

Response to 1st Draft Heritage Implementation Plan Comments

Consulting Party	Name	Comments	Response
2. Agency	TN SHPO Joe Garrison (rep)	If intention is to focus on Plan then incorporate Plan into PA and make it a single document	Signatories have consulted and agreed that the PA and Plan should be two separate documents but that the PA will reference the Plan and the Plan will tier to the PA
4. Group	Between The Rivers David Nickell (rep)	All proposed changes to the HRMP should be provided to the parties to the PA, with opportunity to comment.	Revision of the HRMP will include public review and comment of drafts as they are developed. Revision of the HRMP will be based on the knowledge gained from implementation of the PA and Plan as well as the annual report reviews and comments provided by consulting parties.
		BTR has updated their list of goals for heritage.	We thank you for your contribution and welcome input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
		The timeline included in the Plan for erecting signage at church and school sites is unacceptable to BTR.	We agree and are fortunate that recent developments will allow heritage staff to begin implementing this project in 2012.
		Desires partnership defined by the development of MOU and MOAs. Actual labor of doing their own heritage projects is essential to them.	We thank BTR for their interest in an MOU and future MOAs with LBL heritage staff and we look forward to developing them for the mutual benefit of both our interests.
		Evaluation through both Bulletin 30 and Bulletin 38 Guidelines for significance be added as a desired condition as listed on pages 4-5 of the draft Plan.	As a result of consultation with the Kentucky and Tennessee SHPOs in 2006, LBL agreed to treat all identified sites as eligible for listing on the National Register until a cultural overview with appropriate themes to help guide site significance evaluation is developed. When evaluating sites, LBL heritage staff will use all appropriate National Register Bulletins and guidance documents.
		Requested a meeting with LBL Heritage officials, the Kentucky and Tennessee SHPOs, and all consulting parties during the preparation of the second draft of the PA and Plan.	We agree and a meeting of all consulting parties was held on August 3, 2011.
		Wants the Plan to specify MOUs.	The Plan includes options to develop partnership MOUs to build and define partner relations and MOAs to identify and define mutually beneficial partnership projects. Since an MOU defines a partnership that is negotiated between two parties the only way to specify them in the Plan is to state that they are an option.
		Inclusion of heritage center within LBL, preferably at the Bell City site, so that BTR can house genealogical information, maps, photos and documents for BTR members to do their own research and feel a sanctioned presence within LBL.	LBL Heritage Program has no plans for a cultural center however the Golden Pond Visitor Center provides an exhibit on the history of the area that was developed by a joint committee of former residents, TVA employees, and other community representatives. The Golden Pond Visitor Center is also able to host programs on a wide variety of interests and we encourage BTR to participate and add local historic value for our visitors. In addition, there are many other ways that community members and former residents can preserve and share their heritage and history for future generations to enjoy such as through presentations, working with a local historical society, tours, books, newspaper articles, and cultural demonstrations or events.
		Request the Plan specify that no aspect of the heritage program be	The purpose and vision of the Plan are clearly stated on page 3

Response to 1st Draft Heritage Implementation Plan Comments

		commercial in nature.	and have no commercial component.
		No tours of cemeteries should ever be considered.	We thank you for your input and will take your view into consideration.
		No re-enactments or living history exhibits of cultural practices, such as funeral customs, should be considered.	Many period rural and southern traditional cultural practices are demonstrated at the Homeplace 1850 and these will continue. In fact, we invite BTR to participate and add local historic value for our visitors.
		Expressed the opinion that cemeteries in LBL are not heritage assets to be included in the Plan. Cemeteries belong to the families of the individuals interred.	The Forest Service is legally obliged by the LBL Protection Act to “maintain an inventory of and ensure access to cemeteries within LBL for purposes of burial, visitation, and maintenance.” The cemeteries may or may not be eligible for listing on the National Register (most cemeteries are not eligible but they can be in some circumstances) and those that are over 50 years of age are historic and meet the definition of a PHA. The PHA designation guarantees that a condition assessment will be completed every 5 years.
		BTR expressed concern about the appearance of Forest Service ownership or control over cemeteries within LBL. The Forest Service should not put cemetery information on the LBL web site.	The Forest Service is legally obliged by the LBL Protection Act to “maintain an inventory of and ensure access to cemeteries within LBL for purposes of burial, visitation, and maintenance.” While we appreciate that BTR has reservations about the accessibility of cemetery information, TVA and LBL have produced maps for many years showing cemetery locations. There are over 250 known cemeteries within LBL and many former residents and their descendents request that the information be made more public not less. LBL is working on an interactive map that will include cemetery information such as tract maps, photographs, access to the cemetery, as well as names of deceased when documented.
		It should be specified as policy that LBL cemeteries are not public land free for burials to outsiders.	The Forest Service is legally obliged by the LBL Protection Act to “maintain an inventory of and ensure access to cemeteries within LBL for purposes of burial, visitation, and maintenance.” We do not get involved in any decisions concerning who is allowed to be buried.
		The Plan should clearly specify that the draft Cemetery Handbook is officially withdrawn and does not in any way apply.	We thank you for your input and will take your view into consideration.
		BTR would like a provision that provides them with access to culturally sensitive GIS data.	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Archaeological Repatriation and Protection Act define what types of information are exempt from FOIA. In addition, we will honor all requests by consulting Tribes of what types of information they would not like to be public.
		PHA categories should be clearly defined and it should be specified what role BTR will have in the determination of what is cultural/traditional and what use/reuse is appropriate.	Appendix 2 in the Plan includes a clear definition for PHAs. We invite input from all former residents, their descendents, Tribes, agency professionals, colleagues, and anyone who has an interest in the cultural resource remains at LBL.

Response to 1st Draft Heritage Implementation Plan Comments

		On page 15 of the Plan, the stated purpose of BTR should be re-worded to include protecting the cultural heritage.	The citation on page 15 of the Plan will be edited in the 2 nd draft of the Plan.
		BTR is opposed to the sequestering of information obtained or exploiting it for tourism purposes.	LBL agrees and is also opposed to sequestering or exploiting information.
		Request the former names of places be recovered and marked. Many place names have been altered or changed and sometimes applied to wrong places since the removal of former residents from LBL and this should be corrected.	LBL is currently working on installing church and school marker posts at their former locations but it is neither feasible nor appropriate to mark the locations of every former historic place, LBL welcomes any input that helps us better manage cultural resources and will take any reasonable request into consideration.
5. Group	Between The Rivers Preservation Organization Lynn Lancaster (rep)	Consistent maintenance of cemetery roads	LBL agrees and is legally obliged by the LBL Protection Act to ensure access to cemeteries and we are seeking input from cemetery contacts, families, and groups, so we can create a prioritized listing of cemetery access roads that will include: time of year, how often, and level of maintenance. We also are very grateful when people call in to let us know when a problem appears so that we can take care of it. Consulting party reps and interested public can help by sharing our contact information with cemetery and community members.
		Stabilization of Dr. office on Rd 384 & Griffin house on Rd204	We thank you for bringing this to our attention. This historic site location will be assessed to see if it meets the definition of a Priority Heritage Asset and if it does, a management plan will be developed.
		Clean up around ruins of Iron Furnace on Rd 384	We thank you for the suggestion. This historic site location will be assessed to see if it meets the definition of a Priority Heritage Asset and if it does, a management plan will be developed.
		Marking and interpreting former churches, schools, stores, etc.	LBL is currently working on installing church and school marker posts at their former locations but it is neither feasible nor appropriate to mark the locations of every former historic place, LBL welcomes any input that helps us better manage cultural resources and will take any reasonable request into consideration.
6. Group	Ft. Donelson National Battlefield Steven McCoy (rep)	Concur with the effort and the direction and vision of the plan Will continue partnership efforts	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
7. Group	Stewart County Judge Andy Brigham (rep)	Use of acronyms confusing; include glossary of terms	This may refer to the PA which contains an appendix with definitions and terms but a list of common Acronyms will be added to 2 nd draft. If any Acronyms are used in the 2 nd draft Plan, a list will be added as an appendix for easy reference.
		No discussion of the history of LBL	The Plan does not contain a history since it is in the original HRMP. We will post the HRMP on the LBL heritage web page so people can access the history.
		Standards used to determine if a site is historic?	This definition is in the PA also but any site or object over 50 years of age is considered historic.

Response to 1st Draft Heritage Implementation Plan Comments

		Involvement of other groups/agencies	LBL extended invitations to 16 surrounding groups, pertinent agencies, and local communities to appoint a consulting party representative while we develop the PA and Plan. In addition, LBL heritage staff have developed relationships with peers in regional agencies and universities and will continue to collaborate with them.
		Plans for public dissemination	The 1 st Draft versions of the PA and Plan are posted on the LBL heritage web page.
8. Group	Trigg County Jim Wallace (rep)	Wants to preserve the heritage and history of LBL	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
9. Group	Trigg County Historical Society John Charron (rep)	Repair road to Cunningham Memorial and let public know about it	The memorial (which was installed prior to TVA management) is on an LBL road that is classified as a level 2 legal road which means it is maintenance is categorized as: high clearance vehicles, sometimes impassable, narrow width, could be native surface and a closed canopy. We cannot change its maintenance category but any call that let us know when a legal road is not drivable, allow us to correct the issue and make it passable within the limits of its maintenance category. This historic site location will be included in the interactive historic map planned for the heritage page on the LBL website.
		Protect and preserve only known cave in LBL (collapsing)	We will arrange a visit with Trigg County Historical Society members and determine whether cultural or natural resource management is needed for this site location.
		Mark former location of St. Joseph Catholic Church for public	This historic site location will be included in the interactive historic map planned for the heritage page on the LBL website. In addition, it will be included with our installation of post markers at former locations of churches and schools within LBL.
		Create booklet of personal stories and the history of St. Stephens Catholic Church	We will consider including this suggestion in list of future heritage projects to consider but former residents and family descendants may want to develop booklets and histories on their own as well. In fact, many have published books and histories such as those that were included in the former BTR, Inc. magazine.
		Outreach to the Thomas Bridges Historic Family group of Donaldson Creek and include them in review and comment on PA and Plan	We will consider this suggestion and the PA and Plan are available on the LBL heritage web page. Review and comment is open to everyone. In addition to press releases put out by LBL, Consulting Party representatives can help spread the word out to surrounding communities to ensure everyone who wants to have an opportunity to comment.
10. Group	Lyon County Wade White, Judge Executive (rep)	In what way will Lyon County be consulted on our cultural identity that should be saved at LBL?	Lyon County was invited to appoint a representative for their community's interest in heritage at LBL as a consulting party during development of the PA and Plan. In addition, Between The Rivers, Inc., a non-profit group of former residents from the Lyon and Trigg County portions of LBL were also invited to

Response to 1st Draft Heritage Implementation Plan Comments

			appoint a consulting party representative. Cultural resource management is concerned with places and objects or that have historic value—preserving cultural identity is outside our resource management abilities.
		In what way will BTR and other groups be allowed to protect their heritage?	Lyon County was invited to and did appoint a resident to represent and share their community’s interest in heritage at LBL as a consulting party during development of the PA and Plan. In addition, Between The Rivers, Inc., a non-profit group of former residents from the Lyon and Trigg County portions of LBL was also invited to appoint a consulting party representative. As a federal land managing agency, LBL has responsibility for preserving and protecting the cultural resources within its boundaries. LBL looks forward to continuing to partner with former residents and their descendents as well as other interested community members who are interested in helping with our efforts. In addition, there are many ways that community members and former residents can preserve and share their heritage and history for future generations to enjoy such as through presentations, working with a local historical society, tours, books, newspaper articles, and cultural demonstrations or events.
11. Public	Dill, Joe	Wants to share personal information and supports preservation of historic sites	We thank you for your interest and look forward to your participation.
12. Public	Dixon, Harold	Too complex for general public	While the commenter did not specify whether one of the documents or the process is too complex, LBL agrees that the PA may still be too complex for non-professionals to easily understand and is working with other consulting parties to simplify this document as much as legally possible. The Plan is meant to be straightforward and easily understood by everyone and we will strive harder to meet that objective with the 2 nd Draft Plan.
		Add “consulting parties” to definition section of plan	Since “consulting party” is a legal term that applies only to the PA it is included in the PA definitions. The term is not used in the Plan so it is not defined there.
13. Public	Ezell, June K. Flood	Would like to see several sites designated as historic	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
14. Public	Futrell, Mary Graham	Former resident, in favor of preserving former homesite	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
15. Public	Galloway, Patty M.	Shared personal information and supports preservation of homesites	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
16. Public	Green, Terry	Supports preservation of former residents’ history and would like cemeteries designated as historic sites	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
17. Public	Johnson, Don and Nadene	All historic spots, to include cemeteries, should be preserved	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
18. Public	Klies, Kenneth	Supports preservation of former residents’ history	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes

Response to 1st Draft Heritage Implementation Plan Comments

			input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
19. Public	Kuebrich, Rita	Former resident, Shared personal information and expressed concern for cemetery maintenance	LBL thanks you for your contribution and we share the concern especially as the cemetery community continues to age. We have been fortunate to have had funds during recent disasters so that we could offer help where needed and wanted.
20. Public	Page, Dee	Former resident, Wants to share personal information and supports preservation of historic sites	LBL agrees and thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
21. Public	Queen, Rolla	Former resident, interested in sharing personal information	LBL thanks you for your contribution and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
22. Public	Ramey, Vickie	Former resident, Shared personal information	LBL thanks you for your contribution and welcomes your input which resulted in the reestablishment of the Ramey Overlook at LBL and helped us better manage cultural resources.
23. Public	Vinson, Mancil	Former resident, Shared personal information, Supports preservation of historic sites	LBL thanks you for your continued contributions to the history of LBL which has helped us better manage cultural resources.
24. Public	Wall, Johnny	Expect FS to continue to allow cemeteries to operate without outside control and regulations	The Forest Service is legally obliged by the LBL Protection Act to “maintain an inventory of and ensure access to cemeteries within LBL for purposes of burial, visitation, and maintenance.”
		Believe FS is responsible with continued maintenance of roads providing access to the cemeteries	The Forest Service is legally obliged by the LBL Protection Act to “maintain an inventory of and ensure access to cemeteries within LBL for purposes of burial, visitation, and maintenance.”
25. Public	Williams, John	Former resident, interest in sharing personal information and supports preservation of former residents’ history	LBL thanks you for your support and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
26. Public	Willoughby, Sherry	Former resident, shared personal information, in favor of preserving cemeteries and other areas	LBL thanks you for your support and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
27. Public	Willoughby, Tom	Former resident, shared personal information, in favor of preserving cemeteries and other areas	LBL thanks you for your support and welcomes input that will help us better manage cultural resources.
28. Public	Oliver, Della	Where will artifacts be stored?	Collections storage will be a critical component as LBL heritage staff develops a collections plan. Murray State University currently houses most of the LBL artifact collection.
		Will the current version of the Heritage Implementation Plan prevent the development of a cultural center at LBL?	LBL Heritage Program has no plans for a cultural center however LBL’s Golden Pond Visitor Center provides an exhibit on the history of the area that was developed by a joint committee of former residents, TVA employees, and other community representatives. The Golden Pond Visitor Center is also able to host programs on a wide variety of interests and we encourage former residents and community members to participate and add local historic value for our visitors.