward to continuing to work with representatives of these communities during implementation. This includes the process for the identification, protection, and interpretation of Indigenous Cultural Landscapes.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern that the interpretation of history, in the context of the trail, overlooks the devastating cultural impacts that occurred to the American Indians in the Chesapeake Bay.

Example Quote: “It appears that the Trail is willing to address contemporary natural history issues and ignore contemporary American Indian issues. Of particular interest is that there seems to be no attempt to interpret the impact of John Smith and his fellow Englishmen that so drastically altered the cultures of native populations between 1607 and the present day.

NPS Response:

Trail-related educational and interpretive projects will be developed and implemented as part of ongoing consultation and partnerships with American Indian Tribes and descendent communities.

The trail’s Interpretive Plan (IP) provides much more detail on the variety of approaches for the trail’s primary interpretive themes. This includes an emphasis on the diverse and developed American Indian societies with governmental systems, political and military alliances, elaborate trade routes, arts and architecture, and deeply held spiritual beliefs. The IP identifies the effects of European colonization in the Chesapeake region, resulting in the permanent disruption of

native lifeways, and the displacement and removal of native peoples from their homelands. This topic is addressed in the IP's detailed description of the interpretive themes and is also highlighted as a key interpretative message identified by participants at 2007-2008 interpretive scoping meetings.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern that certain topics related to American Indian land use or museum collections appear to be dismissed.

Example Quote: "The Pamunkey People are the inhabitants of the oldest Indian Reservation in the United States comprised of 1200 acres of land held in trust by the Commonwealth of Virginia. We proudly maintain a very distinctive and educational museum on our reservation, the Pamunkey Indian Museum, which contains a significant number of historical artifacts.... Based on the above information contained within your plan, I disagree with the plan's decision to dismiss the following Impact Topics: 1) Tribal Land Use Plans or Policies, 2) Indian Trust Lands and Resources and, 3) Museum Collections"

NPS Response:

The dismissal of these topics from further discussion in the CMP does not mean that museum collections (American Indian or otherwise) or tribal land use policies do not exist at sites or political jurisdictions associated with the trail route. The topic, "Impacts on Tribal Land Use" was dismissed because the programmatic nature of the CMP does not alter Tribal or other governmental land use policy. The management and development of the plan will not impact existing access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites or adversely impact the physical integrity of any sacred sites. When future trail development actions are implemented, we will continue to consult with tribes and descendant communities on this topic. Similarly, we acknowledge that tribes and descendant communities may hold state trust lands, however the topic "Indian Trust Lands and Resources" is specifically related to federal trust lands. Significant American Indian museum collections exist at many sites and institutions along the trail, including the Pamunkey Indian Museum, and these collections are important to the interpretation and education associated with the trail. However the NPS does not have curatorial responsibility of any specimens, objects, or manuscript and archival collections associated with the trail. If in the future, an NPS education or interpretation facility has curatorial responsibility of a trail-related museum collection, this topic will be addressed at that time and we will follow NPS curatorial standards and procedures.

Funding

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing support for the plan and the potential benefits for the Chesapeake Bay and communities that connect with the trail, while also noting the need for sufficient funding to allow the plan to fulfill its promise.

Example Quote: "I urge you and the National Park Service to provide the adequate funding and other resources to make the promise of the Captain John Smith Trail a reality."

Example Quote: “Lastly, we strongly urge the NPS to provide the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT with the tools and funding it needs to be as successful as other national historic parks and trails. We believe that the trail is an important element for teaching the public about our shared history and heritage, restoring the Bay’s health, creating economic activity, and developing stewardship.”

NPS Response:

We appreciate the overwhelming support for the plan and the benefits communities and partners associated with the trail expect to see as the trail is developed. Many of the comments combined support for the trail with a statement urging that the necessary funding be provided for full implementation. Ensuring sufficient funding is a legitimate concern. However, the plan is a long-term plan, and the costs associated with implementation will be incurred over a 15-20 year period of development and implementation. Ultimately, the costs are subject to both NPS budget priorities and available funding from multiple other sources. Yet, this long-term approach will allow the trail to be developed at a reasonable rate, considering the geographic area and variety of important resources to protect.

Within the plan, cost estimates are described for comparative purposes. Costs for implementation will be refined during trail development based upon final design of facilities and other considerations. Actual costs will vary depending on the degree to which specific actions are implemented and on contributions by the trail’s partners and volunteers.

Overall costs and support of trail development will be shared among the NPS and trail partners. For example, future development of the interpretation/education facilities outlined in Alternative 3 will be at partner sites. Further, the development of facilities and trail access will also serve all national trails and other water trails in the Chesapeake. The NPS believes that the long-term success of the trail is achievable by combining our efforts with those of our partners and communities along the trail.

Unit Status

Topic Statement: The NPS received two comments suggesting that to ensure adequate funding and capacity to implement the plan the NPS should designate a National Park Unit in the Chesapeake Bay.

Example Quote: “The NPS should include measures suggested by both the NPS Special Resources Study of the Chesapeake Bay recently submitted to the U.S. Congress, and President Barack Obama’s Executive Order 13508 issued in May 2009 calling for designation of a new unit of the National Park System on the Bay. Strong local and national support exists for at least one qualified site, historic Fort Monroe in Hampton, Virginia, which the U.S. Army is leaving in 2011.”

Example Quote: “Elevate the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT to a “unit” of the National Park System, so that the trail would be eligible for additional staffing and resources.”

NPS Response:

We appreciate support for the National Park Service's role in the Chesapeake region and the concept of a unit of the National Park System focused on Chesapeake themes. Units of the National Park System are designated by Congress. The Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT has been designated a unit of the National Trail System by Congress. It is out of the scope of this CMP to recommend whether the trail should become a unit of the National Park System. However, as noted in the public comments, in 2003-2004, the National Park Service prepared the *Chesapeake Bay Special Resource Study*, which provided an initial assessment of establishing a national park unit to represent significant themes, lands, and ecosystems of the Chesapeake region. After considerable consultation with states, stakeholders, and the general public, the study recommended making the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network a permanent program of the National Park Service. The study also outlined a number of options and approaches for how a park unit might be designed. Public comment suggested a further water trail option that led to the designation in 2006 of a new unit of the National Trail System, the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail.

In transmitting the Special Resource Study to the Congress in January 2010, the U.S. Department of the Interior Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks wrote: “. . . it is the Secretary's intention to convene representatives of the state governors to seek consensus on a new Bay-focused unit of the National Park System that meets NPS criteria and that aligns with the recommendations of the Special Resource Study. Pending consensus, the NPS is prepared to revise its Record of Decision on the Resource Study/EIS to reflect specific new recommendations.”

The *Strategy for Protecting and Restoring the Chesapeake Bay Watershed* issued under Executive Order 13508 reiterated this commitment. The NPS will convene representatives of the states' governors to explore the potential for a new unit of the National Park System focused on the Chesapeake and its rivers. While the possible types of NPS unit designations vary widely, approaches appropriate for this region would focus on non-traditional models. They would involve collaborative partnerships and retain existing patterns of land ownership and land-use, with federal lands as a small fraction of the conserved area. Further exploration of a “partnership park” based in part on the Chesapeake Bay Special Resource Study would include working landscapes, public access, public interpretation and recreation components. Further analysis would be required to determine the feasibility of a new unit. A new unit of the National Park System would require congressional legislation.

Implementation and Management

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing strong support and desire to begin trail development in a particular region along the trail.

Example Quote: “We are proud that the Lower Susquehanna Heritage Greenway has been identified as a priority trail segment of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail and we thank you for that recognition. Having worked for the last decade on building this

regional trail system, we welcome the resources from the National Park Service to partner with us to fulfill our common objectives.”

NPS Response:

We are encouraged by the extensive interest expressed in correspondence from individuals and organizations throughout the Chesapeake to develop the trail in their communities. The plan describes a segment management structure for the trail, which will develop smaller more specific plans for segments throughout the Chesapeake. The segment approach was developed to provide an achievable step-by-step process to develop the entire 3,000 mile trail. While the NPS and our partners can only develop one or two segment plans in the coming year, we look forward to continuing to work with partners in future segments, building the preliminary steps for developing a trail segment in their region.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern that specific locations were not represented in the trail, or that particular sites or route segments did not receive sufficient emphasis or detail in the CMP.

Example Quote: “We were disappointed that the trail did not include the Lynnhaven River. Though Smith did not lead the exploration on the Lynnhaven River, it was the first tributary river in the Chesapeake Bay that the English settlers explored in the shallow.”

NPS Response:

The trail map and route as illustrated in the CMP was developed within the context of legislation that established the trail. As described above, the segment planning process will allow the trail to provide more emphasis on the unique strengths and challenges in different regions around the Chesapeake Bay and major tributaries. However it should be noted that the Lynnhaven River is a part of the trail.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern regarding the approach for designation of high potential route segments and the priorities for resource protection.

Example Quote: “NPCA respectfully disagrees with the approach in the Trail Management Framework for Criteria for High Potential Route Segments. Because these high-potential segments would be the highest priorities for improved management access, interpretation, and land protection, it is critically important to get this step right. The CMP approach is flawed because for any trail route segment to qualify as having "high potential," it has to meet all five listed criteria. Requiring any site to meet all criteria, and have a willing seller, will dramatically narrow candidates for protection. As a consequence of applying these criteria, there seem to be no high potential route segments on the main stem of the Bay due to its lacking capacity to support high quality recreation.”

NPS Response:

We appreciate the concern and the comments. The management framework provides criteria for priority resource protection, including significant sites described or mapped by Smith, 17th

century American Indian archeological sites, and landscapes evocative of the early 17th century. NPS will be developing a land protection plan in the coming year that will outline more specific criteria, a strategy for land protection, and initial high priorities for protection. The management framework also provides criteria for designation of high potential route segments as required by the National Trails System Act. Additional high potential route segments can be designated upon further analysis by NPS. While it is true that high potential route segments must meet all the relevant criteria, this does not mean that high priority resources will meet the same criteria.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern that implementation of the trail preserve and promote the cultural and historic activities of hunting, fishing and trapping along the proposed trail route.

Example Quote: “We look forward to seeing subsequent plans that incorporate the historical and cultural tradition of hunting, fishing, trapping and habitat conservation along the areas encompassed by the planned CJSCNHT.”

NPS Response:

We appreciate comments in support of the variety of activities and experiences that can be associated with the trail. The relationship between these activities and the lives of American Indians and European settlers in the 17th-century is an important part of both the history and modern heritage of the Chesapeake Bay. While specific management of activities such as hunting, fishing, and trapping is beyond the scope of this CMP, these activities can be promoted by our partners, including the states. Trail development will not affect activities such as hunting, fishing, and trapping.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern that the trail minimize adverse impacts to natural resources during implementation.

Example Quote: “We urge NPS to minimize all adverse impacts on the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve, including impacts to aquatic resources, terrestrial resources and rare, threatened and endangered species.”

NPS Response:

The NPS has a commitment to avoiding adverse impacts to natural resources, including rare, threatened, and endangered species. As specified in the plan, we will continue to work together with site managers as well as local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that site specific trail development will not adversely affect these sites.

Connecting Trails

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing support for side and connecting trails, including expressing interest in applying for designation after the planning process is complete.

Example Quote: “Connecting the Susquehanna to the John Smith NHT will strengthen the link between the River and the Chesapeake and it offers us another tool to share the full story of the Chesapeake region.”

Example Quote: “We are pleased to see that the CMP includes criteria and a designation process to establish connector or side trails. The Accohannock Indian Tribe, one of our constituent tribes, has established the Bending Park Water Trail on Tull’s Branch Creek, which would make a wonderful potential connector trail.”

Example Quote: “We are particularly supportive of the process described in the CMP for establishing connecting trails and believe that both the Severn River and the South River would satisfy the criteria.”

Example Quote: “SGP believes the CMP should have more emphasis on extending the Trail to Pennsylvania and New York. While Captain Smith did not physically make the journey to see what is present day Pennsylvania, it is clear through his journals and the detailed map he drew of the Susquehanna River that his encounters with the Susquehannock Indians helped him to visualize the landscapes of the Susquehanna through their eyes.”

NPS Response:

The trail map and route as illustrated in the CMP was set by the US Congress when it authorized the trail in 2006. As mentioned above, exact locations along the trail route will be established at the segment planning scale, during segment planning and trail development. While the trail route is established, the opportunity for the designation and development of connecting and side trails is outlined in the plan as authorized by the National Trails System Act. In Chapter 2, the CMP describes the criteria and application process for connecting and side trails. Specifically, to be eligible for inclusion as a connecting or side trail, the proposed trail should:

- be significantly associated with the voyages of exploration of Captain John Smith in 1607-1609, or
- be significantly associated with the American Indian town and culture of the 17th century Chesapeake, or
- be significantly illustrative of the natural history of the 17th-century Chesapeake Bay

In addition, eligible applications must meet the requirement for provision of recreation experiences outlined in the application. Appendix P of the CMP details the designation process further, including an example application for designation form.

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concern the trail route excludes significant resources and supplants the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network (CBGN).

Example Quote: “I think the John Smith Water Trail excludes a great many resources and significant areas of the Chesapeake region that also deserve attention, recognition, protection and funding support to the work to lend their hand in improving the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

The trail completely skips the Wye, Choptank and Chester rivers, while it reaches every single other large tributary of the Bay. NPS made great effort to create a network of Gateways throughout the area, which has since been 'replaced' with efforts for this trail---which is in no way as comprehensive as the Gateways network.”

NPS Response:

In designating the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT, the Congress recognized the need to coordinate the development of the trail and the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network (CBGN). The Congress also recognized the fact that CBGN covers a broader landscape than the trail and assists partners to tell a much broader segment of the stories of the watershed.

An example of the two programs working together can be found on the Chester River. The development of the Chester and Sassafras River Water Trails is a project funded by the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network which is implemented as a partnership between the NPS and Sultana Projects, Inc.

Tourism

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing support for the value of heritage tourism and eco-tourism and noting the trail has potential to bring positive economic impacts to local economies.

Example Quote: “The Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT traces Annapolis’ shoreline and we believe it has the potential to attract thousands of additional visitors each year to our city, as well as conserve treasured landscapes around the Bay and expand the public’s appreciation of nature and history.”

Example Quote: “If implemented in accordance with the CMP, we believe the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT has the potential to attract thousands of additional visitors to Delaware each year.”

Example Quote: “Tourism and outdoor recreation are major sources of revenue for the City of Norfolk. Norfolk’s downtown waterfront is a place of parks, outdoor promenades, and museums and we receive visitors from all over the world. We believe the Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT is an innovative outdoor recreation amenity and has the potential to attract thousands of additional visitors each year, especially if the NPS plan is fully implemented.”

NPS Response:

We view heritage tourism development as one of the most important goals of trail development. To achieve this, we emphasized developing partnerships with state and local tourism offices, including destination marketing organizations (DMOs), to address tourism across the vast geographic area the trail includes. The NPS recognizes that tourism can have a beneficial effect

on local economies, and over time, the successful development of meaningful links between partner sites and destinations along the trail will enrich communities and the trail as a whole.

Modes of Transportation and Access

Topic Statement: The NPS received comments expressing concerns over the extent to which the CMP addressed all potential types of new public access, and alternative modes of transportation, including connection to bicycle or hiking trails.

Example Quote: “Whereas I have no specific improvements, I do want to recommend you adopt the plan. Even though I’m not a boater I like the idea that the trail could be available to interact with other trails.”

Example Quote: “Much further work seems to be needed to outline modes of access, and how implementation will address this issue. We hope to be able to integrate the trail. We will hope to work with you further to clarify transportation alternatives to key access points, and to integrate the trail into our broader hiking/biking and transit network, (Mention on p. vii only addresses other water trail’s, auto, and bus routes...) We have developed an interactive web mapping tool of key transportation trails, and are coordinating with DNR to expand this to include a broader statewide trails network, which would include water trails.”

Example Quote: “There is some mention of bike trail in the documents. My comment is that bike trails should be provided and funding for linking the many parks should be included in all proposed alternatives. This is a wonderful opportunity to add the bicycle trails.”

NPS Response:

The NPS realizes that the demands for public access to the Chesapeake Bay require many types of access, and we appreciate receiving correspondence from partners addressing the public access needs. While there is emphasis in the plan on developing “soft” put-in/take-outs for paddlecraft, the CMP is not intended to limit existing or future motorized boat launches on the Chesapeake Bay or its tributary rivers. Rather, it is simply the NPS priority to introduce new soft launches and camping opportunities, two things widely requested of the NPS during public involvement workshops and comment periods. However, the trail is intended to address all water users and we recognize this requires a clearer distinction within the CMP.

Errata & Amendments

The follow section contains corrections and revisions to the draft CMP/EA that are incorporated in the final plan. These edits are organized by chapter and/or section title, the page numbers refer to the page numbers in the *Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT Draft Comprehensive Management Plan and Environmental Assessment*. Paragraphs are cited beginning with the first full paragraph on the page and sentences are counted from the beginning the cited paragraph. Text to be removed from the draft document appears here as ~~striketrough~~, and text to be added appears underlined.

Summary

Pg. v, paragraph 2, sentence 4 currently reads: “New boat access sites would be soft put-ins/take-outs for canoes and kayaks.” This will be amended as follows: “New boat access sites would be ~~soft put-ins/take-outs for canoes and kayaks~~ developed where additional access is needed to meet all types of boating demand along the trail.”

Pg. vii, paragraph 3, sentences 4-5, currently read: “Boat access sites would also be developed where additional access is needed to meet boating demand along the trail. These would be “soft” put-in/take-outs for canoes and kayaks.” This will be amended as follows: “Boat access sites would also be developed where additional access is needed to meet all types of boating demand along the trail ~~boating demand along the trail.~~ These would be “soft” ~~put in/take outs for canoes and kayaks.~~”

Pg. ix, paragraph , sentences 4-5 currently read: “Boat access sites would also be developed where additional access is needed to meet boating demand along the trail. These would be “soft” put-in/take-outs for canoes and kayaks.” This will be amended as follows: “Boat access sites would also be developed where additional access is needed to meet all types of boating demand along the trail ~~boating demand along the trail.~~ These would be “soft” ~~put in/take outs for canoes and kayaks.~~”

Pg. 2-19, paragraph 1, sentence 3 currently reads: “Investment in new public access sites would emphasize soft access sites for non-motorized car-top boats such as canoes and kayaks coupled with opportunities for backcountry camping along the trail – meeting a demand that is currently not well-served by existing partner facilities along the trail.” This will be amended as follows: “Investment in new public access sites would emphasize soft access sites for non-motorized car-top boats such as canoes and kayaks coupled with opportunities for backcountry camping along the trail – meeting a demand that is currently not well-served by existing partner facilities along the trail.”

Pg. 3-12, paragraph 4, sentence 4 currently reads: “New boat access sites would primarily be “soft” put-in/take-outs for canoes and kayaks.” This will be amended as follows: “New boat access sites would ~~primarily~~ be developed where additional access is needed to meet all types of boating demand along the trail ~~“soft” put in/take outs for canoes and kayaks.~~”

Pg. 3-53, Table 3.6 Comparison of Alternatives currently reads: “New boat access sites would be soft put-ins/take-outs for canoes and kayaks.” This will be amended as follows: “New boat access sites would be ~~soft put-ins/take-outs for canoes and kayaks~~ developed where additional access is needed to meet all types of boating demand along the trail.”

Chapter 1

Pg. 1-28, paragraph 1. The following sentences will be added at the end of the paragraph: “Consultation as per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended, is also a planning process conducted when the broadest range of alternatives are available for consideration. Consultation with State Historic Preservation Offices, the appropriate tribes and descendent communities, and other with an interest in historic preservation is an important scoping activity.”

Chapter 3

Pg. 3-28, Figure 3.5. The map in Figure 3.5 incorrectly labels Roberts Island with a primitive camping designation. Roberts Island is managed by the Maryland Park Service as part of the Rocks and Susquehanna State Park Complex and the Maryland Park Service does not allow camping on Roberts Island. This designation will be removed from Figure 3.5.

Chapter 5

5.4.1 Impacts on Archeological Resources

Pg. 5-28, paragraph 2, sentence 3 currently reads “Trail partners could potentially receive matching grant funds and subsequent grant projects would be subject to review by appropriate SHPO for protection against negative impact to archaeological resources.”

To clarify that the Section 106 process engages the NPS, appropriate SHPO, and the relevant site this sentence will be amended as follows:

“Trail partners could potentially receive matching grant funds and subsequent grant projects would be subject to site specific review by the NPS, the appropriate SHPO, appropriate tribes and descendent communities, and others with an interest to ensure the protection against negative impact to archaeological resources.”

Similar clarification occurs in the following sentences:

Pg. 5-29, paragraph 2, sentence 3

Pg. 5-30, paragraph 2, sentence 3

5.4.2 Impacts on Historic Structures

Similar clarification of the Section 106 process will be made in section 5.4.1, as follows:

“Trail partners could potentially receive matching grant funds and subsequent grant projects would be subject to site specific review by the NPS, the appropriate SHPO, appropriate tribes and descendent communities, and others with an interest to ensure the protection against negative impact to historic structures.”

Pg. 5-33, paragraph 3, sentence 3

Pg. 5-34, paragraph 4, sentence 3

Pg. 5-35, paragraph 3, sentence 3

5.4.3 Impacts on Ethnographic Resources

Similar clarification of the Section 106 process will be made in section 5.4.3, as follows:

“Trail partners could potentially receive matching grant funds and subsequent grant projects would be subject to site specific review by the NPS, the appropriate SHPO, appropriate tribes and descendent communities, and others with an interest to ensure the protection against negative impacts to discrete ethnographic resources such as objects, structures, and archeological sites.”

Pg. 5-38, paragraph 5, sentence 3

Pg. 5-39, paragraph 5, sentence 3

Pg. 5-39, paragraph 5, sentence 3

Chapter 6

6.3 Section 106 Consultation

On page 6-4, paragraph 5, sentence 1 reads “Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation of 1966(NHPA), as amended, requires that federal agencies consider the effect of undertakings on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and allow the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment.”

Stating that the requirement is limited to properties listed on the National Register is an error, Section 106 Consultation includes properties that are included in or eligible for inclusion. The sentence will be amended to read:

“Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation of 1966(NHPA), as amended, requires that federal agencies consider the effect of undertakings on properties ~~listed on~~ included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and allow the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment.”

Appendix L.

Page L-7, first heading incorrectly refers to the “Occoquon National Wildlife Refuge.” This will be corrected to read “Occoquon Bay National Wildlife Refuge.”

Figure L.9 is incorrectly labeled, “Illustrative Concept for Trail Opportunities in the Vicinity of the Featherstone, Mason Neck, and Occoquan Bay National Wildlife Refuges.” This will be corrected to read: “Illustrative Concept for Trail Opportunities in the Vicinity of the Featherstone, Elizabeth Hartwell Mason Neck, and Occoquan Bay National Wildlife Refuges.”

Appendix P.

To clarify the requirements for a connecting trails application the following amendments will be made to Appendix P: Connecting or Side Trail Designation.

Pg. P-3, bullet 1, currently reads “a letter of consent from each affected landowner (for land trails, letters of consent are required from all landowners, both public and private, whose property the trail crosses. For a water trail, letters of consent are required from all landowners/managers, both public and private, of access points and landings along the trail, as well as from the owners(s) of the body of water.)” Because the required Application for Designation (pg P-4 through P-8) already requires a signed “certification of public use” (P-8) including certification that “all affected land and water owners, public or private, have been notified and have given their written consent” it is not necessary to require the applicant to include copies of consent letters with the application. Therefore this bullet will be removed from the list of requirements for an application package.

Pg. P-8, clause (5) under Certification for Public Use reads: “All affected land and water owners, public or private, have been notified and have given their written consent to this application. If this trail becomes permanently closed to public use, we will immediately notify the Department of the Interior’s National Trails System Coordinator.” This will be amended, listing the correct administrator in the second sentence, as follows:

“All affected land and water owners, public or private, have been notified and have given their written consent to this application. If this trail becomes permanently closed to public use, we will immediately notify the ~~Department of the Interior’s National Trails System Coordinator~~ Superintendent of the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail.”

Pg. P-8, Checklist for submission, third line reads: “include letters of permission from all affected public and private land and water owners?” For the reason described above, this line is removed.

Glossary

The following definition of “historic property,” will be added to the Glossary.

Historic Property. A district, site, building, structure or object significant in American history, architecture, engineering, archeology or culture at the national, State, or local level.