

CHAPTER 5:

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

(blank back of divider)

PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

This *Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* for Monocacy National Battlefield represents the thoughts of the National Park Service — including the national battlefield staff and the National Capitol Regional Office, the Maryland State Highway Administration, and the public. Consultation and coordination among the agencies and the public were vitally important throughout the planning process. The public participated through three primary avenues during the development of the plan: public meetings, responses to newsletters, and comments submitted to the national battlefield's Web site.

PUBLIC MEETINGS AND NEWSLETTERS

A notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement was published in the *Federal Register* on September 23, 2002 (FR vol. 67, no. 184, p. 59539).

Public meetings and newsletters kept the public informed and involved in the planning process for Monocacy National Battlefield. The National Park Service compiled a mailing list that consisted of interested citizens, legislators, businesses, local governments, members of organizations, and various government agencies. The first newsletter, issued in December 2002, described the planning effort. The National Park Service received written responses to the first newsletter.

The National Park Service conducted public scoping meetings on July 29 and

31, 2002, in the Gambrill House, Monocacy National Battlefield. A total of 16 people attended the two meetings. Only 6 people attended another scoping meeting at the same location in December 2002 (inclement weather).

The National Park Service met with the Maryland State Highway Administration and the Frederick County Commissioners on July 31, 2002, and with a representative of the Maryland historic preservation officer on August 1, 2002.

The National Park Service received written responses to the newsletter and comments at all the meetings. The comments received are summarized earlier in this document, under "Planning Issues and Concerns" (p. 28). All the comments received were considered and incorporated into the issues for the plan.

A second newsletter distributed in April 2003 described the draft alternative concepts for managing the national battlefield. A total of 36 electronic and mailed comments were received in response to that newsletter. The comments gave positive feedback on the planning process and the alternatives presented. Many commenters expressed appreciation for the opportunity to comment and take part in the planning process.

Most people who commented expressed preference for alternative 2. Many commenters mentioned that the Battle of Monocacy is the primary purpose for the establishment of Monocacy National Battlefield and said that the

battle should be the main focus of the plan.

About a fifth of the commenters said they preferred a blend of themes, with priority given to the battle, using the local and “crossroads” themes to provide context. Still fewer expressed preference for alternative 3. Only a few people supported selecting alternative 1, the no-action alternative, and the original alternative 4 (since eliminated).

Some people expressed concern about how the actions for each alternative were selected, saying that the National Park Service should identify the best treatment for each area and bundle those actions under one “action” alternative, so that there would be only two alternatives, no change (the no-action alternative) and “full theme development.”

One person said that almost the entire battlefield should be a preservation zone because natural resources are a part of the cultural landscape.

Many commenters questioned why the National Park Service proposed to remove the toll house.

Some people expressed concern about the cost of the deck over I-270. One commenter expressed a liking for the deck connection over I-270, and another said that more information should be available about the I-270 connection.

Several people suggested reordering the interpretive themes, and one suggested a rewording of one theme.

Some commenters said the National Park Service should not let cost be a

limiting factor because significant support can be raised through nonappropriated funding avenues.

The following ideas also were suggested:

- Improve traffic safety.
- Improve access to the national battlefield.
- Improve signs at the national battlefield.
- If new monuments are added, do not confine them all into one “alley.”
- Include the alternative transportation system in all alternatives, and identify what the threshold would be for implementing the transportation system.
- Fully furnish at least one battlefield structure in period style, and make that house accessible to the public.
- Seek private funding sources.
- Define the boundary of the battlefield without the filter of integrity. Pursue the acquisition of these lands whenever possible. Expand the boundary.
- Consider planting a buffer of trees to screen urban sprawl.
- Provide access to Union or Confederate positions.
- Offer first-person soldier accounts of the battle (“living history”).
- Minimize development to help ensure maximum preservation of the battlefield.
- Market the national battlefield.

- Make and sell a DVD of the national battlefield that would include all necessary interpretation.
- Make available a library archive that the public can access to learn more about the battle.
- Restore the 1864 battlefield landscape.
- Encourage groups to raise funds for new monuments to be added on the battlefield and to direct their efforts to additional land acquisition.
- Guard against the cumulative impacts of recreational use.

CONSULTATION WITH ORGANIZATIONS AND WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS

Section 7 Consultation

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As required by section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the National Park Service has coordinated informally with the Chesapeake Bay Field Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during the preparation of this document. The list of threatened and endangered species in appendix F was compiled with the use of lists and information received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

In accordance with the Endangered Species Act and relevant regulations in 50 CFR 402, the National Park Service has determined that the actions of the alternatives of this plan would not be likely to affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species. A copy of this draft plan has been sent to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with a request for written concurrence with

that determination. In addition, the National Park Service has committed to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service about future actions conducted under the framework described in this plan to ensure that such actions would not be likely to result in adverse effects on threatened or endangered species.

Maryland Department of Natural Resources. The National Park Service consulted with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources to get a list of state listed species that may be present in the national battlefield. On September 11, 2003, the department responded that it has “no records for Federal or State rare, threatened, or endangered plants or animals within this project site.” The full text of the letter is reproduced in appendix F. However, a study done at the national battlefield by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources in 1998 listed some state species. That list is the one used in this document

Natural Resources Conservation Service. The National Park Service consulted with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (NRCS), in February 2004 about prime and unique farmlands. The conclusion of the NRCS representative was that there are no prime and unique farmlands in the battlefield.

Section 106 Consultation

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470, et seq.) requires that agencies with direct or indirect jurisdiction over historic properties consider the effect of any undertaking on properties eligible for listing in the

National Register of Historic Places. To meet the requirements of 36 CFR 800, the National Park Service sent letters to the Maryland historic preservation office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on April 11, 2002, inviting them to participate in the planning process. All the newsletters from this planning process were sent to both offices with a request for comments.

Stipulation VI.E of the 1995 programmatic agreement among the National Park Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers requires the following of the National Park Service:

During the planning process, the park superintendent, in consultation with the SHPO, will make a determination about which undertakings are programmatic exclusions under IV.A and B, and for all other undertakings, whether there is sufficient information about resources and potential effects on those resources to seek review and comment under 36 CFR 800.4-6 during the plan review process . . . documentation of this consultation will be included in the GMP [plan].

The superintendent of Monocacy National Battlefield and the job captain / project manager met with a representative of the Maryland state historic preservation office on August 1, 2002, at the national battlefield and again in June 2003 at the SHPO office in Crownsville, Maryland, to discuss the progress of the alternatives of the *General Management*

Plan and the strategy for dealing with the proposal to widen I-270.

AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS THAT RECEIVED A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT

Federal Agencies and Officials

Advisory Council on Historic
Preservation
Chesapeake Bay Program Office
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resource Conservation
Service
U.S. Forest Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Geological Survey
National Park Service
Andersonville National Historic
Site
Antietam National Battlefield
Appomattox Court House
National Historical Park
Arkansas Post National Memorial
Catoctin Mountain Park
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal
National Historical Park
Chickamauga and Chattanooga
National Military Park
Colonial National Historical Park
Fort Donelson National Battlefield
Fort McHenry National
Monument and Historic Shrine
Fort Sumter National Monument
Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania
National Military Park
Gettysburg National Military Park
Harpers Ferry National Historical
Park
Kennesaw Mountain National
Battlefield Park
Manassas National Battlefield Park
Pea Ridge National Military Park

Pecos National Historical Park
Petersburg National Battlefield
Richmond National Battlefield
Park
Shiloh National Military Park
Stones River National Battlefield
Ulysses S. Grant National Historic
Site
Vicksburg National Military Park
Wilson's Creek National
Battlefield

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Senator Barbara A. Mikulski
Senator Paul S. Sarbanes
Roscoe G. Bartlett, Representative to
Congress

State Agencies and Officials

Chesapeake Bay Commission
Maryland Department of the
Environment
Maryland Department of Housing and
Community Development
Director, Historical and Cultural
Programs
Maryland Department of Natural
Resources
Maryland Department of Planning
Deputy Director, Office of Planning
and Preliminary Engineering
Maryland Department of
Transportation
Maryland State Historic Preservation
Office
Monocacy Scenic River Local Advisory
Board
Governor Robert L. Erlich, Jr.
State Representative Richard B.
Wheldon, Jr., District 3B
State Senator Alex X. Mooney,
District 3

Local Agencies and Officials

Frederick County

Commissioner Michael Cady
Commissioner Jan Gardner
Commissioner John L. Thompson Jr.
Commissioner John Lowell
Commissioner Bruce Reeder

City of Frederick

Principal Planner

Organizations and Businesses

Associated Press
Ben Hur Museum
Baltimore Civil War Round Table
Capitol Hill Civil War Round Table
Central Delaware Civil War Round
Table
Civil War Medical Museum
Civil War Preservation Trust
Civil War Round Table of Alexandria,
Virginia
Civil War Round Table of the District of
Columbia
The Civil War Times
Community Commons
Franklin County Civil War Round Table
Frederick Chamber of Commerce
Frederick Community College
Historical Society of Carroll County,
Maryland, Inc.
Historic Sites Consortium
Jefferson County Civil War Round
Table
Kent Civil War Society
The Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.
Loudoun County Civil War Round
Table
Maj. Gen. Isaac Trimble Camp 1836,
Maryland Division, Sons of
Confederate Veterans
Maryland Historical Society
National Parks Conservation
Association

National Parks Foundation
New Jersey Civil War History
Association
Northeast Kingdom Civil War Round
Table
Northern Virginia Relic Hunters
Association
Northwestern University

Pipe Creek Civil War Round Table
RK&K, LLP
The Rectory School
Shoemaker, Horman & Clapp, PA
The Skedaddlers Civil War Round Table
South Mountain Relic and Coin
Tourism Council of Frederick County,
Inc.