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ABSTRACT

MARITIME HERITAGE TRAILS AS PUBLIC OUTREACH TOOLS: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC MODEL FOR THE APALACHICOLA RIVER, FLORIDA

Irina Tidmarsh Sorset

With the infusion of ethnographic research into the development of the Apalachicola River Maritime Heritage Trail (ARMHT), this research provides an effective methodology for making the past relevant through public interpretation and heritage tourism. Maritime heritage trails allow for the interpretation of multiple archeological, historical, and natural resources, while social research into the study area and potential trail users addresses the needs of contemporary communities. Researching the historical context, identifying available heritage resources, and visually assessing potential trail sites provided the foundation for establishing the Apalachicola River’s interpretation potential. Information from community observations, community participation, free listing, group interviews, and cultural informants illuminated public opinions and attitudes. Data from the focus group, pilot study, and the Apalachicola River Questionnaire (ARQ) established parameters for trail design, layout, interpretive content, and interpretive materials. By allowing ethnographic data to steer and guide each stage of the ARMHT model, this research was able to identify, adapt to, and address public wants and needs during the developmental stages. As demonstrated throughout this research, public interpretation of heritage resources that begins with community assessment creates the foundation for a successful and community-relevant heritage tourism product.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Professionals in the field of public archaeology always seek to improve techniques for instilling a sense of ownership and stewardship for nonrenewable heritage resources. This study includes a methodology that uses ethnographic and social research to develop a public interpretation strategy for connecting people to the past. By involving communities in the developmental stages of local public outreach projects, archaeologists will better understand their potential audience’s wants and needs and will be able to develop a more effective interpretation. As a case study, this thesis shows how to portray the archaeological heritage of the Apalachicola River in Florida through a model maritime heritage trail.

Located in the panhandle of Florida, the Apalachicola River has a rich cultural history hidden within a vast riverine landscape (Figure 1). Thematically linked interpreted sites such as maritime heritage trails capture the cultural, historical, and environmental contexts of archaeological resources. Survey methodologies such as questionnaires and interviews examine contemporary issues, current uses, and communal needs surrounding the Apalachicola River. Infusing social research and public opinion into the developmental stages of the trail can help make maritime trails and their cultural resources applicable to modern societies. Using the model Apalachicola River Maritime Heritage Trail (ARMHT), this research can be adapted and utilized to develop interpretive trails and other public archaeology ventures in other locations.
Research Problem

The field of archaeology is both glorified and demonized by the general public. On one end of the paradigm, people view archaeologists as adventure seekers holding the key to the secrets of the past. Mythicized by the character of Indiana Jones, archaeologists are seen by many as individuals who dig for lost treasures and riches while wearing leather jackets and fedoras and bearing whips. On the other end of the spectrum, people view archaeologists as hypocritical academic snobs who rob communities of their artifacts. Some argue that although archaeologists insist that others not dig or collect any artifacts on or under the ground,
archaeologists themselves indulge in these very acts privately, away from the public view. Between these two extreme perspectives of the field of archaeology and its professionals, the reality of what exactly archaeologists study, how it relates to people today, and why it is important often is unclear to the general public.

In order to bridge these diametric public viewpoints of the field, archaeologists have made significant efforts to educate the public. As expressed by McGimsey (1972:4), “Archeologists, amateur and professional, cannot expect others to preserve the nation’s heritage if we, who by interest or training are best qualified in the field, do not assume a role of positive leadership and public education.” The focus on educating others about the relevance and significance of historical, cultural, and archaeological resources has become an important subfield of archaeology, termed public archaeology.

Developing and creating outreach tools is fundamental to public archaeology. The goal of many of these tools is to effectively communicate the importance of preservation and conservation of archaeological resources. Public outreach tools “need to relate interpretation of the past to contemporary social and political issues in ways that are flexible enough to permit varied public responses” (Shackel and Chambers 2004:119). As archaeologists, how can we adequately create a product for the public without asking the public what it wants? If we fail to elicit public response, then archaeologists become the stereotype of the academic snob. As McManamon (2002:37) argues, “The most significant and meaningful messages are not ‘one size fits all.’ Instead, they are local. Different communities have different pasts and need to know specific things about those pasts.” Ethnographic and social research can provide this insight into the interests of a potential audience and help unite the archaeologist with the public.

Many outreach tools are devoid of public involvement other than in the implementation and assessment stages. Instead of waiting until the end to ask the opinions of the public, we must begin the process with the public. One technique for getting the public involved in the early stages of public archaeology is ethnographic research. Establishing an ethnographic model for the development of public interpretation tools will assist with relating the past to present
populations. With the inclusion of public input during the developmental stages, archaeologists will more successfully make cultural resources applicable and meaningful to modern societies.

In order to develop an ethnographic public outreach methodology, the current study uses the Apalachicola River in northwest Florida and its surrounding populations as a case study. This study uses a maritime heritage trail to interpret the Apalachicola River’s cultural past because such trails are able to portray resources in proper geographical context. The model heritage trail is developed from the results of social research that provide insight into local heritage memory and the general population’s wants and needs. By putting people into the beginning stages of public archaeology, archaeologists will be better able to give the past relevance for the local community. Archaeologists must understand that “the levels of knowledge and the views of the general public about archaeology is an important component of effective public outreach” (McManamon 2002:36). By conducting initial ethnographic research of the public through tools such as interviews and questionnaires, archaeologists have the ability to create outreach tools that use public input in the developmental stages, rather than solely in the assessment stage. The key research question at the initial stage focuses on how to combine the archaeological record and local historical memory of the Apalachicola River into the modern community through a maritime heritage trail. Interpreting this importance for trail visitors who may be local or who may be from other areas is vital for creating a successful maritime heritage trail.

This research does not produce a physical trail, but rather a collection of ethnographic data and conclusions of public opinions that can guide future interpretative planning. A proposed ARMHT model demonstrates how data from this thesis can be transformed into a heritage tourism product. Although the current case study uses the Apalachicola River located in the southeastern United States, other heritage professionals can adapt and use this public archaeology model for varying environments, locations, and resources.

Public Archaeology

The term public archaeology has several meanings within contemporary archaeology. During the 1970s, professionals used public archaeology to describe what is now often referred
to as Cultural Resource Management (Merriman 2004:3), which King (2004:362) defines as “the
management both of cultural resources and of effects on them that may result from land use and
other activities of the contemporary world.” The use of public archaeology to describe Cultural
Resource Management developed “because it relied on public support in order to convince
legislators and developers that archaeological sites needed protection” (Merriman 2004:3).
Although public archaeology within the United States “can be understood as encompassing the
[Cultural Resource Management] compliance consequences as well as educational archaeology
and public interpretation in public arenas such as schools, parks, and museums” (Jameson
2004:22), this research focuses on the latter definition concerning public interpretation.

Throughout the past few decades, public archaeology has increasingly been used to refer
to activities focused directly on engaging the general public. For the current study, the definition
of public archaeology closely parallels that of the Florida Public Archaeology Network (2007):
“Public archaeology is a part of a larger heritage management movement dedicated to increasing
public awareness and expanding educational opportunities about archaeology.” The foremost
goal of public archaeology is to inform the interested public about archaeology and to preserve
the fragile and irreplaceable remains of our past. The terms community archaeology, educational
archaeology, and archaeology heritage tourism are often used in conjunction with this definition
of public archaeology.

The intellectual lineage of public archaeology flows from the field of applied
anthropology (Shackel and Chambers 2004:12). Professional concerns regarding the discipline
of anthropology maintaining its relevance to current society created “focus on new approaches
(such as public anthropology) and other ways in which anthropologists can expand the impact
of their ideas and connect with broader audiences” (Rylko-Bauer et al. 2006:178). Although
“presenting archaeology to the public is not a new idea,” it has become a major focus of today’s
archaeological community worldwide (Merriman 2004:132). Archaeologists increasingly
emphasize the importance of making the archaeological record relevant to current society.
Without collaboration among academics, professionals, and the general public, the field of
archaeology remains disconnected from current issues, needs, and desires. People who do not view archaeology as pertinent to their lives are less likely to join archaeologists in the fight to preserve cultural resources. In many cases, “the best protectors of archaeological resources are often the people who live near the sites” (Lipe 1974:25). This relationship between local resources and the people living near them is the reason professionals must continue to engage the local community.

Increased interest in public archaeology is evident in the growth of literature surrounding the subject (McGimsey 1972; Potter 1994; Smardz and Smith 2000; Little 2002; Merriman 2004; Shackel and Chambers 2004). The increase in scholarly publications relating to this field created a niche for a new peer-reviewed international journal in 2009 entitled Public Archaeology. In addition to these more traditional avenues, the topic of public archaeology and its associated projects are visible on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, blogs, and other multimedia-based technologies, demonstrating a growth not only in academia but also in more public venues.

Public archaeology programs are gaining visibility within the United States because “the integration of public education and outreach in archaeological programs is increasingly common” (McManamon 2002:33). Good examples of active public archaeology programs are in place across the United States. Created in 1967, the Arkansas Archaeological Survey’s (2010) mission “is to conserve and research the state’s heritage and communicate this information to the public.” Crow Canyon Archaeological Center (2012) in Cortez, Colorado, founded in 1983, is dedicated to teaching “the public about archaeology, history, and culture through a variety of hands-on experiences.” The United States Department of Interior’s Bureau of Land Management, in partnership with Montana State University, established Project Archaeology in the early 1990s (Project Archaeology 2000). The target audience for Project Archaeology (2000) consists of educators and students, and the purpose of the program is “to develop awareness of our nation’s diverse and fragile archaeological sites, to instill a sense of personal responsibility for stewardship of these sites, and to enhance science literacy and cultural understanding through the study of archaeology.” Programs such as these continue to advance the field of archaeology.
by engaging with non-professionals in order to promote and protect nonrenewable historic resources.

Overall, the growth of the field of public archaeology is tremendous. In 2004, the State of Florida established the Florida Public Archaeology Network, which consists of eight regional centers across the state. The regional centers of Florida Public Archaeology Network are dedicated to educating the public about terrestrial and underwater archaeology in order “to help stem the rapid deterioration of [the] state’s buried past and to expand public interest in archaeology” (Public Lands and Property 2004). The Florida Public Archaeology Network used the regional framework of Arkansas and a similar regional program in Louisiana as models for their regional centers’ approaches to statewide education.

Academic institutions teach more classes and tailor degrees toward a specialization in public archaeology. Although some programs in public archaeology such as those at the University of South Florida and Binghamton University in New York are geared more toward Cultural Resource Management, other programs focus on public education and stewardship. Arizona State University, California State University, University of Massachusetts, and the University of West Florida all have public archaeology programs or internships focused on community-based archaeology.

Many professional organizations are strong supporters of public archaeology and sponsor conferences, workshops, lectures, and materials dedicated to the subfield. The Society for American Archaeology (2011) is an advocate for integrating the public into all aspects of archaeology. In addition to incorporating “public education and outreach” as Principle No. 4 in its statement of ethics, the Society for American Archaeology has teaching resources for educators, an award for excellence in public education, a dedicated section of its website, and a committee designated for public education.

The Society for Historical Archaeology (2007) also incorporates public archaeology into its Code of Ethics with Principle 7: “encourage education about archaeology, strive to engage citizens in the research process and publicly disseminate the major findings of their research.”
The Society for Historical Archaeology’s 2008 annual meeting was based on the theme “The Public Benefits of Historical Archaeology.” The four-day conference featured symposia, panels, workshops, and sessions that illuminated current public outreach endeavors across the world. Since the 2008 meeting, annual conferences have dedicated sessions and workshops targeted to those engaged in, or wanting to engage in, public archaeology. The Society also has a Public Education and Interpretation Committee. In 2011, the Society for Historical Archaeology established the Daniel G. Roberts Award for Excellence in Public Historical Archaeology as one of its major awards.

The Archaeological Institute of America’s (2012) mission includes promoting “a vivid and informed public interest in the cultures and civilizations of the past.” The Archaeological Institute of America also produces the popular Archaeology magazine and has a dedicated Education Committee. In partnership with the Society for American Archaeology and the Society for Historical Archaeology, the Archaeological Institute of America created the Archaeology Educational Clearinghouse, which promotes archaeological curriculum for use in classrooms and other venues. The collaboration between these three strong organizations created a united front for archaeological education resources. The user-friendly website for the Archaeology Educational Clearinghouse is a portal to teaching resources from each sponsoring organization. Through its interactive website, participation in the National Council for the Social Studies annual conferences, and collaboration with other organizations, the Archaeology Educational Clearinghouse makes a significant impact on public archaeology education.

Archaeologists use material objects that have been left behind to try to understand past peoples and cultures. Through fastidious research, excavation, and analyses, “archaeologists speak for the silent people. They take objects that in themselves would be mute and permit these objects to have a voice” (Kennedy 2002:xii). The science of archaeology lends itself to connecting current society with societies of the past. Interpreting history through the physical representations of past lifeways creates an opportunity for tangible learning. Archaeologists strongly believe that although some artifacts legally “belong” to private, state, or federal entities
because of property boundaries, “no one owns exclusive rights to an archaeological object or, even more important, to archaeological data” (McGimsey 1972:6). The science of archaeology reveals information about past human culture and ways of life; therefore, everyone should have access to this knowledge, not just a few people.

Throughout this thesis, I refer to the public as a specific population group: The public is anyone who is not a trained archaeologist. By using a broad definition of public, this study encompasses all demographics of age, gender, ethnicity, education, religion, income, and profession. Despite this use of one single definition for public, it is important to note that “there is no single public and no single past” (Little 2002:7). Each person’s experiences construct his or her own worldview, thus shaping how one interprets the past, views the present, and imagines the future.

Methodology Overview

The purpose of this research is to propose a methodological framework for including the public in the development of heritage interpretation products, such as a maritime heritage trail. Archaeologists, historians, and other social scientists routinely rely on oral histories, interviews, and other similar ethnographic methods to investigate social memories associated with their research. Anthropologists use local memories of community life, historical happenings, and social interactions to help understand how people construct meaning from the past. Although the process of exploring social memories to help reconstruct the past while understanding cultural and personal biases plays an important role in some research, my thesis does not use public input in this way. Instead, I employ ethnographic methods to understand the wants and needs of potential audiences for consideration and use in the developmental stages of public outreach tools.

In the United States, there has been an increase in interpretive heritage materials such as outdoor signage and websites over the past couple of decades. The growth of engaging in-person historical experiences, including interpretive trails, has increased within the heritage industry. At first, professional emphasis focused on practical specifics for interpretive materials such as
production, cost, maintainability, and sustainability. Now that best practices and parameters for successful interpretation designs are widely agreed upon, the heritage industry seeks to answer questions of assessment for interpretive products, including heritage trails, routes, and corridors. Questions that need addressing include those surrounding visitor usability and experiences, the ability of material to relate to audiences, and the success of instilling stewardship messages. Assessment of interpreted heritage materials allows professionals to adapt and learn from successes and failures of established products. Currently, many assessments are conducted once the interpretive product is in place, after all the research, design, and implementation has taken place. Audience surveys about what visitors liked and disliked, what they would like to see, and whether they would return ask valid questions that help to improve visitor experiences.

By using an ethnographic approach for the ARMHT, I sought to answer similar questions usually reserved for the assessment of existing interpretive products. Instead of waiting until the end to ask pertinent questions of visitors after the majority of funding sources, time, and resources have already been used, this model explores these questions first. By assessing the potential needs and wants for a heritage trail in the initial stages of development, the interests of visitors are used to develop the trail. Through community immersion, participant observation, focus group interviews, and a formal questionnaire, I gathered valuable information on potential users of a maritime heritage trail along the Apalachicola River. Data from this research provide directions for the design and layout of a trail, content and format of interpretive materials, and insight into community concerns and issues regarding the river.

Interpretive materials must relate to their audiences or risk losing stewardship messages. No matter how well a project is funded, staffed, or researched, without consideration of the potential audiences, the likelihood of successful visitation and consumption is low. The National Trust for Historic Preservation encourages professionals who are developing heritage trails to include public input during the developmental stages through a variety of techniques and methods (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011b). The ethnographic model used in this research not only conforms to this direction of public input but also builds upon this literature by specifically
addressing the ways to achieve user input in a cost-efficient manner. Although I applied the ethnographic model to a riverine maritime heritage trail, this framework can easily be adapted for the development of a variety of other interpretive heritage materials.

Significance of Study

Archaeologists are ultimately storytellers for past peoples and cultures, piecing together clues from history and interpreting them for those living today. The goal of interpretation is not to instruct, but to inspire people (Tilden 2007:59). The art of interpretation is essentially “communication that stresses ideas and relationship” (Ward and Wilkinson 2006:2). Effective communication needs common ground with defined terms and clear motivations. There is no single way to interpret the past. Interpreters trying to reconstruct history and convey a message for a particular audience must first know their audience. In addition to knowing the audience, interpreters must move beyond simply identifying and more toward understanding the wants and needs of potential audiences. If the audience is known but its perspectives, desires, and motivations are unknown, how can archaeologists communicate? The public is comprised of thousands of different audiences with different worldviews and values. Interpretation is “an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships . . . rather than simply to communicate factual information” (Tilden 2007:33). Public archaeology outreach tools must use adaptive techniques and approaches that are tailored to intended audiences in order to reveal meaning and communicate messages of stewardship for cultural resources.

As the field of public archaeology continues to grow, we must remember “that many people may have views of the past and of places associated with it that differ substantially from those held by archaeologists or historians with their research-based knowledge” (McManamon 2002:31). To communicate the importance of preservation and stewardship for nonrenewable archaeological resources, public archaeologists must move beyond involving the public only at the end stages, such as implementation and assessment. Archaeologists must include the public in all stages of public archaeology, including development, creation, and reproduction of outreach activities.
Ultimately, this research will contribute to the field of applied anthropology. Shackel and Chambers (2004:12) stress that “the increasingly public roles of archaeologists require new skills and expertise related to working effectively with communities and a variety of stakeholders.” The use of ethnographic research in developing public outreach tools is one way for archaeologists to connect the past with the present. The proposed maritime heritage trail can serve as a model for the use of ethnography in the development of additional public outreach tools that will identify and address local communities’ wants and needs. By better understanding their public, archaeologists can successfully educate others about the importance of protecting and preserving nonrenewable cultural resources.

Public involvement in preserving the past through heritage tourism is key in building ownership, stewardship, and appreciation. Many institutions encourage public participation; however, the details for how to involve the public within the confines of real world problems such as money, time, and staff have not been addressed fully. This thesis presents a new methodological approach to the question of how to develop effective interpretation of cultural heritage, one that will be seen as relevant not only by archaeologists but also by the people who are closest to the resources and who are ultimately the individuals who preserve sites and encourage stewardship in others.
What is a maritime heritage trail? While the meaning of the component words may be clear to most, together the term *maritime heritage trail* becomes more difficult to define. Popular online dictionary sites offer a variety of definitions that the general public might come across in a quest for understanding a maritime heritage trail’s purpose. *Maritime* is defined as “relating to navigation, shipping, etc; seafaring” and “near, or living near the sea” (Maritime 2009). A legal definition of *maritime* characterizes the word more broadly: “of or relating to navigation or commerce on navigable waters” (Maritime 1986). The third definition for *heritage* reads, “the evidence of the past, such as historical sites, buildings, and the unspoilt natural environment, considered collectively as the inheritance of present-day society” (Heritage 2009). A trail is “a path or track made across a wild region, over rough country, or the like, by the passage of people or animals.” (Trail 2009). By picking out key words from all of these definitions, one might define a maritime heritage trail as a path highlighting both the history and nature of places relating to the water. Although definitions for a maritime heritage trail vary, the purpose of this research is to emphasize how the history or heritage of a place is multi-dimensional. Perhaps the term *maritime cultural heritage* would further help distinguish the trail.

The anthropology department at Missouri State University (2011) succinctly defines and lists the tangible and intangible elements of cultural heritage:

*Cultural Heritage* refers to the cultural legacy inherited from previous generations, a legacy which we often want to identify and preserve because it reinforces our cultural identity or sense of who we are as a people. Cultural heritage may be tangible and include archaeological sites, artifacts, buildings, historic sites, monuments, graves, and culturally significant landscapes such as sacred places. It may also be intangible, as in language, oral
histories, beliefs, practices, rituals, ceremonies, customs, traditions, music, dance, crafts, and other arts.

Interpretation of both the tangible and intangible properties of the past enables people to relate to their history. For this study, I classify a maritime heritage trail as a trail highlighting maritime culture through thematically linked archaeological and historical resources.

Heritage Tourism

Because of the flexible nature of heritage trails and their ability to adapt to a variety of environments, themes, and resources, heritage trails are utilized in many ways throughout the world. To define a heritage trail, a broad definition that can encompass every possible variation is best. The New South Wales Heritage Office (1995:4) within the Australian Government classifies heritage trails as “established routes linking significant items of an area’s heritage.” A heritage trail can also be defined as “a corridor, route or pathway that will have strong linkages with the natural environment, open space networks and cultural heritage” (Drew et al. 2003:4). In addition to the term heritage trail, heritage corridor and heritage route can describe similar endeavors. Initially, people used heritage trails more widely outside of the continental United States. For several decades before heritage trails gained popularity in the United States, visitors to Europe and the Middle East had opportunities to partake in archaeology-themed trails and tours (Philippou and Staniforth 2003:135).

Creating, developing, and maintaining heritage trails is an important part of the heritage tourism industry. Heritage tourism is defined by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2011b) as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts, and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present. It includes cultural, historic and natural resources.” Heritage-based vacationing is one of the fastest growing sectors in the tourism industry.

In Florida, cultural tourism accounts for a large percentage of visitors. The Division of Historical Resources within the Florida Department of State capitalized on this interest by creating and distributing themed statewide heritage trails. Since 1991, the Department of State has published a collection of trails surrounding a variety of Florida heritage themes: Black,
Cuban, Women’s, Jewish, World War II, Native American, Spanish Colonial, and Civil War. The Department of State’s website describes these publications as travel and educational booklets “designed to raise awareness of the state’s cultural and historical resources” (Florida Division of Historical Resources 2011). These publications are distributed not only to visitors but also to local residents and students.

The Office of Greenways and Trails in the Florida Department of Environmental Protection has several designated heritage trails within their extensive network of paddling, cycling, walking, skating, horseback riding, and hiking trails. Many of these trails use printed and digital brochures as well as several linked websites for interpretation. The Blackwater River State Park Heritage Trail follows the old Florida and Alabama Railroad, used during the 20th century for the lumber and naval aviation industry. The Florida Keys Overseas Heritage Trail is another heritage-focused trail within the Office of Greenways and Trails. The Florida Keys Overseas Heritage Trail spans from Key Largo to Key West and incorporates remains of Henry Flagler’s railroad built during the early 20th century. The Office of Greenways and Trails’ Economic Benefits of Trails webinar echoes the positive impact heritage tourism has on cities, towns, and states.

Terrestrial versus Underwater Resources

Applied anthropology, public archaeology, and historic preservation programs emphasize the importance of public education about the preservation and conservation of nonrenewable historical and archaeological resources. Although most professionals in the field agree that the general public is starting to understand the preservation message with regard to terrestrial sites, the rate of effective education tends to be slower as far as maritime and submerged sites are concerned. This different mindset for underwater resources might exist because people view maritime resources in more of a “finders-keepers mentality” or because there is “less policing” of maritime resources (Scott-Ireton 2006:5). Supporters of the preservation effort struggle to effectively communicate the importance of conserving and protecting maritime resources.
This struggle is depicted through the formation of a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention by the International Council on Monuments and Sites. In 2001, the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage was held to address growing concerns within the field for preservation of maritime resources: “the elaboration and the adoption of this Convention reflect the awareness reached within the international community of the cultural and historical significance of this heritage as well as the increasing threat this heritage faces” (Carducci 2006:i). The preservation, conservation, and stewardship of maritime resources are of foremost concern within the archaeology community. Some may argue that one possible solution to increase site stewardship is additional legal punishment and fines; however, “the answer lies in greater efforts toward public education rather than in enforcement alone” (Harris 2002:60). Education through interpretative heritage trails is one avenue toward creating public understanding, appreciation, and preservation of maritime cultural resources.

Maritime Heritage Trails

Maritime heritage trails are a popular means to present information about archaeological and historical resources. Unlike underwater heritage trails, maritime-themed routes encompass terrestrial and underwater resources, and visitation is accessible to both divers and non-divers. Interpreted sites linked in a thematic manner are effective tools for public outreach because such trails are able to capture historical, environmental, and cultural contexts of communities or even entire regions. Tyler (2000:16) explains that “visitors’ interest in historical artifacts increases significantly if objects are displayed in their actual environment rather than in museum display cases, which gives the artifacts a richer context.” By essentially producing an outdoor museum, these trails allow the public to experience firsthand archaeological resources in their original contexts.

Heritage interpretation using maritime-focused trails is relatively new in the field of anthropology and public archaeology. In 1981, the Rottnest Island Underwater Shipwreck Trail was created as the first maritime heritage trail in Australia (Philippou and Staniforth 2003:135).
An anthology entitled Submerged Cultural Resources Management: Preserving and Interpreting Our Sunken Maritime Heritage (Spirek and Scott-Ireton 2003) is “the first published source describing the scope and breadth of today’s underwater heritage trails and preserves” (Smith 2003:viii). This book presents examples of programs that use maritime heritage trails to promote the conservation of nonrenewable cultural and historical resources. The book also demonstrates the international focus on maritime heritage trails as public outreach tools, including specific applications in Australia, Canada, Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Scotland, and South Carolina.

Currently, many manifestations of maritime heritage trails exist throughout the United States. In the past few decades, trails “have become an important method of presenting a wide variety of heritage sites, [thus] enabling the public to access and enjoy these sites” (Philippou and Staniforth 2003:135). Variances in their locations (inland versus coastal), trail accessibility (land versus water based), and interpretative methods (signage versus podcasts) are numerous. In addition to the variety of formats, language used to describe interpreted sites associated with water includes shipwreck trails, shipwreck preserves, shipwreck parks, and underwater archaeological preserves (Scott-Ireton 2005). Maritime heritage trails are also a popular format for interpreting both terrestrial and underwater resources. River, bay, pond, and lake heritage trails are similar in function. Although many of these entities can and do function as maritime heritage trails, the scope of this research is solely on interpreted sites specifically called maritime heritage trails, a classification which makes strong connections to both natural and cultural heritage.

Examples of trails include many types of resources, interpretive methods, and environments. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin (2003) created hiking and biking trails with historical markers for lighthouses, scuba-diving trails with mooring buoys for shipwrecks, walking trails with waterfront parks for maritime scenery, and driving trails with maritime museums for historical collections. South Carolina has paddling and scuba-diving heritage trails along the Cooper and Ashley Rivers (Harris 2002:67-68). The Maine Maritime Heritage Trail (2012) is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to sharing nautically themed events and
locations on its website. Virginia’s Mathews Maritime Heritage Trail (2012) is a water-based trail in the Chesapeake Bay Area. The Cayman Islands Maritime Heritage Trail consists of a driving trail with signage and brochures (Cayman Islands National Museum 2010). Michigan has the Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Trail, which interprets the northeast part of the state’s rich history through signage on historically significant landscape (Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary 2010).

Within Florida, maritime heritage trails take several forms. The State of Florida’s Division of Historical Resources (2011) established a statewide Maritime Heritage Trail from Pensacola to Key West. Florida’s Maritime Heritage Trail system is an umbrella for several individual trails focusing on lighthouses, forts, environments, ports, shipwrecks, and communities. Each of these trails highlights different themed resources across the state (Smith 2007). The State of Florida’s Underwater Archaeological Preserves are locally nominated historic wrecks that are interpreted for divers and snorkelers and that also function as a maritime heritage trail (Scott-Ireton 2003). The 1733 Spanish Galleon Trail is a scuba-diving shipwreck trail interpreting the Spanish plate fleet disaster in the Florida Keys (McKinnon 2007). In 2012, the State of Florida created the Panhandle Shipwreck Trail to encourage economic growth for the Gulf Coast scuba-diving industry after the Deep Water Horizon oil spill of 2010. The Panhandle Shipwreck Trail encompasses historical and artificial reef wrecks from Pensacola to Port St. Joe. In addition to the State of Florida’s Maritime Heritage Trail, Biscayne National Park’s (2011) maritime heritage trail is a diving trail highlighting six historic shipwrecks. The flexibility of maritime trails allows historians, archaeologists, and conservationists the ability to adapt each trail to fit many different geographical locations, archaeological deposits, and local needs and interests.

Within the last 20 years, heritage professionals have addressed the growing need for guidance by creating and implementing heritage trails. Established guidelines include the public, but either in a limited scope or without specific involvement details. In 1995, the Australian New South Wales Heritage Office (1995) developed a Heritage Information Series that includes
“Guidelines for Heritage Trails,” a 30-page document intended primarily for local government officials. Created as a University of Sydney graduate student research project, the document breaks heritage trails into two categories: guided and self-guided. Recommendations for designing a trail include audience identification; potential trail sites; the path for linking trail items; accessibility of locations; funding sources; interpretation materials and content, design, and placement of materials; installation and upkeep procedures; and trail implementation logistics. Public involvement for these guidelines includes notifying individuals owning property or living near the trail in order to gauge any hesitation or negative reactions to being included along a proposed route (New South Wales Heritage Office 1995:4). The guidelines also encourage public involvement while trying to secure funding for the development of the trail and interpretative materials.

The National Heritage Board (2006) in Singapore “promotes public awareness and appreciation of our heritage through educational, outreach and community programmes.” In 2004, the National Heritage Board (2009) created “Guidelines for Developing Heritage Trails” for a program that awards student-led research promoting public appreciation for Singapore culture and history. Within the National Heritage Board’s (2004:4) six pages of guidelines, public involvement is limited to oral histories that gather personal memories and traditions.

Within the United States, many guidelines and tips for developing heritage tourism products and heritage trails refer to the standards set forth by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Founded in 1949, the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2011a) has a mission to provide “leadership, education and advocacy to save America’s diverse historic places and revitalize our communities.” Between 1990 and 1993, the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Heritage Tourism Program embarked on the Heritage Tourism Initiative. Pilot areas were chosen to develop heritage tourism in order to understand the best practices for thriving long-term programs. One tool created from this initiative was the “Four Steps for Successful and Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism” (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011b).
The first step is assessing the need for the potential viability for heritage tourism in the desired area. The potential is broken down into five subcategories of needs evaluation: attractions, visitor services, organizational capabilities, protection, and marketing. The first step also includes finding demographic information for current visitors and contacting organizations and institutions that can supply visitation data. The second step is planning and organizing human and financial resources. This level recommends gaining local support from institutions, government, and storefronts that are part of the surrounding community development area. The third step is preparing, protecting, and managing the cultural resources for heritage tourism programs, as well as balancing the visitor’s wants, the community’s needs, and the resources’ protection into a cohesive long-term interpretation plan. The final step entails marketing to create a successful program through public relations, advertisements, and partnerships.

Another outcome from the Heritage Tourism Initiative pilot study includes the “Five Principles for Successful and Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism” (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011a). By collaborating with various partners, finding a local fit, making interpretation memorable, representing authenticity, and preserving historical assets, heritage tourism programs can increase their chances for long-term success. Throughout The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s guiding steps and principles for heritage tourism development is a major emphasis on keeping the local community and visitors in mind at every stage of the process.

Since 1993, many communities have used National Trust for Historic Preservation’s steps and principles for developing cultural heritage-based tourism. For example, the Texas Heritage Trail Program created the “Heritage Tourism Guidebook” to help those interested in starting their own community programs to preserve cultural resources while increasing economic impact. The Texas Heritage Trail Program within the Texas Historical Commission (2007) is a heritage tourism program created especially for that state. Created in 1997 by the State Legislature, the Texas Heritage Trail Program used 10 existing scenic driving trails to divide the state into 10 distinct heritage areas (Texas Historical Commission 2010). Texas’s “Heritage Tourism Guidebook” (Texas Historical Commission 2007) defines tourism and heritage tourism, identifies
the growth within the industry, highlights the economic impacts, indicates the four parts of planning, and includes resources.

The four-step heritage tourism planning process, in alignment with the National Trust for Historic Preservation process, includes assessing potential; planning and organizing; preparing, protecting, and managing; and marketing for success. The “Heritage Tourism Guidebook” stresses that when developing a heritage tourism site, “the community and the resources must come first, and the benefits must be seen as more than economic” (Texas Historical Commission 2007:13). The Texas guidebook encourages public involvement while assessing potential audiences. Recommendations include obtaining visitor demographics and identifying which visitors would engage in heritage tourism sites. Suggestions include audience analysis through questionnaires, telephone surveys, focus groups, observations, photographs, guest books, and interviews. Although 12 commonly used methods for collecting information are included (Texas Historical Commission 2007:17), the guidebook notes that “each of these methods is complex, and further research, information and assistance should be gathered before development.” Oral histories with local residents are encouraged in order to help with conducting historical research and finding historical photos (Texas Historical Commission 2007:32).

In 2008, the county of Sussex in Delaware developed the “Heritage Tourism Planning Guidebook,” citing the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s recommendations. Sussex County’s guidebook focuses on how to implement heritage tourism programs within the area (Jiang and Homsey 2008). Delaware employs a “SWOT” analysis for assessing potential tourism endeavors: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. The guidelines emphasize identifying and understanding stakeholders such as “local officials, state and county government officials, private and nonprofit groups, the business community, and private citizens” (Jiang and Homsey 2008:18). Similar to the Texas approach, Sussex’s guidebook suggests using “surveys to collect stakeholder opinions about local heritage tourism programs or to help develop a set of shared values and goals for the community” (Jiang and Homsey 2008:23). Surveys should
specifically identify behaviors of people who currently use or who have used heritage tourism endeavors (Jiang and Homsey 2008:16).

Many of these established guidelines include recommendations for public input into the developmental stages of heritage tourism. Since most of the reviewed literature focuses on the full production of heritage trails from beginning to end, addressing public involvement is limited. As depicted in the Texas and Sussex County approaches, surveys and interviews are encouraged to elicit community needs and wants but go no further to explain how to develop these tools effectively. The ethnographic model for the Apalachicola River Maritime Heritage Trail addresses this void in literature and expands upon current themes of making past cultures relevant to today’s society.

The Apalachicola River Maritime Heritage Trail model uses ethnographic research to engage public memory not as a source of stories and photos, but rather as a source to understand the local cultural basis for an effective heritage trail. By explaining the theoretical background and methodologies used in developing surveys for heritage tourism endeavors—specifically maritime heritage trails—practitioners can better understand how to design, create, and distribute questionnaires. A trail developed through this type of ethnographic research should have local relevance, which is essential for local buy in, local preservation efforts, and local promotion of the trail itself.

Heritage trails illuminate past people and cultures through historical interpretations. Interpretation is the format through which ideas are communicated. Tilden (2007:33) defines interpretation as “an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information.” The National Trust for Historic Preservation explains heritage tourism interpretation as “making your community’s history, culture, or scenery emotionally accessible to visitors” (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011d). Once the decision is made about which story of past cultures to interpret, the next question is how to convey the message. Interpretation can happen in many formats, including brochures, websites, signs,
exhibits, podcasts, living history, maps, Smartphone applications, audio tours, guidebooks, and interactive kiosks. The goal of any interpretation material is to “engage visitors in experiences they understand, learn from, and respond to emotionally,” thus making the past relevant (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011d). Implementers of the ARMHT can choose the most appropriate interpretation format that best suits their particular audience, budget, and resources.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach for the development of the ARMHT is three-fold. First, known heritage resources were located and mapped to identify possible trail sites. Next, the ethnographic framework defined the parameters for public input. Finally, data collection techniques indicated the process for gathering information pertaining to the wants and needs of communities surrounding the Apalachicola River.

Heritage Resources

Maritime heritage trails are educational, engaging public archaeology outreach tools that transport audiences back in time while immersing them in the environmental and cultural context of each location. Heritage resources are cultural, historical, and natural entities that society “inherit[s] from the past and use[s] in the present day” and that can represent local, state, or national significance (Timothy 2011:3). Whether urban or rural, built or natural, tangible or intangible, ultimately every place has heritage resources.

In order to create a maritime heritage trail for the Apalachicola River, I first needed to identify the known archaeological and historical resources in and along the river. Although many local-level institutions have compiled data on known historical resources, I used statewide and national repositories with information vetted by heritage professionals. The three sources used to identity heritage resources included two publicly accessible websites, the National Register of Historic Places and the Florida Historical Markers Program, and one restricted database, Florida Master Site File (FMSF). I utilized data for all archaeological, cultural, historical, and natural resources located within the six counties surrounding the Apalachicola River to generate a preliminary list of maritime resources for the maritime heritage trail. The Florida counties bordering the Apalachicola River are Jackson, Gadsden, Calhoun, Liberty, Gulf, and Franklin.

Coordinated by the National Park Service, the National Register of Historic Places (2012) is the official federal list of nominated eligible properties that are significant to America’s history.
Currently 80,000 properties are listed on the register that represent a variety of buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts with local, state, or national importance. The online database associated with the National Register’s website allows users to search by resource name or type and geographical location. Although digitizing nomination forms, photographs, and maps is an unfinished and ongoing National Park Service project, general information for all listed properties is available.

The Florida Historical Markers Program within the State of Florida’s Division of Historical Resources maintains an online statewide database of official markers. The program “recognizes historic resources, persons, and events that are significant in the areas of architecture, archaeology, Florida history, and traditional culture by promoting the placing of historic markers and plaques at sites of historical and visual interest to visitors” (Florida Historical Marker Program 2012). The program has two types of marker designations: site and landmark. In Florida, there is a distinct difference between the two. A site must be at least 30 years old and must have regional or state significance, and a landmark must be at least 50 years old with regional, state, or national significance. Official state markers are searchable by county on the State of Florida’s website. Most marker listings on the website contain the title, location, county, city, descriptive text, and sponsors.

The FMSF is the state’s official inventory of historical resources and maintains copies of manuscripts pertaining to cultural and archaeological properties. The FMSF started at the University of Florida in the 1940s and has since evolved through a number of different locations and formats (Vincent S. Birdsong 2011, elec. comm.). Currently housed within the Division of Historical Resources, the FMSF contains more than 180,000 inventoried resources (FMSF 2012). The FMSF has specific forms for documenting terrestrial archaeological sites, shipwrecks, bridges, structures, cemeteries, lighthouses, and historic districts. All of these forms are categorized by county, specifically township and range. In Florida, the exact site location is exempt from the Sunshine Public Information law in order to protect these nonrenewable resources from non-research activities such as looting. Archaeologists and other heritage
professionals are able to obtain site location information after registering with the FMSF office to obtain access to the site file forms containing exact spatial coordinates for the boundaries of known sites.

After potential maritime heritage trail resources from the FMSF, the Florida Historical Markers Program, and the National Register for Historic Places were identified, the information was focused on resources in proximity to the Apalachicola River. In order to represent the geographical location of these maritime resources, I used geographical information systems (GIS) to plot known archaeological and historical sites along the Apalachicola River. As described by Esri (2012), one of the leading GIS technologies companies, “GIS integrates hardware, software, and data for capturing, managing, analyzing, and displaying all forms of geographically referenced information.”

The Archaeology Institute at the University of West Florida (UWF) utilizes GIS technologies for academic and contract archaeological projects. Because of the Archaeology Institute’s previous research within the Florida panhandle, GIS maps already exist for the Apalachicola River area and include environment features, transportation corridors, and public lands boundaries for the six counties surrounding the river. The Archaeology Institute integrated the FMSF’s GIS data of known archaeological and historical resources into the Apalachicola River area map. Since the original Archaeology Institute maps include FMSF data from previous years, a request for the most recent tabular GIS data for the six counties surrounding the Apalachicola River ensured inclusion of all known recorded sites. The FMSF resource data is divided into the following categories: archaeological site, National Register district, resource group, historic structure, bridge, cemetery, and shipwreck.

Using ArcGIS 9 software to view the counties surrounding the Apalachicola River, I selected specific data layers for visibility, including rivers, counties and cities, highways, and all cultural resources. Hiding some of the GIS data layers created a cleaner map for identifying historical resource locations in association with familiar landmarks such as highways and towns.
Since the purpose of the maritime heritage trail model is to highlight resources that are visible while traveling on or alongside the river, resources closest to the river were favored for trail inclusion over resources located farther away from the river. Available information built into the FMSF’s GIS data includes each site or survey number, name, type of resource, and associated time period. An email request for the full manuscripts associated with each resource enabled access to original site forms, historic and modern photos, various types of maps, and historical background when available. Potential sites include resources within one mile of the Apalachicola River.

Ethnographic Research

Using ethnographic research to develop a model maritime heritage trail for the Apalachicola River is one way to identify the needs and wants of the trail’s potential audience. The term *ethnography*, when used as a verb, simply “means the collection of data that describe a culture” (Bernard 1998:16). Although traditional thoughts regarding the use of ethnography among anthropologists may invoke images of researchers immersing themselves into an indigenous culture within the depths of a jungle, ethnographic research is widely used in everyday society. From large-scale international companies maneuvering cultural differences among business partners to college campuses understanding student alcohol use, collecting information pertaining to a specific group within a society can help solve modern problems.

The length of time needed for ethnographic research varies greatly depending on the familiarity with the specific culture group and its population. Bernard (1995:72) states that “it takes a year or more to do an ethnographic study of a culture that is very different from your own.” However, ethnographers working within their own culture with a narrowed research question can collect, analyze, and interpret research data in a much shorter timeframe. In fact, “much of today’s applied anthropological research is done in weeks or months, using rapid assessment methods” (Bernard 2011:57). Anthropologists employ rapid assessment methods when they have limited time to explore topics, when “how” or “what” questions need to be
answered, and when individuals in their natural setting need to view researchers as partners instead of as experts (Beebe 2001).

This thesis used a compressed ethnographic research design for the development of a maritime heritage trail for the Apalachicola River. Compressed ethnographies are also referred to as “rapid ethnographic procedures, rapid rural appraisals, focused ethnographic studies, and brief ethnographies” (Trotter and Schensul 1998:717). A compressed ethnographic research design was suitable for this project because (a) the researcher is familiar with the geographical area of the Apalachicola River and has lived within northwest Florida for over 25 years; (b) the research questions did not attempt to address a “wide spectrum of beliefs and behaviors in different cultural domains”; and (c) local cultural experts helped steer research design and data collection techniques (LeCompte and Schensul 1999b:88).

Typical compressed ethnographies’ timeframes can range from a few days to several weeks, resulting in a more cost-effective budget for researchers (Trotter and Schensul 1998:717). Although “rapid appraisal,” “focused ethnography,” and “microethnography” are the fastest growing ethnography techniques, Stewart (1998:20) warns about the use of these methods:

[Despite] their alluring requirements of very modest brushes with the field and reliance instead on focus groups and interviews, these approaches have a clear ecological advantage—in maximizing publications and minimizing expenses—over traditional ethnography. . . . The less the time for fieldwork, the less the ethnography will be an ethnography.

Others echo Stewart’s concerns about researchers choosing compressed ethnographies over traditional ethnographies purely because of the perceived ease and benefits. Trotter and Schensul (1998:78) state that “although brief ethnography appears simple, it is more difficult and demanding than other forms of ethnographic research or assessment.” These considerations and warnings were taken into account for the ARMHT model.
In order for a method or model to be used, it must be applicable to potential users. If the theoretical framework behind an ethnographic design is one that does not take reproduction into consideration, then the design will not be used no matter how perfect it is. LeCompte and Schensul (1999b:88) explain that “there are many occasions when resources of time, money, and staff do not permit conduct of a full-fledged ethnography . . . [M]ethodologists have designed modifications of traditional ethnography that accommodate to shortened time lines and/or multiple sites.” I chose to use a compressed ethnographic approach for the model ARMHT over other forms of ethnography because of the likelihood of its reproduction by future trail implementers.

**Participant Observation**

Face-to-face observation or fieldwork is a critical component in all ethnographic research. Bernard (1995:136) broadly defines participant observation as “getting close to people and making them feel comfortable enough with your presence so that you can observe and record information about their lives.” Although participant observation is universally accepted as one of the dominant research methods in cultural anthropology, there are several definitions and distinctions for what participant observation is and is not (Dewalt et al. 1998:259). I used Spradely’s (1980:54) dual-purpose definition of a participant observer: someone who engages in and observes activities. Spradley (1980:53) purposefully makes a clear distinction between “ordinary participants” and “participant observers.” People are ordinary participants in their known cultural environments by partaking in everyday societal activities. Conversely, participant observers are “explicitly aware” of factors associated with and influencing cultural activities and personal interactions by making broader emic and etic observations and recording each experience (Spradley 1980:53-58).

Developing the model for the ARMHT required several levels of participation observation. Since ethnographies “require that researchers develop considerable rapport with and trust among the people under study,” a substantial amount of time was dedicated to participatory observation (LeCompte and Schensul 1999b:85). First, passive participation, or
“hanging out” as Bernard (1995:151) describes it, creates a sense of place while observing local river communities. Next, moderate participation gains social acceptance by balancing “being an insider and an outsider” through observation and limited participation (Spradley 1980:60). Finally, active participation enables full participation in local activities associated with the Apalachicola River.

**Community Involvement**

One of the goals of public archaeology is to partner with existing groups in an effort to help foster better relationships between professional archaeologists and local citizens. In alignment with public archaeology goals, “ethnographic field research depends on developing close personal relationships with community members over time” (Trotter and Schensul 1998:718). Since the ARMHT utilizes a compressed ethnographic research design, it is crucial not only to make connections but also to include local expertise in the initial stages of development. The model for the ARMHT relies heavily on working with existing institutions and local community members to assist in its development.

Currently, many organizations are tied to the Apalachicola River. Although the vast majority of these organizations are oriented toward preserving the ecology, geography, and recreational use of the Apalachicola River, they are potential users for the heritage trail and are included as key informants. Through the incorporation of stewardship of cultural resources with ecological resources, the ARMHT can include educational information about the important connection between both resources, thus reinforcing the preservation and conservation message.

The Apalachicola Maritime Museum (2008) was “organized exclusively for charitable, educational, and scientific purposes.” The museum has an active sailing program, allowing visitors to take trips along Apalachicola Bay. In addition to its sailing program, the Apalachicola Maritime Museum collaborates with other organizations to offer kayak river trips exploring the river. Although the itinerary of the trip mentions a few cultural activities, the predominant focus is on the ecology of the river.
The Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve (2012) is a federal and state entity whose mission is to manage, research, monitor, and interpret coastal natural resources along the Apalachicola River. Staff at the reserve work closely with regional universities and other agencies to provide research opportunities and student fellowships. In addition to scientific research, the Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve has an active educational outreach program that includes speaker series, field trips, and interpretive materials.

The Apalachicola Riverkeeper is a not-for-profit organization focusing on environmental advocacy for the river. A member of the worldwide Waterkeeper Alliance, the Apalachicola Riverkeeper (2012) operates with a mission to instill stewardship and protection for the river’s bay, watersheds, and tributaries “in order to improve and maintain its environmental integrity and to preserve the natural, scenic, recreational, and commercial fishing character.” Local members and volunteers are active in paddling trips, coastal clean-ups, and fundraising events.

Creating close community relations with local potential maritime heritage trail users is imperative to compressed ethnographies. Established organizations such as the Apalachicola Maritime Museum, the Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve, and Apalachicola Riverkeeper provide past and current information regarding river usage trends, local politics, sensitive community topics, and prudent public concerns. In addition to providing local insight, these partners brought a dataset of current members and volunteers, who participated in surveys associated with the development of a maritime heritage trail.

Data Collection

Before any data collection for this research commenced, an Institutional Review Board (IRB) review was required to approve all aspects of research involving human participants. The United States government mandates that IRB committees be “set up by an organization to review, approve, and regulate research conducted by its members, on its premises, or under its sponsorship” (LeCompte and Schensul 1999b:188). Any entity receiving federal funding of any kind must comply with the IRB mandate and must maintain a process for review and approval of research involving human subjects before the commencement of a study. Although
originally established for research involving human subjects within the biomedical fields, some anthropological research falls under IRB review (Fluehr-Lobban 1998:182).

Since the core of the maritime heritage trail model involved the public at the developmental stages of a public archaeology outreach program and since the research was conducted under the direction of a federally funded institution, UWF IRB approval (Appendix A) was required. The IRB application at UWF requires research objectives, participant recruitment, confidentiality of data, methods, associated risks, informed consent, and samples of any interviews and questionnaires.

For this research, potential human research participants included adults who were at least 18 years of age and associated with the Apalachicola River. Participants included the following: federal, state, and local officials; private and public landowners; recreational users of the river; business owners; private and public organizations and institutions; and local and visiting citizens. Participation in the project was voluntary; thus, numbers ranged between 5 and 100 participants during each ethnographic stage.

All data gathered through this research remained confidential and were shared only with my thesis committee. All names remained anonymous. Multiple stages of this research, including interviews and questionnaires, used a grand tour approach. The term grand tour derives from “the common experience of having someone show you around their house, place of business, or school” and highlighting the “major features” of the building without going into specific details about activities or private information (Spradley 1980:77). I used general open-ended questions to elicit respondent-structured answers. The ethnographic research for the ARMHT posed no immediate or long-range risks to participants. The only foreseen risk during this research might have arisen from participants voluntarily talking about illegal activities, such as archaeological site looting or illicit drug activity. Informed consent was obtained through a written letter or email that used simple language to detail the project, the participants’ role, and provide my contact information.
To obtain public input for the ARMHT in a compressed ethnographic research design, several different techniques for data collection are encouraged by professionals in the field of ethnography. LeCompte and Schensul (1999b:89) favor “cognitive elicitation techniques, such as listing and pilesorts, group interviews with representative samples of individuals, in-depth interviews with cultural experts or key informants, and brief surveys administered to small representative samples” because of the techniques’ suitability for short collection timeframe requirements as well as for cross referencing datasets. I used a variety of data collection techniques to understand local wants and needs regarding the development of a new interpretive trail.

Cognitive elicitation techniques “explore how people think about and locate meaning” in their surrounding environments (Trotter and Schensul 1998:708). For example, free listing is a cognitive technique that “can be used to find out where to concentrate effort in applied research, and especially in rapid assessment” (Bernard 2011:288). Free listing helps identify elements about the data domain as a whole—in this case the Apalachicola River—instead of individual respondents within the domain (J. Schensul et al. 1999:121). I used the free listing technique to narrow concerns, attitudes, and river usage pertaining to the Apalachicola River with short general questions such as “Who is responsible for the river and its resources,” “What is most significant about the Apalachicola River,” and “How do people use the Apalachicola River?” The frequency and consistency of responses help to categorize common answers and to label groups using culturally specific vernacular language (Trotter and Schensul 1998:709).

Informal group interviews with potential users of the ARMHT included boaters and kayakers using the river recreationally, tourists enjoying riverfront communities, and heritage professionals interpreting the river’s resources. Characteristics of informal interviews include spontaneous questions during the course of conversation with “self-selected” individuals in their natural settings (J. Schensul et al. 1999:56). In the field, informal group interviews produced more information within a short timeframe from a larger population sample than did interviews with individuals. Although group interviews have several advantages, group interviews are
influenced by interaction among participants and do not necessarily represent all opinions of specific individuals (Weller 1998:372).

Interviews with cultural experts representing different types of potential maritime heritage trail users illuminated various public opinions in regard to the Apalachicola River and the development of a trail. By utilizing key informants’ local expertise, this data collection technique established “ethnographical insight otherwise obtained through more time-intensive participant observation and in-depth interviewing” (Trotter and Schensul 1998:717). Although interviewing experts is widely accepted as an established method, Aunger (2004:112) challenges that key informants “who by definition are not representative of the group from which they come” should not be “assumed to be sufficient” in accomplishing the goal of characterizing a cultural group. In addition to free listing, informal group interviews, and cultural expert interviews, I also employed a formal questionnaire among a small sample of individuals who might potentially use a maritime heritage trail. The use of the questionnaire as a data collection technique strengthened the validity of results by collecting opinions and feedback regarding the proposed trail from individuals not considered key informants, thus creating a larger representative sample.

**Questionnaire Development**

The use of survey methodology to obtain information in a standardized way is prevalent throughout today’s modern society: “surveys are the most widely used form of systematic data collection. . . . They are used in the needs assessments that precede program planning and implementation” (LeCompte and Schensul 1999b:68). There are as many types of surveys as there are uses, and survey methodology includes two broad categories: interviews and questionnaires. The main distinction between the two is the identity of the response recorder: Researchers complete interviews, while respondents answer questionnaires.

For the ARMHT model, I considered several different data collection methods, including door to door, telephone, mail, online, and drop and collect. Although each method had its own advantages and disadvantages, many were not feasible avenues for future trail implementers.
to reproduce because of the money, time, and personnel needed in association with survey delivery, collection, and analysis (Bernard 1995:258). Conversely, the use of SurveyMonkey provided a cost-effective platform for creating, distributing, and interpreting an unsupervised, self-administered, Web-based questionnaire for the ARMHT. SurveyMonkey is a popular online company that creates, manages, and analyzes digital surveys. Advantages of using a self-administered survey include limiting unintentional bias that could occur during face-to-face interviews or supervised questionnaires, standardizing all questions, and delivering a greater number of questions within a short timeframe (Bernard 1995:260; Bourque and Fielder 2003:20).

Information from the questionnaire can serve as the basis for data collection for eventual implementers of the Apalachicola River Maritime Heritage Trail. With the data gathered from this survey, potential trail developers can tailor interpretation to their local audiences. The purpose of this questionnaire was to obtain answers to the following questions:

- Who is using the Apalachicola River?
- What are current views and attitudes of the river?
- When, how, and why are people interacting with the river?
- What concerns do people have about the current conditions of the river?
- Do people currently use any educational programs associated with the river?
- Is there an interest for a maritime heritage trail?
- What historical time periods interest people the most?
- What format and length of maritime heritage trail is wanted?

The survey used a combination of question types: multiple choice, dichotomous, ranking, contingency, and open ended. Although experts recommend that a self-administered questionnaire consist primarily of closed-ended questions, the Apalachicola River Questionnaire (ARQ) contained a few open-ended questions relating to abstract topics such as ownership of natural and cultural resources (Bourque and Fielder 2003:20).

When using a questionnaire for data collection, it is imperative for researchers to accept that the rate of return for this technique is relatively low. I accepted this innate limitation of
self-administered surveys and attempted to increase questionnaire participation by carefully constructing a sense of professionalism as well as considering question order, visual appeal, and overall length (Bernard 1995:277-281). Although an unsupervised questionnaire can lower unintentional intimidation and personal influence upon respondents, Aunger (2004:34) stresses the need for attention to the “priming effects of question order on the nature of responses to particular questions.” In addition to limited completion rates and bias-influenced responses, an online survey limits participation to individuals with computer and Internet access. I am aware of the economic and educational bias associated with using a strictly Web-based questionnaire.

**Focus Group**

Many participants in the in-depth interviews of cultural experts and key informants also served as participants in a focus group. Run by a researcher, focus groups usually consist of 4 to 12 people who engage in “series of discussions designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest” (Krueger and Casey 2009:2). Effective focus groups must be homogeneously appropriate for the research question; therefore, all members of the maritime heritage trail focus group have some connection to the Apalachicola River and are not limited by demographic traits (Bernard 1995:228). Trotter and Schensul (1998:717-718) stress that “critical to focused ethnography is prior determination of all the important sectors contributing to the problem, from which researchers can draw representative samples of key information and focus group respondents.” Recruitment for the ARMHT focus group included individuals from five categories of potential trail users:

- Organization tied to the river
- Institution interpreting cultural and historical resources
- Individual living along the river
- City, county, state, or federal official
- Visitor, past resident, or researcher

In regard to the questions asked during ethnographic research, focus group members ultimately “construct validity” so that there is a “match between the meaning intended by the research
and meaning assumed by the respondent” (LeCompte and Schensul 1999b:71). In addition to helping formulate appropriate research questions and illuminating culturally specific attitudes, members of the focus group also served as members of the pilot test group for the formal online questionnaire. The purpose of pilot-testing a survey is to “ensure that the population will understand the questions and to establish the adequacy and range of the distribution of responses for each variable” (S. Schensul et al. 1999:169). Without members of the Apalachicola River Maritime Heritage Trail focus group, the questionnaire component of this research would not have been a strong data collection technique.

**Analysis**

Ethnographic research is composed of two main areas of data analysis: qualitative and quantitative (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983; Agar 1986; Kirk and Miller 1986; J. Schensul et al. 1999; Aunger 2004). S. Schensul et al. (1999:195-196) caution that “the problem for ethnographers lies in how to integrate the results of each kind of data analysis so that they complement and reinforce one another.” Analysis of qualitative data can vary from relatively simple to rather complex, depending on the nature of the data being obtained (LeCompte and Schensul 1999a:6). The majority of researchers use qualitative techniques for analyzing ethnographic data obtained from participant observation, free listing, group and key informant interviews, and the focus group. The ARQ collected a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. Although Trotter and Schensul (1998:171) explain that compressed ethnographies “generally do not make use of quantitative sampling or survey techniques,” the online questionnaire collected quantitative data. Quantitative data is potentially useful for assessment abilities, funding potentials, and overall justification of the ARMHT for future implementers.

By analyzing qualitative and quantitative data gathered from a variety of data collection methods, the ethnographic component of this research identified contemporary issues as well as the wants and needs of the communities surrounding the Apalachicola River. These data ultimately influenced the development and interpretation methods for the ARMHT model. As addressed by Jameson (2007:12), “public interpretation is probably the most important activity
that occurs at an historic site in that it delivers the conservation, education, and stewardship message that represent the transcendent humanistic value of the resource or site.” Public interpretation that is influenced by public opinion creates a sense of ownership which in turn should better promote cultural stewardship among its users.
CHAPTER IV
STUDY AREA BACKGROUND

Developing effective interpretative heritage outreach tools requires extensive research into the study area. This chapter discusses the environmental and historical contexts of the Apalachicola River. Historical background research of the Apalachicola River contextualizes the existing maritime features on the landscape, thus strengthening the stewardship message of the ARMHT by demonstrating the connection between modern societies and past peoples.

Environment

The Apalachicola River is located in the Florida panhandle and is the largest river by volume in the state (Gibson 1979:13). The waters of the Apalachicola River “flow in a southerly, sometimes corkscrew manner before emptying into the Gulf of Mexico” (Turner 2003:1). The river is 105 miles long, has 17,200 square miles of drainage area, and is alluvial, transporting “sediment, usually from upstream erosion of silt and clay,” giving the river a “muddy brown color” (Marth and Marth 1990:19). The Apalachicola River is part of a larger river system that incorporates the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers (Owens 1966:1). The Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint river system drains a large portion of the southeast United States, including parts of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. The river’s access to the interior southeast as well as the Gulf of Mexico is a significant geographical characteristic.

Water erosion of quartz crystal from the Appalachian Mountains during the last Ice Age traveled to the Gulf of Mexico via the Apalachicola River. Because of thousands of years of depositional stages and weathering, these quartz crystals are responsible for the sugar-white sand beaches found along the Florida panhandle (McGovern 2007:50). The upper portions of the Apalachicola River consist of limestone bedrock bottom, and the lower sections of the river that are closer to the coast have a sandy bottom. The geology along the river’s bank is diverse, including large sandy bluffs, bottomland hardwood forests, aquifer fed springs, cypress swamps, grassy marshes, and an estuarine bay (Benke and Cushing 2005). The Apalachicola-
Chattahoochee-Flint river valley historically served as a flood plain, with the Apalachicola River spilling its waters onto the surrounding land seasonally. The Apalachicola River is formed at the confluence of the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers. Currently, the confluence begins at Lake Seminole, which has inundated the former river confluence. Lake Seminole is located on the border of Florida and Georgia and is a manmade reservoir created when the United States Army Corps of Engineers built the Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam during the 1950s.

The river’s biodiversity is one of the highest in the southeastern United States. The freshwater ecosystem creates a haven for a variety of species. The Apalachicola River basin, which consists of the areas drained by the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint and its tributaries, “has the highest species density of terrestrial and aquatic amphibians and reptiles in all of North America north of Mexico” (Benke and Cushing 2005:143). The *Torreya taxifolia*, or the Florida Torreya, is an endangered evergreen tree with needle-like leaves found only along the eastern banks of the Apalachicola River. Apalachicola Bay, because of its rich estuarine nature and nutrients, is well-known for its significant quality of shellfish, such as oysters. Some of the river’s wildlife inhabitants include river otters, alligators, water snakes, striped bass, snapping turtles, salamanders, white pelicans, and bald eagles (Benke and Cushing 2005:144-145).

**Historical Context**

The Apalachicola River has a rich and diverse history. Native American and European inhabitants of the area utilized the river’s resources for sustenance, transportation, and commerce. The river’s direct access from the Gulf of Mexico to the southeast interior of the United States was significant for military, economic, and political ventures. Analysis and interpretation of primary historical documents, maps, and photographs provide insight into the changing dynamics of the river’s usage throughout time.

Although a variety of prehistoric archaeological resources are located in the area, the ARMHT model focuses only on the historic time period because of my interests and because the project scope had to be kept manageable. The classification the historic period varies depending on region and research. In the southeastern United States, most academics categorize the historic
period as beginning in the early 16th century with the arrival of Spanish explorers. The FMSF
designates Florida’s historic time periods to include the following: First Spanish, 1513 to 1763;
British, 1763 to 1783; Second Spanish, 1783 to 1821; Territorial Development, 1821 to 1845;
Statehood and Antebellum, 1845 to 1860; Civil War, 1861 to 1865; Reconstruction, 1866 to
1879; Post to Reconstruction, 1880 to 1897; Spanish/American War, 1898 to 1916; World War
I and Aftermath, 1917 to 1920; Boom Times, 1921 to 1929; Depression and New Deal, 1930 to
1940; World War II and Aftermath, 1941 to 1950; Modern, 1950 to present. For this research,
names and dates associated with the historic time periods are defined more broadly than they are
in the FMSF classifications. Although historical archaeologists usually classify archaeological
and historical resources as being at least 50 years old, this research includes recent history and
extends the “historic” time to present day in order to include resources significant to modern
communities.

This research does not attempt to summarize almost 500 years of history in one chapter.
Instead, this section provides a concise overview of northwest Florida’s historical periods
to provide context for interpreted resources along the river. During the Spanish period, the
boundary of La Florida greatly exceeded that of the modern-day state of Florida. Because of
the complexity of the history of La Florida and of what is today Florida, this section focuses
on presenting an overview of the historical periods in northwest Florida and, more specifically,
within the Florida counties drained by the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (Figure 2). For
this thesis, northwest Florida “consists of the sixteen counties west of the Aucilla River,” a
classification which parallels the Florida Division of Historical Resources’ (1990) definition.
For thousands of years before European contact, native populations lived in what is today the state of Florida. Florida’s warm climate and access to inland and ocean waterways provided a suitable living environment for animals and humans alike. Within the peninsula of Florida, “nearly three dozen major rivers course through the land, nearly 8,000 lakes exist, plus the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico wash much of the Florida land mass” (Turner 2003:1). The Spanish were the first Europeans to visit this area in the early 16th century; the First Spanish period in Florida extends from 1513 to 1763. Early Spanish explorers to Florida included Juan Ponce de Leon in 1513, Pánfilo Narváez in 1528, Hernando de Soto in 1539, and Tristán de Luna y Arellano in 1559 (Memory et al. 1998:7).

During the 16th century, the geographical location for new settlements, the potential for gold and silver, and an abundant native population for slaves were key factors in attempts to explore Florida (Weber 1992:30-59). Positioned in the middle of Spanish mercantile shipping routes between Mexico and Europe, Florida was a strategic location for Spain to control to protect its vessels, crews, and cargos sailing with the Gulf Stream and trade winds (Walton 1994:54). The Spanish gave the river its modern name by using the “Indian word Apalachicola in reference to the river and to all the Indians that lived along the lower part of the Chattahoochee River” (Owens 1966:3).
Spanish involvement in Florida during the 17th century predominately focused on establishing missions to spread Roman Catholic and European ideologies and to recruit Native American converts. The Spanish mission system stretched from St. Augustine through Tallahassee to Pensacola (Worth 2008). Although the mission system around the Apalachicola River was not as extensive as in the Tallahassee and St. Augustine areas, a few missions such as Santa Cruz de Sabacola, which was located near the present-day city of Chattahoochee, existed near the river’s headwaters (Memory et al. 1998:7). Toward the beginning of the 18th century, raids from the north by the British and Creek Indians devastated the coastal missions by burning compounds, killing friars and missionaries, and scattering native inhabitants (Gannon 2003:14).

During the time of struggle for control of the New World by colonial powers, the countries of Spain, England, and France competed for the best political, economic, and environmental lands. The early 18th century in Florida and other Gulf Coast states was characterized by colonial powers building garrisons, forts, and presidios for military defense from coastal and inland threats (Athens et al. 1993:166-168). In 1754, the French and Indian War began over the conflicting expansion of French and English territories within the North American continent (Tebeau 1980:72).

With the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763 ending the Seven Years’ War, Spain ceded Florida to Britain. This treaty marked the beginning of the British period which spanned 1763 to 1783. The Apalachicola River became a political border for distinguishing geographical ownership. Historical documents describe Britain’s newly acquired territory as West and East Florida: “East Florida is bounded to the Westward by the Gulf of Mexico and the Apalachicola river [sic]; to the Northward, by a line drawn from that part of the said river where the Chattahoochee and Flint rivers meet” (Boswell 1776:406). The Apalachicola River, centrally located within the panhandle, became important to colonial powers. Although the river’s delta was often classified as a marsh, the lands further north were “heavily populated by Indians, rich in forest and game products” (Owens 1966:2) and became the sought-after prize of northwest Florida.
With the onset of the American Revolutionary War in 1775, British northwest Florida saw an increase in population from loyal British subjects seeking refuge from the American rebellion further north (Athens et al. 1993:169). The period is marked by the establishment of British trading companies made possible through increased interaction between British settlers and Native American groups (Coker and Watson 1986). Panton, Leslie and Company, led by businessman William Panton, was started east of the Apalachicola River in 1783. Building upon the established success of Panton, the British governor implored him to “erect a trading post along the Apalachicola River with fixed prices” (Memory et al. 1998:7). The trading store at Prospect Bluffs along the banks of the Apalachicola River was established soon after.

By the end of the American Revolutionary War in 1783, and with the defeat of the British garrison at Pensacola in 1781, Spain had regained control of West and East Florida, establishing the Second Spanish period, which lasted from 1783 to 1821 (Gannon 2003:24). In his account of his travels during the latter years of the 1790s, French nobleman Duke de la Rochefoucault Liancourt noted that the population to the east of the Apalachicola River was relatively small but had established rice and cotton plantations (Mavor 1809:283). Liancourt also noted East Florida’s environment as having large trees consisting of “red and white oaks, cypress, cucumber trees, and red and white cedar, and hickory” (Mavor 1809:283).

Although Spain regained control of Florida, the trading networks and trading posts established by British subjects were left in some places. Panton, Leslie and Company prospered and dominated European trade with Native Americans in Florida and elsewhere as a result of the Spanish Empire’s allowing special rights for the English company (Gannon 2003:26). Soon, rival trading companies vying for control over the Apalachicola River initiated raids against Panton, Leslie and Company during the 1790s (Horrell 2005:41). After the death of William Panton in 1801, the company was renamed after one of the surviving partners in 1804, becoming John Forbes and Company (Owens 1966:36). The company struggled to recover from the raids, reorganization of the company after Panton’s death, and unpaid Native American debt. To recoup outstanding debt owed to the company by Native Americas, an agreement allowed transfer
of land titles in place of cash. In what is now known as the Forbes Purchase, the company exchanged Native American trade debt for 1.3 million acres east of the Apalachicola River (McCarthy 2004:40). By maintaining British and Native American trading relationships, the Spanish government benefited economically from imposed fees associated with customs and movement of goods (Wright 1967).

During the War of 1812, the United States and England both established military strongholds within Spanish Florida (Gannon 2003:27). To protect Florida from being subsumed into the new United States, Britain and Spain worked together to safeguard the region by increasing military presence (Horrell 2005:41). Protecting the Apalachicola River and its key geographical advantages for economic and military efforts was of foremost importance to Britain. As a result, the British established an octagonal fort near the site of the Forbes trading post along the Apalachicola River in 1814. The fort, sometimes referred to as the “Negro Fort,” housed many Native Americans and runaway African slaves who were recruited to fight against the United States. Although the British abandoned the fort in 1814 at the end of the war, their recruiting efforts had significant impact on the demographics of the area (Yomans 2012:17).

Many of the recruited population stayed at the Negro Fort and continued British efforts to protect and defend its strategic position on a high river bluff that provided river traffic protection as well as mercantile advantages. In 1816 during the onset of First Seminole War, the United States embarked on an effort to ensure a safe shipping route up the Apalachicola River by removing the constant threat of attack from the fort. Ordered by General Andrew Jackson, two United States Army gunboats and troops maneuvered up the Apalachicola River and fired upon the Negro Fort (Horrell 2005:42). With a single cannon shot to the powder magazine, United States troops destroyed the Negro Fort, killing more than 250 individuals (Tebeau 1980:110; Memory et al. 1998:12). Utilizing the same strategic location of the Negro Fort along the Apalachicola River, Jackson built a new fort named Fort Gadsden. Although located within Spanish-claimed lands, the United States Army occupied Fort Gadsden from 1818 to 1821.
Historical accounts of the Apalachicola River during the Second Spanish period depict the river’s use for political advantage and economical venture. The following historical account characterizes the Apalachicola River:

[It is] susceptible of immense advantages to the settlement of the country; which the sale of lands by Messrs. John Forbes & Co. to several enterprising gentlemen will promote in a very rapid degree; the most ample means, and all possible encouragement, being offered by them to settlers. It was on this river that the trade with the Indians was to have been carried on, by agreement with the Upper and Lower Creeks; and is more calculated for the prosecution of that trade than any other part of the country (Forbes 1821:121).

Eventually, Spain surrendered East and West Florida to the United States in 1821, establishing the Territory of Florida.

_Territorial, Statehood, and Antebellum, 1821 to 1860_

Cultural and economic clashes between new settlers in the Florida Territory and existing Native American populations resulted in the Treaty of Moultrie Creek in 1823, an agreement which resulted in the removal and displacement of Florida’s indigenous populations (Taylor 2005:64). Although political tensions were high during this period, the Apalachicola River Valley boomed with new manufacturing and trading of goods such as cotton. Throughout the 19th century, the river and its surrounding communities became economically important for the region and the growing United States.

During the early and middle 19th century, cotton was one of the most important and valued commodities and exports in America (Willoughby 1993:1). The production and shipment of cotton from the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint river valley contributed greatly to the overall economic impact of cotton for the country during this time. The lands surrounding the upper and middle Apalachicola River were ideally suited for growing cotton, and production in Florida became significant beginning in the late 1830s and 1840s. The rich alluvial sediments, temperate climate, and abundance of well-drained land supported the success of the crop in
northwest Florida. The river’s access to inland cotton production areas in Georgia and Alabama and to the Gulf of Mexico contributed to the rapid expansion of the industry and growth of the importance of the river as a means for transporting cotton to market.

In an effort to control exchange of goods and to reduce the smuggling of commodities, the United States began establishing regulations and building infrastructure in the Apalachicola River region (Owens 1966:74). In 1822, President James Monroe established the Port of Apalachicola by appointing a port collector (Owens 1966:1). The United States Customs house was built in Apalachicola in 1825 and immediately began receiving shipments of goods from Georgia and Alabama (Memory et al. 1998:15). Cotton warehouses facilitated the packing, storing, and shipping of thousands of bales of cotton processed each year (Figure 3). By the mid-1800s, more than 40 warehouses were strategically located near ship landings along the Apalachicola River, such as the wood frame cotton warehouse located on Rocky Bluff Landing (Willoughby 1993:12-13). The lucrative nature of the cotton business was displayed along the river by the building of large plantation homes, such as planter Jason Gregory’s house. Built in 1849, the house was situated on a high bluff at Ocheesee Landing overlooking the Apalachicola River.

FIGURE 3: Photograph of cotton warehouses in Apalachicola, circa 1870s. (State Archives of Florida, Florida Memory, RC09455.)
The cotton industry’s demand for more effective transportation of cargo fostered the steamboat industry along the river (Bass 2008:108). Before steamboats, the shipment of cotton required the use of flatboats that could travel only with the flow of the river, thus preventing the boats from returning up river (Bass 2008:107). The advent of the steamboat transformed the Apalachicola River, as well as many other waterways throughout the southeast United States. The use of steam power meant that many maritime obstacles, such as currents and contrary winds, had less of an effect on the transportation of people and goods. The first known steamboat to ply the waters of the Apalachicola River was the *Fanny* in 1827 (Bass 2008:107). Steamboats were an important fixture on the Apalachicola River up to the early 1900s, not only for the transportation of agricultural products but also for the movement of troops and military supplies (Figure 4). Partly because of steamboats and partly because of the cotton production in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint drainage, the city of Apalachicola became an important cotton port during the 1830s (Turner 2003:12). As maritime industries grew during this time, continued friction between Europeans and the native population in the Territory of Florida ignited the Second Seminole War in 1835.

FIGURE 4: 1889 Photograph of the steamboat *Naida* on the Apalachicola River. (State Archives of Florida, *Florida Memory*, PR09960.)
Although steamboats revolutionized inland waterway transportation, they were not without inherent hazards and dangers. After numerous accidents because of fires, boiler explosions, and river snags, steamboat travel was deemed unsafe (Bass 2008:2). Toward the mid-19th century, the establishment and development of railroad companies in Georgia and Alabama began to compete with the steamboat industry in the transportation of goods and people (Willoughby 1993:128). The first rail lines in Florida utilized draft animals to move rail cars. In 1836, the Lake Wimico and St. Joseph Canal and Railroad company built a railroad that utilized horses and steam engines to connect the Apalachicola River with the Gulf coast city of St. Joseph, modern Port St. Joe (Turner 2003:13-14).

The impetus for the railroad from St. Joseph stemmed from rivalry and competition with the successful port of Apalachicola. Situated approximately 25 miles west of Apalachicola, St. Joseph was established in 1835 (Tuner 2003:12). The first settlers of St. Joseph consisted of former Apalachicola residents escaping taxes and fees imposed on them after their land and buildings were reclaimed by Forbes and Company (Gerstner and Gamst 1997:739). As a mechanism to build the new city and to prosper from the cotton economy, the citizens of St. Joseph decided to build a canal or a railroad to connect Apalachicola River commerce traffic directly to the city’s Gulf-front wharfs. A railroad was chosen over a canal, with anticipated success resulting from intercepting steamboats further up river, thus diverting business from the Apalachicola port (Willoughby 1993:117; Turner 2003:12-14). Unforeseen circumstances, such as declining profit margins, crippled the company’s finances; an 1841 yellow fever epidemic devastated the population, and an 1844 hurricane destroyed the remaining infrastructure, preventing the company’s success (Willoughby 1993:117; Turner 2003:15; Barnes 2007:57).

In 1845, Florida was admitted to the Union as a state after initial constitutional papers were signed a few years earlier in the city of St. Joseph (Taylor 2005:74). The Statehood and Antebellum period lasted from 1845 to 1860. Although the river’s natural hazards, seasonal water levels, and shallow bay posed constant threats to boats plying the waters of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint, modifications to vessel drafts and overall size allowed the
maritime industry to overcome navigational obstacles (Willoughby 1993:117). Cotton continued to be one of the major commodities during this time, in spite of profit margin fluctuations. Because of improvements in land-based transportation routes, several competing cotton markets arose, resulting in the economic impact of the crop being spread among several Southern cities (Willoughby 1993:116-137). Comparable to the ports of Mobile and Pensacola, Apalachicola was a booming maritime community. In addition to Apalachicola, many towns along the river flourished after statehood (Taylor 2005:75).

The growth of maritime industry and trade along the river promoted the establishment of several towns and cities along the river’s banks. The need for access points near the river required infrastructure for both water and land transportation. Waterfront communities accommodated the daily and seasonal needs associated with the region’s trade and commerce. Published in 1855, Fanning’s Illustrated Gazetteer of the United States used data from the 1850 United States census to list a variety of information about the nation’s states, counties, cities, and towns. In 1850, only four counties bordered the Apalachicola River: to the west Jackson and Calhoun counties, and to the east Gadsden and Franklin counties. Several towns, cities, and post offices near the Apalachicola River and its confluences are listed in the 1855 Gazetteer: in Jackson County, Bailey’s Mills and Millwood; in Gadsden County, Aspalaga, China Hill, “Rickoe’s Bluff,” and Chattahoochee; in Calhoun County, Ocheesee, Blountstown, and Iola; and in Franklin County, “Appalachicola” (Fanning 1855). As testament to their significance in the historical fabric of the river, many of these towns still exist today.

Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 to 1879

With the election of Abraham Lincoln as United States President in 1860, Florida seceded from the Union in 1861 following Mississippi and South Carolina (Gannon 2003:41). Florida’s American Civil War period thus began in 1861 and lasted until 1865. Although happening a few days before Florida seceded, one of the first military acts of the Civil War within the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint river valley took place in Chattahoochee at the Apalachicola Arsenal (Turner 1999:22). Built during the 1830s, the Apalachicola Arsenal, also referred to as
the Chattahoochee Arsenal, was located at the northernmost extent of the Apalachicola River and originally served as a supply point for troops and ships during the Second Seminole War. After the Second Seminole War ended in 1842, the newly established state of Florida maintained a small contingent of troops on site at the Arsenal. In 1861, with tensions building and the reality of secession mounting, a nearby Florida militia seized the United States Arsenal (Turner 1999:21-22).

With the onset of the Civil War, the Apalachicola River once again was of significant military importance as an artery of trade and transportation. In addition to commerce, the river provided the Confederacy access to the interior and to the important manufacturing center of Columbus, Georgia (Turner 1999:5-6). Towns along the river also played an important role in military history by aiding in Confederate ship-building and in the production and transportation of salt that was vital for food preservation (McCarthy 2004:48).

With the Union Gulf Coast blockade beginning in the summer of 1861 and occupation of the city of Apalachicola in 1862, defense of the river from incursions by Union gunboats became of critical importance to the Confederacy. In order to prevent Union troops from taking strongholds farther up the river, Confederate authorities built river defenses utilizing the river’s natural geography and topography. Strategically placed river obstructions within the narrows of the river prevented or slowed maneuverability; troops stationed at batteries atop high bluffs maintained armed vigilance for Union vessels; and military vessels safeguarded maritime infrastructure (Mabelitini 2012:27).

The strategic sinking of vessels and placement of chains and other objects in order to create obstructions utilized the river’s arduous navigational areas, referred to as “‘the Narrows’ because of the series of abrupt bends and the narrow channel width” (Gilmer 1890:450). According to a military correspondence of 1863, certain areas of the river “could be approached by the enemy only with great difficulty” (Gilmer 1890:450). Corresponding with the river obstructions, construction and reinforcement of armed earthen batteries took place near Neal, Alum, Ricko’s Bluffs, the Narrows, and Fort Gadsden (Mabelitini 2012:36-38). From the start
of construction in 1862 to the end of the war, Union forces never seriously challenged the linear chain of Confederate defenses along the Apalachicola River. The Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint river valley only saw minor conflicts during the Civil War, including raids against supply ships, destruction of salt work operations, burning of supplies, confiscation of bales of cotton, and capturing of prisoners (Horrell 2005:62; Mabelitini 2012:52-53). In 1865, Union troops accepted the surrender of Confederate forces in Florida at the capital in Tallahassee, thus ending the Civil War in Florida.

The battlefield fighting was over, but the northwest Florida inhabitants’ fight to survive continued well after the war during the Reconstruction period from 1866 to 1879. Civil War era man-made obstructions altered the course of the mighty Apalachicola River by redirecting tributaries, creating oxbow lakes, and blocking once-navigable waters. In addition to hindered water transportation, Florida’s railroad infrastructure and steam engines were greatly depleted by wartime efforts (Turner 2003:38-41).

After the Civil War, Apalachicola River use underwent a transitional period. Communities lining the river experienced economic difficulty because of inherent reconstruction struggles combined with a diminishing agricultural economy and silting of the pass at Apalachicola Bay (Memory et al. 1998:23). Riverine communities along the Apalachicola struggled after the war but emerged from depressed times with the resurgence of the lumber business in the area. During the 1870s, a significant increase occurred in industry and river traffic associated with harvesting lumber resources along the Apalachicola River (McCarthy 2004:83). Sawmills and lumber camps dotted the banks of the river. Several large lumber companies established strongholds within the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint drainage, including the Cypress Lumbering Company and the Coombs Lumber Company (Figure 5). Similar to the cotton industry in the area, the success of the lumber industry relied heavily on the maritime transportation advantages of the Apalachicola River. Trees felled up river were floated downstream, processed by sawmills, and loaded on vessels for worldwide distribution. The renewed development of the region’s railroads provided access to inland forests and new transportation routes.
In order to facilitate the movement of goods along the Apalachicola River, steps had to be taken to remove obstacles—both naturally occurring obstructions and obsolete wartime barriers—during the Post-Reconstruction period from 1880 to 1897 (Figure 6). Historical governmental documents illustrate this transition:

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, the sum of $5,000 has been expended in removing snags, sunken logs, and overhanging trees from the Apalachicola River, the Cut-off, and Lower Chipola River and in opening a practicable but narrow and crooked channel through Lee Slough. Steamboats can now, with some difficulty, pass through the Cut-off, Lee Slough, and Lower Chipola River on the upstream passages. These waterways afforded the only practicable means of transportation for the production of this section of county, which is being rapidly settled by fruit-growers, and it is very desirable that a sufficient appropriation shall be made to enable a safe channel to be opened through Lee Slough (United States War Department 1893:213).

Maintaining the navigability of the river allowed several maritime industries to thrive during this time.
During the 1890s, naval stores became important aspects of the region’s booming lumber economy (Memory et al. 1998:67). Producing wood byproducts such as pitch, resin, oil, tar, and oakum, naval stores along the Apalachicola River supplied water-proofing materials for wooden ships (Horrell 2005:67). Wooden steamships, schooners, and tugboats relied on these products to caulk hull seams to diminish the constant threat of leaks. In addition to ships, other maritime products such as wooden barrels used naval store products for waterproofing purposes. Resin and turpentine were also used for the production of several non-maritime-related commodities, including paints, soaps, and furniture polishes.

The river and its bay’s rich abundance of maritime resources provided a lucrative location for the harvesting and commercialization of marine delicacies. The discovery of sponge beds off nearby Dog Island launched the area’s sponging industry, which shipped the maritime commodities to markets around the world (Rogers 1986:124). Although Apalachicola Bay’s sponge industry could not compete with more prosperous Florida sponge beds such as Tarpon Springs, the harvesting and trading of sponges supported the local economy until the early 20th century. In addition to sponges, oysters provided a base for Apalachicola’s seafood industry (McCarthy 2004:67). Apalachicola Bay’s warmer water and rich estuarine environment

FIGURE 6: 1920s Photograph of a snag boat on the Apalachicola River. (State Archives of Florida, *Florida Memory*, N040963.)
combined with fresh water from the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint river systems creates an advantageous growing environment for oysters. Improvements in seafood packaging, harvesting techniques, and maritime infrastructure launched Apalachicola’s lucrative oyster industry.

In 1898, the United States and Spain engaged in conflict over Cuba. The southern part of Florida supplied Cuban revolutionaries United States troops, ammunition, and supplies. Threats from Spain initiated United States government funding for improvement of coastal defenses from Pensacola to Key West (Knetsch and Wynne 2011:90). During this time, communities surrounding the Apalachicola River experienced a steady economy. By the early 19th century, “the commerce of the river consist[ed] chiefly of cotton, naval stores, general merchandise, saw logs, and timber for export” (United States War Department 1911:469).

Moore conducted some of the first documented archaeological research of the area during early 1900s (Moore et al. 1999:6). Many of Moore’s investigations were of the Native American shell mounds located along the banks of the river. In the early 20th century, the seafood industry expanded its commodities to shrimp, crabs, and fish in addition to oysters, relying on the improved rail system established by the Apalachicola Northern Railroad in 1907 (Figure 7; McCarthy 2004:76). The economy of the Apalachicola and its connecting rivers “increased from about $4,000,000 in 1899 to about $16,889,600 in 1910” (United States War Department 1911:469).

FIGURE 7: 1907 Photograph of the first train to cross the Apalachicola Northern Railroad bridge. (State Archives of Florida, Florida Memory, RC11950.)
The United States’ entry into World War I in 1917 began Florida’s World War I and Aftermath period, which lasted from 1917 to 1920. The state contributed to the war effort by providing service members, lumber, and shipyards (Gannon 2003:74). Similar to the rest of the country, northwest Florida families struggled during wartime hardships.

After World War I, the country as a whole, including Florida, experienced Boom Times from 1921 to 1929. The state’s railway infrastructure grew to nearly 5,500 miles (Turner 2003:117). An abundance of available land for sale attracted investors and vacationers escaping harsh northern winters. The housing market and its high profit margins boosted individual wealth within Florida during 1924 and 1925. However, in 1926, the land boom in Florida collapsed because of the drastic decrease in land value, foreshadowing the nation’s economic crisis to come (Downing 2001:12). Although short, this period of growth had a substantial impact on Florida’s economy, population, and land usage distribution.

With the United States stock market crash in 1929, the country and the whole world spiraled into one of the worst economic crises of the 20th century. During the Great Depression, United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt instituted several programs to help ease the economic burden felt by families all across the country. Florida’s Depression and New Deal period ranged from 1930 to 1940. Roosevelt’s passion for conservation and love of nature were depicted in the missions of several of the New Deal programs, including the Civilian Conservation Corps, established in 1933. In Florida, the Civilian Conservation Corps contributed to the Florida State Park system. For example, Torreya State Park, located on the east side of the river near Bristol, is one of nine New Deal Era parks in Florida. A major Civilian Conservation Corps undertaking on the Apalachicola River was moving and renovating the Gregory House from its original location at Ocheesee Landing to Torreya State Park across the river (Figure 8).
In addition to state parks, the Civilian Conservation Corps helped establish national forests. During this period, the area surrounding the Apalachicola River was recognized as viable land for recreation, renewing and replanting resources, and preserving environmental landscapes. Currently the largest forest in the state, the Apalachicola National Forest, established in 1936, occupies much of the timber land east of the river and west of Tallahassee (McCarthy 2004:41).

The United States formally entered World War II in 1941. With the increasing need for military machinery, weapons, and ammunition, employment opportunities began to rise. Large uninhabited areas of Florida’s panhandle served as training grounds for pilots, D-day invasion preparation, and aircraft testing (Wynne and Moorhead 2010).

Modern Era, 1942 to present

The Apalachicola River and its surrounding communities continued to adapt and change in many different ways in Florida’s Modern period. Evidence of progress and industry since 1942 are still recognizable on the landscape. With the continued shift in transportation toward
land-based operations such as rail and road, the river’s usage focused on hydroelectric power (Eidse 2006:48). The United States Army Corps of Engineers completed construction of the Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam at the confluence of the Apalachicola, Flint, and Chattahoochee Rivers in 1957 (Marth and Marth 1990:20). After the dam was in place, the resulting reservoir of water north of the Apalachicola River was named Lake Seminole.

Residents and visitors to the area started using the river for recreational purposes. Many individuals built fishing camps and hunting cabins along the banks during the mid-20th century (Memory et al. 1998:22; Figure 9). Several areas along the river became popular family recreational destinations. In addition, tourists flocked to the city of Apalachicola to experience its historic waterfront and Southern charm.

![1965 Photograph of a fishing and hunting lodge on the Apalachicola River. (State Archives of Florida, Florida Memory, C650976.)](image)

Although use of the Apalachicola River throughout the historic period changed in many ways, common themes exist into the 21st century. The seafood industry continues to be one of the major economic stimuli to the region. The ecotourism industry promotes the environmental significance of the river while highlighting its recreational uses. Areas set aside as public lands
help to protect and manage the river’s timber resources. Interpretive materials displayed at museums, trails, and historic towns showcase the historical significance of the region.

Throughout time, people have used the Apalachicola River in a variety of ways, including economic, political, and military ventures, and that use continues today. The history of the river’s development and growth adds significant context for the current place names, infrastructure, city locations, and uses of the river. The wealth of primary and secondary research material provides ample content for interpreted text for the ARMHT. In addition to text, the availability of historical photos and maps through online resources provides easily obtainable visual representations of the past. Without an understanding of past lifeways and events, heritage tourism products such as the ARMHT would lose valuable meaning. The preservation of nonrenewable heritage resources is imperative for comprehending, appreciating, and interpreting the past.
CHAPTER V
STUDY AREA RESEARCH

Research into the surrounding areas of the Apalachicola River provided an interpretation framework for the ARMHT. According to Brochu and Merriman (2008:45), interpretation content or “deciding what to talk about depends on three things: the resources at hand, the interests of the audiences, and the desires of management.” The identification of archaeological, historical, and natural resources along the Apalachicola River established a baseline for existing heritage properties. This chapter first assesses the archaeological, historical, and natural resources within the project area by county and then depicts community-based ethnographic observations.

Assessing County Heritage Resources

From the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s checklist for “Basic Elements for Attracting Tourists,” I adapted and created an inventory for heritage resources along the Apalachicola River (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011c). This list identifies potential sites for inclusion in the maritime heritage trail model. Candidates for inclusion in the ARMHT inventory include a variety of resources:

- Museums
- National Register of Historic Places
- National Landmarks
- Historic districts or towns
- Fountains, sculptures, and monuments
- Buildings and bridges
- Cemeteries
- Historic place names
- Trails and byways
- National parks and forests
- State parks and forests
In combination with GIS data location, the inventory of potential ARMHT sites uses information from the FMSF, the Florida Historical Markers Program, and the National Register of Historic Places. Organized by county, the inventory first catalogs nearby communities, public boat ramps with direct access to the river, and roads crossing the river, a list which helps in planning the trail’s logistical design details. Next, resources are listed in alphabetical order by site type. In addition to each site’s associated time period, evidence of interpretation resources is recorded, including existing on-site structural remains, available historical photos and documents, interpretive signs and displays, and historical designations. Compiling known interpretation features about each site enables future trail implementers to make final site selections based on the availability of interpreted information in combination with public input.

The ARMHT inventory is listed by county from north to south and west to east. Jackson County is the northernmost county on the western bank of the Apalachicola River, bordering Alabama and Georgia. United States Highway 90 and Interstate 10 are the only roads crossing over the river in the county. One public boat ramp has direct river access. The town of Sneads, located in the northeast section of the county between the river and its headwaters at Lake Seminole, is one of the largest populated areas nearby. Within Jackson County (Table 1), potential trail sites are few. Although limited, identified resources do represent a variety of different site types, including terrestrial and underwater, dating from the 19th and 20th centuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>First Seminole War</td>
<td>1817-1818</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Remains of Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck</td>
<td>Wooden Barge</td>
<td>1821-1899</td>
<td>Remains of Wooden Barge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck</td>
<td>Steamship</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>Remains of Steamship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gadsden County (Table 2) is the northernmost county on the eastern bank of the river, bordering Georgia. United States Highway 90 to the north and Interstate 10 in the middle are the only roads crossing this section of the river. There are two public boat ramps. The city of Chattahoochee, located at the north end of the county, is the largest river community in the county. Potential sites in Gadsden County represent a large time span and can illustrate the river’s military, economic, transportation, and navigation usages throughout time.

TABLE 2
GADSDEN COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Campsite for Land Surveyors</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Historical Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>First Spanish Native American</td>
<td>1531-1763</td>
<td>Artifact and Lithic Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Victory Bridge</td>
<td>1919-1969</td>
<td>Remains of Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Woodruff Lock and Dam</td>
<td>1957-Present</td>
<td>Dam Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Apalachicola Arsenal</td>
<td>1835-1862</td>
<td>National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Ferry Master</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Remains of Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calhoun County (Table 3) is the middle county on the western bank of the river. State Highway 20 crosses the Apalachicola River at the south end of the county. Three public boat ramps spread along the length of the county provide entrance and departure points. Ocheesee, Selman, Blountstown, McNeal, and New Hope are the cities nearest the river. Blountstown is the largest of these communities, with a historic downtown area and existing interpreted historic village at the Panhandle Pioneer Settlement. Several of the identified potential trail sites include locations that were in use for a long time. The sites in this county lend themselves to interpreting the use and reuse of the riverine land, from Native America hunting and habitation to European plantation fields.
TABLE 3
CALHOUN COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Ocheesee River Landing</td>
<td>1821-Present</td>
<td>Artifact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Refuse/Dump</td>
<td>1821-Present</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Refuse/Dump</td>
<td>1821-Present</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Refuse/Dump</td>
<td>1716-Present</td>
<td>Artifact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Blountstown</td>
<td>1823-Present</td>
<td>Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Calhoun County Courthouse</td>
<td>1904-Present</td>
<td>National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liberty County (Table 4) is the middle county on the eastern bank of the river. The only road that crosses the river from Liberty County is State Highway 20. Three publicly accessible boat ramps provide service to the river. Sweetwater, Bristol, and Estiffanulga are the closest towns. Although the majority of land in Liberty County is part of the Apalachicola National Forest, many potential trail sites with significant interpretative features are already in place. Although information on the Civil War-era cemetery is sparse, ARMHT implementers choosing to interpret the site can use contextual contemporary information to highlight local involvement during the war.

TABLE 4
LIBERTY COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Alum Bluff Battery</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>Remains of Earthworks Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Neal’s Bluff Batteries</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>Remains of Earthworks Interpretive Signs Museum Display Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Rock Bluff Landing</td>
<td>1821-Present</td>
<td>Artifact Scatter Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 continues
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Logging Industry and Naval Store</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Artifact Scatter Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>ca. 1870</td>
<td>Grave Depressions and Headstones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>United States Military</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>30-40 Graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Forest</td>
<td>Apalachicola National Forest</td>
<td>1936-Present</td>
<td>Florida National Scenic Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Feature</td>
<td>Torreya Tree</td>
<td>1835 (Discovered)</td>
<td>Historic Marker Tree Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Feature</td>
<td>Apalachicola Bluffs and Ravines Preserve</td>
<td>1985-Present</td>
<td>Large Red Sand Bluff Hiking Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck</td>
<td>Sidewheel Steamboat</td>
<td>ca. 1840</td>
<td>Remains of Machinery Artifact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Torreya State Park</td>
<td>1933-Present</td>
<td>National Register Historic Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive Signs Hiking Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Sawmill</td>
<td>ca. 1840-1861</td>
<td>Remains of Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Vernacular Construction</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Remains of Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Cotton Warehouse</td>
<td>1845-1860</td>
<td>Remains of Building Interpretive Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Hunting Cabin</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Remains of Building Artifact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Gregory House</td>
<td>1849-Present</td>
<td>Remains of Building Interpretive Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Display</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gulf County (Table 5) is the southernmost county on the western bank of the river, bordering the Gulf of Mexico. No road directly crosses the river; however, United States Highway 98 is located on the southernmost edge of the county and travels over Apalachicola Bay into Franklin County. Two boat ramps allow public use. Iola, Wewahitchka, Honeyville, Gaskins Still, and Dalkeith are communities connected to the Apalachicola River via its tributaries. This
county contains many unique resources common to lower portions of the river but not found in the northern counties. This region is still known for its quality honey, and interpreting its beginnings in the ARMHT directly ties today’s culture into past lifeways, thus increasing the trail’s relevance to its audiences.

TABLE 5
GULF COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Battery Gilmer</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of Earthworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Battery Cobb</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of Earthworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Refuse/Dump</td>
<td>1513-1763</td>
<td>Artifact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Historic Iola</td>
<td>1821-1899</td>
<td>Historic Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Feature</td>
<td>Forbes Island</td>
<td>ca. 1804</td>
<td>Historic Place Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Named)</td>
<td>Historical Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck</td>
<td>Pull Boat</td>
<td>1900-1940</td>
<td>Remains of Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artifact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck</td>
<td>Steamship</td>
<td>1890-1899</td>
<td>Remains of Machinery and Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Apiary</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Remains of Structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Franklin County (Table 6) is the southernmost county on the east and west banks of the river and also borders the Gulf of Mexico. At the county’s south end, United States Highway 98 crosses Apalachicola Bay. Four public boat launches provide river access. Brickyard, Bay City, and Apalachicola are the closest communities to the river. Apalachicola has a thriving historic district and is a popular Gulf Coast tourist destination. Available heritage resources in Franklin County are diverse. Specifically, the identification of the remains of several lumber mill highlights this booming 1870s industry.
TABLE 6
FRANKLIN COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Interpretive Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Site</td>
<td>Fort Gadsden</td>
<td>1814-1821</td>
<td>Historic Memorial Remains of Fort Foundations Interpretive Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Apalachicola Northern Railroad Company</td>
<td>1906-Present</td>
<td>Remains of Bridge Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Federal Cemetery</td>
<td>ca. 1885</td>
<td>Historical Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Apalachicola</td>
<td>1827-Present</td>
<td>Historic District Interpretive Signage House Museums Historic Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Feature</td>
<td>Brickyard Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Place Name Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Feature</td>
<td>Bloody Bluff Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Place Name Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck</td>
<td>Steamboat</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>Remains of Machinery Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Forest</td>
<td>Tate’s Hell State Forest</td>
<td>1994-Present</td>
<td>Historic Place Name Historic Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Recreation Area</td>
<td>Fort Gadsden</td>
<td>ca. 1950</td>
<td>Outdoor Exhibits Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Lumber Mill</td>
<td>20th Century</td>
<td>Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Vernacular House</td>
<td>ca. 1920</td>
<td>Remains of House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Apiary</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Remains of Apiary Historic Photos and Documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By identifying and inventorying known historical, archaeological, and natural resources along the river, potential sites for the ARMHT become easy to reference. Based on written records and online databases, numerous sites can represent each historic period. Although I used the most current available information for each of the listed sites, some of the information is dated, including several archaeological sites which had only the original FMSF forms from
the mid-20th century. With the resources for each county listed, the next step was to understand the content that was of most interest to potential trail users and to travel down the Apalachicola River to visually locate potential sites and to visit those that are publicly accessible.

Community Immersion

Community immersion, no matter the level of involvement, helps to establish a baseline for current trends and helps to formulate the ethnographic research focus. Before developing initial survey questions, I made numerous visits to the study area. During each visit, I employed several different stages of participant observation. As Jiang and Homsey (2008:16-17) explain, researchers need to do the following:

[A]ssess the current “self-image” of your community by looking at the types of cultural events and activities that regularly occur. Evaluate whether the historic and cultural themes you wish to promulgate match this existing character. If possible, it is advantageous to make sure that significant tourist activities complement, or at least do not detract from, the themes you are attempting to develop.

Although I grew up within the Florida panhandle and have lived there for over 25 years, little of that time was spent near the communities along the Apalachicola River. There was significant need, therefore, to become acquainted with the current community environments along the Apalachicola River.

I chose to focus most of the land-based community immersion in the city of Apalachicola. Located at the delta of the river in Franklin County, Apalachicola is a popular tourist destination that is best known for its oysters. Water-based community immersion utilized several public boat ramps located in the cities of Chattahoochee, Blountstown, Bristol, Estifianulga, Wewahitchka, and Apalachicola (Figure 10).
Passive Observations

Initial visits to the study area were simply as a visiting tourist. During these trips, I did not discuss research agendas or express interest in cultural heritage tourism. The purpose of visiting as a tourist was to experience the communities of the Apalachicola River as an outsider. Goals of this stage of participant observation included seeing what the cities had to offer to their visiting populations passing through or staying for an extended weekend trip.

During overnight trips to Apalachicola, I stayed at two different accommodations that represented the visitor overnight options: one slightly expensive historic hotel in the city and another moderately priced commercial chain hotel just outside the business district. The Gibson Inn, located in the heart of downtown Apalachicola, is a hotel listed on the National Register of Historic Places with 30 unique individual rooms ranging in cost from approximately $115 to $260 a night at the time of this study. Built in 1907, the Gibson Inn exudes the historic Southern charm of Florida with 19th-century architectural features that include a wraparound porch with rocking chairs. The Best Western Apalach Inn, located on the main highway to the west of downtown Apalachicola, is an independently owned and operated franchise hotel with 40 similar exterior-access rooms ranging in cost from approximately $80 to $110 a night. The only
franchise hotel in Apalachicola, the Best Western has a large parking lot with boat trailer and motor home capabilities.

Both accommodations were very clean with friendly staff and a steady flow of people checking in. Even though the Best Western was only a few minutes’ drive away from the heart of the city, the atmosphere at the Gibson Inn was more communal and inviting for a tourist. With its open lobby flowing into the bar and restaurant area, the Gibson Inn’s house-style first floor encouraged visitor and local interaction. Many year-round and part-time residents, business owners and employees, and fishermen frequent the historic inn. Because of the atmosphere at the Gibson Inn, I was able to observe and interact with a variety of potential ARMHT users. Common themes that arose from interaction included the ecological importance of the river, its recreational usage viability, and concern over maintaining the environmental viewshed. Although more subtle, these themes were also present at the Best Western through displays of brochures and flyers in the lobby. By staying overnight several times in Apalachicola and interacting with visitors and locals, I was able understand the importance of the river’s environment to the community.

During trips to Apalachicola, I also visited potential stakeholder organizations and future implementers of the ARMHT. Before its move to Eastpoint, Florida, the Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve was tucked away on the northern end of Apalachicola. During its tenure in Apalachicola, the Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve had a small but extensive visitor museum highlighting the environmental importance of marine estuaries and the conservation and stewardship of natural resources. The Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve also had its aquatic research lab open to visitors as well as an interpretive boardwalk through the grass flats of the Apalachicola River delta. Although the majority of interpretative materials focused on plants and animals, literature and signage mentioned culture resources. From initial perceptions, the ARMHT is compatible with the Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve’s missions of education, preservation, and stewardship.
The Apalachicola Maritime Museum is located on the eastern side of the downtown district. During my initial visits, the museum was housed in a modified warehouse with docks located behind the museum. Inside the museum, a variety of artifacts and interpretive panels describe historic maritime lifeways and practices. An engaging video about the Apalachicola Maritime Museum’s kayaking river trips as well as footage from documentaries highlights the Apalachicola River. The Apalachicola Maritime Museum’s kayaking trips could easily use content and interpretative materials from the ARMHT to supplement existing trips.

The Apalachicola Community Center is located in Battery Park at the foot of the John Gorrie Memorial Bridge. The Community Center is a modern structure used for a variety of purposes such as conferences, meetings, weddings, and other group gatherings. The building displayed announcements for public events, brochures for local organizations, and flyers for recreational activities. Future implementers of the ARMHT could use this building for promotional trail materials or as a space for informative lectures using trail content.

While driving around the city of Apalachicola, I saw much evidence of its historical background. Prominently displayed in many hotels, restaurants, and office buildings, black and white historic photographs capture past maritime lifeways. House museums, cemeteries, businesses, bed and breakfasts, and restaurants proudly displayed historical markers and plaques. Walking around the downtown and waterfront streets, exploring community shops and businesses, eating at locally owned restaurants, and experiencing nightlife opportunities, I gained tremendous insight into the tourists’ point of view of Apalachicola. Residents and visitors alike clearly appreciate and are proud of their maritime history and riverine environment. In order to make the ARMHT relevant to those in Apalachicola, interpretation should complement the river’s ecology and biology with its history.

In addition to Apalachicola, I wanted to experience more rural areas of the river, so I stayed overnight in the city of Sneads at the headwaters of the river. Accommodations for the night were at Seminole Lodge and Marina, a popular local fish camp. Bordering Lake Seminole and Three Rivers State Park, the lodge is located on waterfront property with RV trailer parking,
campsites, and motel rooms. The predominant interest of lodge visitors was fishing. Because
the campsite emptied before daybreak and quieted by dusk, I was unable to interact directly
with many people during my stay. Through observations, however, it was clear that popular
recreational uses of Lake Seminole and the Apalachicola River included sport fishing and family
picnics. Incorporating these pastimes of residents and visitors alike into aspects of the ARMHT is
possible.

*Moderate Observations*

After initial overnight visits in Apalachicola and Sneads, the next stage of my
ethnographic research involved moderate observations, cultural expert interviews, and group
interviews. I participated in the Gulf of Mexico Alliance Community Input Workshop as an
advocate for cultural resources along the Gulf. The Alliance is a partnership between state
and federal entities along the Gulf of Mexico established to increase communication and
collaboration. The purpose of this meeting was to bring together local citizens and professionals
with a common interest in the Gulf’s environmental and economic health. The main goal of
the workshop, which was held in the Apalachicola Community Center, included collecting
citizen recommendations for the development of the second Five-year Action Plan. During the
workshop, participants divided into working groups to discuss water quality, habitat conservation
and restoration, ecosystem integration and assessment, nutrients and nutrient impact, coastal
community resilience, and environmental education. Observations and participation in the
Alliance provided insight into the multidisciplinary interest in the Apalachicola River and its
surrounding bodies of water.

I gave professional presentations on the development of the ARMHT model at the
following conferences: the Northeast Florida Symposium on Maritime Archaeology in St.
Augustine, Florida; the Society for American Archaeology in Atlanta, Georgia; the Society for
Historical Archaeology in Amelia Island, Florida, and Baltimore, Maryland; the Ninth Maritime
Heritage Conference in Baltimore, Maryland; and the Rural Tourism Summit in Blountstown,
Florida. Professional feedback from posters and paper presentations emphasized that the
importance of the ARMHT model is its adaptability of use for other public outreach tools. I was reminded several times that community-implemented projects are usually not well-funded, especially in the current economic climate. Therefore, careful consideration is needed of the model’s development time, production cost, and trail sustainability.

In addition to professional presentations, I conducted two community presentations about the ARMHT. The first presentation was held at the Apalachicola National Estuarine Research Reserve while it was still located in Apalachicola. The audience for this talk consisted mainly of residents of the city of Apalachicola and surrounding areas. This presentation was a proposal for developing the ARMHT and concluded with a group interview. Before the presentation, I conducted free listing techniques to elicit how audience members viewed the Apalachicola River. I asked attendees to define the Apalachicola River. Most definitions were geological in nature, but many highlighted the fight between Alabama, Georgia, and Florida over the control of water flow within the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint watershed. Free listing techniques confirmed the environmental views of the river and illuminated concerns of southeastern water rights. After the presentation, members of the audience voiced interest in a heritage trail but also illuminated some previously overlooked concerns about the river. One concern regarded the presence of non-licensed structures used as dwellings permanently fixed along the river’s bank and the negative visual appeal and pollution created.

The second presentation I gave was part of the Florida Public Archaeology Network’s Florida Archaeology Month Lecture Series in Pensacola. The audience consisted of college-age students and adult residents. Again, the purpose of this community lecture was to propose the development of the ARMHT, receive feedback from potential tourists, and gauge concerns and interest surrounding the Apalachicola River. During the group interview, members from the audience voiced their overall approval of the trail and many wanted to see a multi-day component to the trail. Because most of them have to travel more than three hours by car to visit the Apalachicola River, they would like to spend several days in the area. Many audience
members from the Apalachicola and Pensacola community presentations provided email addresses in order to receive and complete the formal questionnaire for the ARMHT.

The next phase of my research focused on water-based observations. After creating an inventory of potential ARMHT heritage resources and conducting land-based ethnographic observations, I needed to evaluate the trail sites in person from the water. Without physically going to the Apalachicola River, I could not truly assess the visibility and accessibility of each resource. The first water-based visit consisted of a two-part boat reconnaissance trip of the entire length of the river. The purpose of this trip was to do the following:

- locate inventoried heritage resources,
- assess interpretation potential for sites,
- inspect land and river access points,
- create practical length segments for the trail, and
- experience firsthand what ARMHT users will see.

Starting at the river’s headwaters in Chattahoochee, my team of fellow graduate students and thesis committee members and I embarked down the river in a 24-foot pontoon boat. By using a GIS map of inventoried sites and a GPS, we were prepared to locate known heritage resources. Once we were on the river, its vastness and wildness were immediately apparent. It is clear why the majority of recreational activities and community advocate groups focused on the environment. The majority of the reconnaissance trip was spent surrounded by thick forests, fish and birds, sandbars, and other geological and biological river features. Surprisingly, after many failed attempts at discovery, about 80% of the inventoried resources remained completely hidden. Suddenly, the challenge for making the Apalachicola River’s cultural resources applicable to modern communities doubled in magnitude.

Resources that were visible from the water were a welcome change in scenery regardless of their size. Because of the winding nature of the river, many sites remained out of sight until the pontoon was right next to the resource. In addition to historic bridges, sites within state and national lands and sites associated with a unique geological feature were the most distinguishable
from the river. For example, Alum Bluff is the “largest exposed geological feature in Florida” and can easily be described as a red sandy clay mountain that towers overhead (The Nature Conservancy 2012). Located near the city of Bristol within the Apalachicola Bluffs and Ravines Preserve, Alum Bluff has archaeological remains of a Confederate battery. Although the battery is not well-preserved, Alum Bluff provides future trail implementers an unmistakable visual marker to interpret the Apalachicola River’s influence during the Civil War and to discuss the tactical advantages of the river’s geological features.

Within Torreya State Park, several heritage resources were evident by small clearings in the forest along the bank of the river. From the water, the Gregory House is one of the most visible heritage resources. Painted white, this large 19th-century plantation mansion stands in stark contrast to its surrounding natural environment. Although the Civilian Conservation Corps moved the house from its original location in the 1930s, the original house site is still discernible. Across the river from Torreya State Park at Ocheesee Landing, a tree still stands where the Gregory House was initially built, evident by the tree’s proximity to the Gregory House in historical photographs.

Also located within the boundaries of Torreya State Park are the remains of a cotton warehouse from 1845. The remains of the warehouse are discernible from the water as a number of brick footers and a state park boundary marker, visible because the vegetation has been thinned. At the time of my visit, onsite signage identified the structure’s remains simply as a “historic cotton warehouse” and urged visitors to help protect and preserve the site by not digging or removing artifacts and not camping overnight. This site is visible from the water with in-place interpretation and land-based accessibility, and interpretative materials for the ARMHT can highlight the region’s significant cotton industry to the state of Florida.

To access Torreya State Park’s resources not visible from the river, my team and I beached the pontoon boat on a nearby sandbar and climbed that bank of the river to the park’s nature trail. The trail highlights the area’s unique local vegetation and the remains of a Confederate Civil War earthen battery. Apparent by several series of depressions in the ground
and mounds of earth, the batteries are a major visible resource for the park. At the time of my visit, some small signs interpreted and identified the battery for park visitors. Since my visit, archaeological excavations at the battery have revealed intact gun emplacements and powder magazine structures (Mabelitini 2012). In addition to learning more about Confederate structural engineering, ordnance supplies, and military tactics, archaeologists also commissioned an artist to paint historical re-creations of the battery. In the future, park staff or ARMHT implementers can use the historical research, archaeological data, and artistic renditions from this archaeological research to expand upon current interpretive resources at the park.

Fort Gadsden State Historic Site, located within the Apalachicola National Forest, is marked by a clearing on top of a high bluff with a wooden fence, flagpole, and interpretive sign noticeable from the water. Similar to Torreya State Park, many of Fort Gadsden’s heritage resources were not visible from the river. Once again, my team and I scaled the banks of the river to assess the visible heritage and interpretative resources at the site. A full-color outdoor exhibit highlights the fort’s history with interpretive text and artifacts. The raised outline of the octagonal British fort magazine dramatically demonstrates its size and strategic placement. Interpretive signs and a guided path to the cemetery, with visible grave shaft depressions, depict the horrific explosion of the power magazine that killed more than 250 individuals. A sign interpreting the remains of a steamship’s boiler and paddlewheel machinery illuminates the importance of the cotton industry and steamships as well as the inherent dangers associated with steam engines.

The lower sections of the Apalachicola River have some unique heritage resources visible from the water. Wooden rooftops, platforms, and docks for apiaries were hard to locate without the GIS map. Although initially difficult to discern from the surrounding tree cover, once located, the apiary features appeared well-preserved. Interpretive materials for apiaries can highlight the biological and cultural significance of the Tupelo honey industry. This heritage resource is one from which ARMHT trail users can take a piece of history home by buying locally produced honey in river communities. The remains of a lumber mill’s triangular pier foundations protrude
from the tree-covered banks into the river near Apalachicola Bay. Similar to the Gregory House, this resource is highly visible because of its reflective white oyster shell composite. In addition to using these remains to highlight the successful lumber industry in the area, ARMHT implementers should go a step further. Interpretive text for the remains of the lumber mill can easily be converted into information on the importance of stewardship for both natural and historical resources. Specifically, text can contextualize modern forestry practices in relation to those of the past. Land usage policy reform provides a tangible example of the importance of studying history and of learning lessons from the past.

Although the majority of the inventoried resources could not be located, additional features that were not part of the original ARMHT list were visible. For example, much evidence of United States Army Corps of Engineers dikes and other man-made water management barriers are visible along the river. Many dikes consisted of linear rows of rock and wooden tipi-like structures perpendicular to the river’s banks. These resources are ideal for depicting how modern and historic human behavior influences the flow and path of the river throughout time. Specifically, Civil War-era maps depicting navigational obstructions can illuminate the locations and development of modern oxbow lakes and tributary waters.

No established river access points are available for the resources; however, most had shallow sandbars nearby, where we anchored the pontoon and climbed the banks to assess each site’s interpretation potential. Both Torreya State Park and Fort Gadsden Historic Site had several signs, exhibits, and trails contextualizing their resources. Since the implementers of the ARMHT should not encourage its users to use non-established access points from the river, interpretive materials that users can carry with them on the river can echo and build upon existing themes at each site. For example, in addition to text, water-resistant brochures can utilize historical photos to illustrate what once existed. Brochures can also encourage users to access the sites via land entrances to get a close-up view of the resources.

Overall, the reconnaissance trip was very successful and allowed me to realize the importance and need for historical photos in the ARMHT. Although a tremendous amount of
history can be used to formulate engaging interpretive texts, potential trail users will visually starve without an abundance of images. In addition to maps, sketches, or recreations, historical photos should play a major role in interpretive materials. Before the trip, I had concerns about how the ARMHT could denote site locations without using exact GPS coordinates, especially for sensitive archaeological sites or privately owned land. The river’s mile marker signs were easily visible and spaced every 10th of a mile, thus providing an ideal means for ARMHT site designations.

Active Observations

After passive and moderate community observations, it was evident that a popular pastime for residents and tourists alike was kayaking the Apalachicola River and its many tributaries. Advertisements for kayaking tours, businesses renting kayaking equipment, personal vehicles hauling kayaking gear, and numerous statewide-established kayaking trails solidified kayaking as a major means for exploring and enjoying the Apalachicola River. Future ARMHT designers can easily create interpreted materials appropriate for kayakers.

In order to experience this established community activity, I participated in one of the Apalachicola Maritime Museum’s annual kayaking trips. Described as “an epic one-week kayak and canoe educational adventure” (Apalachicola Maritime Museum 2008), the eight-day trip starts at the river’s headwater in Chattahoochee and ends in Apalachicola Bay. With a paddling average of 14 miles per day for a total of 106 miles, these trips were for experienced paddling enthusiasts. Considering my limited recreational kayaking and canoeing experience, I chose to participate in only the first part of the trip.

The Starfish, a pontoon support vessel, accompanied participants and provided a platform for securing individual canoes and kayaks, transporting overnight camping supplies, and preparing daily meals. The trip’s itinerary highlighted daily educational programming. Although the trip was mostly environmental in nature, we participated in a few historical field trips, including Torreya State Park, Fort Gadsden, and a presentation about the production of Tupelo honey.
Fifteen people participated in the kayaking trip. Everyone except me was middle-aged or newly retired; participants came as couples or with friends. Members of the group were from the southeastern United States and as far west as Montana and Texas. During the welcome night reception, it was evident that the reason the participants chose this trip was the Apalachicola River’s biodiversity. Over the next three days, we spent most of our time together as a group paddling the river, exploring the wilderness, sharing meals, and setting up camp each night. I was able to conduct several informal individual and group interviews during this trip. Response from these interviews provided input on the ARMHT from a niche of tourists. These individuals likely would not specifically travel to visit a maritime heritage trail rather than take a kayaking tour, primarily because they were unclear what a maritime heritage trail entailed. After I explained the basic concepts of the ARMHT, many became enthusiastic and welcomed any supplemental information on heritage topics while paddling. The kayakers emphasized the need for flexibility of interpretive components as well as trail length. Future ARMHT implementers should consider developing a trail that does not have a predetermined order but rather has thematically linked sites that can stand alone.

My perceptions of the river during this trip were very similar to those I had during the boat reconnaissance trip; in fact, because of its slower pace, the biological and the environmental aspects of the river were even more pronounced. Although beautiful, the same riverine scenery for hours becomes monotonous. Even though heritage resources were not previous interests of the kayakers before the trip, they became interested because the resources provided visual relief from the vegetation on the river’s banks. Reactions of curiosity by paddlers at every visible historical and archaeological resource solidified the necessity for the ARMHT to provide interpretive material for highly visible sites. If no remains of archaeological sites exist, trail implementers can use significant geological features of the river to interpret aspects of history, such as drawing attention to Alum Bluff, which is associated with Andrew Jackson’s campaign during the First Seminole War and with Civil War river defenses. Additionally, the ARMHT has
the potential to attract a wide audience of users, not just those seeking to learn about the river’s heritage.

Through the community immersion process, I was able to experience and participate in several segments of Apalachicola River culture. Information from free listing, observations, informal individual and group interviews, and cultural expert interviews provided invaluable insight into the wants and needs of potential ARMHT users. Ultimately, these ethnographic techniques directly steered and influenced the development and design of the formal ARQ and the overall ARMHT model.
CHAPTER VI
APALACHICOLA RIVER QUESTIONNAIRE

Designing, testing, and distributing the ARQ was one of the last stages in developing the ARMHT model. After I researched the historical context of the area, assessed the heritage resources, engaged in community immersion, and conducted ethnographic observations and interviews, a wealth of information guided the questions and content of the ARQ. Questions highlighted recurring themes in the wants, needs, and concerns of potential ARMHT users.

Questionnaire Design

SurveyMonkey has many questionnaire design options that allow flexibility with appearance, layout, question type, and data collection. Several different membership categories are available in SurveyMonkey, ranging from the free “Basic” option with limited features to the $65 per month “Platinum” option with unlimited advanced features. Since I did not know how many ARQ responses I would receive and needed more advanced features for design and analysis, I chose the “Pro” level membership. The Pro level membership includes an unlimited number of survey questions and 1,000 monthly responses per questionnaire. Using Secure Sockets Layer (SSL), SurveyMonkey ensures the protection and security of all responses through Internet data encryption. To keep all responses anonymous, I used a Web link for access to the ARQ and disabled SurveyMonkey from saving individual computer IP addresses.

The questionnaire showed the percentage of completion with a progress bar at the bottom of each page. The navigation buttons allowed participants to move to the next page, return to the previous page, or exit the survey. To comply with UWF’s standard IRB policy requiring only individuals 18 years or older in human research, I used skip logic for the first question regarding the participant’s age bracket. The only question that required an answer before progressing to the next page was the first question regarding age. If a respondent chose “Under 18,” the survey skipped to a page explaining the minimum age for participation. Although not foolproof, this method helped to ensure that only adults participated in the ARQ. To help stem the problem of
an individual taking a survey multiple times, SurveyMonkey provides a setting for allowing only
one questionnaire response per computer. Since participants might complete the questionnaire
from public use computers such as those in libraries, I allowed multiple responses per computer.
Toward the end of the ARQ I did ask, “How many times have you taken this survey?” to try to
determine whether multiple responses from the same person was an issue.

I used a variety of question types for the ARQ: multiple choice allowing only one answer,
multiple choice allowing multiple answers, rating scale, comment box, and multiple text boxes.
Respondents were not required to answer every question before progressing to the next page. For
questions with lists, such as those used in multiple choice and rating scale, I enabled a random
sort option so that the order of each item would not subconsciously influence participants. The
order of the questions progresses from general to specific: views of the Apalachicola River,
visitation usages, interests in educational programs, and ARMHT themes and design.

Focus Group and Pilot Study

When developing a culturally effective questionnaire, researchers must make sure
“language and patterns of speech in the survey be couched in the same meaning system and
frame of reference used by the people who are to answer the questions” (LeCompte and Schensul
1999b:71). The purpose of the pilot study was to establish a baseline of feedback from a small
group of known local informants. The small group, also referred to as the focus group, provided
open and honest reactions to the overall ARQ.

After the initial ethnographic background research and interviews with cultural experts,
I selected key informants to be a part of the focus group. Eleven individuals participated in
the pilot survey: eight females and three males. Most participants were between 45 and 64
years of age, and all were English speakers. The majority of the participants lived in Florida,
and one lived in both Alabama and Montana. The participants represented all predetermined
categories for associations with the Apalachicola River: organization tied to the river; institution
interpreting cultural and historical resources; individual living along the river; city, county, state,
or federal official; and visitor, past resident, or researcher. The majority specified an association with the tourism industry or state government.

The pilot ARQ consisted of 15 pages with 45 questions. The questionnaire began with a welcome page containing an introduction to the research and a disclaimer for the survey. This page fulfilled UWF’s IRB requirements for electronic informed consent. Following the welcome page, the survey included 6 questions focusing on demographics, 16 questions pertaining to the river in general, 6 questions on educational programs associated with the river, 12 questions about a maritime heritage trail for the river, and 5 questions at the end of the questionnaire collecting general knowledge. The last two pages of the survey thanked participants, described the intended outcome of this research, and solicited names and emails of potential stakeholders and trail users for inclusion in the ARQ.

Focus group members received an email invitation to participate in the ARQ. Since all pilot study individuals were familiar with my research agenda, I requested that participants try to take the survey from the point of view of someone who does not have prior knowledge about the maritime heritage trail model. After the participants completed the survey, I asked them to answer a few questions that addressed some of my initial concerns about the questionnaire:

- How long did it take you to complete the survey?
- What did you think of the length of the survey?
- Were any of the questions unclear or confusing?
- Did you have any suggestions or comments about the survey?

In regard to the first two questions pertaining to the length of the survey and amount of time needed for completion, answers varied widely. It took the majority of respondents between 20 and 34 minutes to complete the survey. One individual spent 1 hour completing the survey. I attributed this time range disparity to the open-ended questions which had comment boxes for answers. It was logical that those participants who submitted in-depth answers spent more time completing the survey than did participants whose answers were simple. Of those who answered the question regarding the length of the survey, 70% responded that the survey was too long.
Several indicated that they skipped many of the questions because of the length of the survey and that by the end of the survey, they were tired of answering questions.

Feedback concerning the clarity of questions within the survey was sparse. The survey listed 14 historic periods with proper names and dates associated with each, paralleling the FMSF categories. Only one participant commented on the question asking about which historic time period he or she would like to learn more about or that interested him or her the most. The respondent indicated that the general public may not know enough to select such a focused time period and suggested combining categories to limit the number of options. Another pilot group member expressed uncertainty about the type of answers some questions were trying to elicit.

Responses to the question regarding any additional comments or suggestions were very informative. One pilot group member suggested including sportspeople who utilize other north Florida rivers in the survey population. Another expressed concern regarding input from individuals without Internet service who represent an important stakeholder group. One participant suggested allowing pilot group members to comment on each question as they were taking the survey to allow more comments on individual questions rather than commenting in a separate email after completing the survey. Another member of the group suggested asking a series of questions about the different sections of the river (upper, middle, and lower). Because of the length of the river, framing responses to specific questions for the river as a whole presented some difficulty. Several participants requested changing the questions that require only one answer to allow several possible answers. For example, the questionnaire asked participants to pick one answer for a historic period and type of maritime trail that they would be interested in using, but respondents might have interest in several time periods. A few respondents suggested using more multiple-choice questions and fewer open-ended questions to help aid in the progression of the survey. Allowing for an optional comment area on all questions would capture in-depth feedback from those interested in giving additional explanation. These data would help narrow peoples’ choices to obvious answers but would allow the question to capture any additional answers. The use of questions that simply required a “yes” or “no” answer deterred those wanting to elaborate.
The pilot group for the ARQ did have demographical shortcomings. No one within the group was in the age bracket of 18 to 24 or had a primary language other than English. The eight participants from Florida were all located within the Big Bend area: Apalachicola, Quincy, and Tallahassee. No snorkelers or divers were within the group.

Although only 11 participants constituted the pilot group, they did represent a wide variety of potential users. Participants included those who had visited the river only once as well as those who visited daily. The group represented seasonal visitation throughout the year. Of the pilot participants, 72% had used other trails associated with the river, and 50% of the group was familiar with or had used some type of maritime heritage trail.

I took all comments and feedback from the focus group and results from the pilot study into consideration. One of the major concerns with the survey was its length. Finding a balance between obtaining as much information as possible without deterring participation required the streamlining of questions. One way to overcome this challenge included removing questions that asked for diametric opinions. For example, I removed a question so that the participants did not answer both “Is there anything that deters you from using or visiting the river?” and “Is there anything that would encourage you to use or visit the river more?” Answers in the pilot group to the second diametric question included responses such as “ditto” and “same as above” which could not be linked to individual surveys and therefore proved useless in capturing the intended meaning of these statements. In addition to removing similar questions, I also rearranged the page layout, reducing the overall survey page count. With fewer pages, the progress bar displayed greater survey completion percentages as participants advanced the pages.

I also addressed critical feedback concerning the clarity of some questions and the limited number of answer choices. For the majority of the “yes/no” questions soliciting respondents’ opinions, I added a “No Opinion” option. Multiple choice and rating questions that had originally allowed only one answer allowed multiple answers in the study. The final revised ARQ consisted of 13 pages with 43 questions (Appendix B).
Results of Questionnaire

Since the rate of questionnaire and survey returns and completions is typically low, I created a large database of email addresses of potential ARMHT users and implementers. From the beginning stages of this research, I collected email contacts for individuals, businesses, organizations, and programs associated with the Apalachicola River. Sources for email addresses included websites, brochures, business cards, flyers, newspapers, magazines, and TV and radio advertisements. I distributed the Web link to the ARQ via email and social media outlets. The link also appeared in a local newspaper article highlighting my research. Personally, I sent over 500 emails, posted 30 Twitter messages, and made 14 Facebook posts. With each invitation, I encouraged recipients to share the survey link with co-workers, friends, family, and anyone who might be interested in the Apalachicola River. Several recipients let me know that they had shared the SurveyMonkey link by forwarding the email, retweeting tweets, and sharing on Facebook.

In total, 109 people participated in the ARQ. Not all respondents answered every question; therefore, results are based on total percentages for each question. Most participants were between 45 and 64 years of age (Figure 11); 64% were males, and 32% were females. All but one spoke English as his or her primary language. Most people lived in Florida at the time of the study, with a few individuals living in Alabama, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee.
The survey population was representative of each of the predetermined associations with the Apalachicola River (Figure 12). Although almost 20% of participants chose “Other,” written specifications indicated that the majority actually fell under “Individuals living along the river” or “Visitor, past resident, or researcher” categories. Many did not know how to classify recreational uses of the river within the predetermined categories. About 25% of people identified as fitting within more than one category.
Views about ownership of the Apalachicola River were overwhelmingly inclusive or exclusive. Words and phrases used for inclusive responses included “people,” “everybody,” “future generations,” and “Mother Earth.” Exclusive responses stated that “no one” owned the river. Top responses for the most important aspect of the river included water flow and quality, ecosystem and biodiversity, and the seafood industry. When asked to rate the predefined categories in importance, most felt that all categories were important, with only 20% of responses rating a category as having less importance (Figure 13).
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**FIGURE 13.** Average rating of important aspects of river. (Chart by author, 2012.)

Participants thought some of the most important aspects of the river in the past included transportation, commerce, and prehistoric inhabitants. Common responses to what were important aspects of the river at the time of the study included recreation, navigation, seafood industry, and environmental stewardship. Participants thought some of the most important aspects of the river in the future would include freshwater source, restoration of environmental health, water rights, and economic impact. All respondents believed that either separately or working together, federal or state agencies and the public are responsible for preserving the river.

Data gathered about when people use or visit the Apalachicola River were evenly distributed. Seasonally, participants used the river year-round. Frequency of use ranged from every day to annually, with few who had never been to the river or visited only once. Means
for using or visiting the river were predominately car and motorized vessel (Figure 14). Many of the responses under the “Other” category included “boat,” a response which falls under the motorized vessel, and “walking,” a response which falls under hiking.
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FIGURE 14. Current means of using or visiting the river. (Chart by author, 2012.)

The majority of participants use or visit the river to enjoy the natural environment and to partake in recreational activities. Common factors that deter some people from visiting the river include low water levels and flow, limited public access, speed of motorized vessels, and travel distance. At the time of the study, almost 60% of respondents used existing trails associated with hiking, paddling, birding, and bicycling. Close to 90% of all respondents had some concerns about the Apalachicola River. Common concerns included water flow and quality, resource exploitation, development, and environmental and archaeological preservation. To change the river, participants would like to minimize upstream pollution and control of water flow, reduce dredging activities, and increase available educational and recreational programs. Keeping the natural beauty and preserving the wildlife of the river are of importance as well.

Regarding educational programming along the river, 71% of respondents were aware of existing programs at the time of the study, and 80% were interested in a new program. Because of human curiosity and lack of individual stewardship, 93% of participants believed others would be interested in a new educational program. Many felt a new educational program would
capture the interest of people while promoting individual stewardship for the river’s resources. Specifically, respondents felt that year-round residents and visitors would benefit the most from a new educational program, especially adults aged 19 to 64 and youth under 18 years of age. Recreation, archaeology, and economy rate highest in importance for a new educational program on the Apalachicola River (Figure 15).
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**FIGURE 15.** Average rating of important aspects for a new educational program. (Chart by author, 2012.)

Nearly 75% of participants were not familiar with a maritime heritage trail. Anticipating this response, I provided a general description of a maritime heritage trail and asked respondents if they thought any benefits or problems would be associated with a maritime heritage trail. Responses regarding benefits to the river and its surrounding populations highlighted an increase in heritage tourism, local stewardship and conservation, and a sense of ownership and pride. Responses about problems that a maritime heritage trail might cause the river and the people living around the area included concerns of increased traffic and development, trail maintenance, environmental impact, and property rights.

Questions pertaining to specific interests in an ARMHT asked about themes, format, length, and interpretive trail aids. Although nearly 70% of respondents knew about historical sites or events associated with the Apalachicola River, 44% did not think any one particular
aspect of history should be highlighted. Almost 40% of participants were interested in learning more about several time periods through associated interpretive ARMHT materials instead of choosing only one of the historical periods (Figure 16). Respectively, the Civil War, First Spanish, Territorial Development, and Prehistoric periods received the most responses.

Concerning what type of trail participants were most interested in using, 83% of participants indicated water-based trails, 68% chose land-based trails, and 38% selected Internet-based trails. Hiking and boating were the most popular ARMHT preferred uses (Figure 17). Of all the respondents, only one participant suggested something other than the predetermined answer choices: a scuba-diving trail.
Although only 38% of participates indicated interest in a solely virtual ARMHT, 82% of respondents would consider using websites as part of interpretive trail aids. Brochures and signs were the next most likely used trail aid (Figure 18). Five participants specified their interests in aids for the ARMHT in addition to the listed choices of possible trail aids. Responses for other interpretive trail materials included a scavenger hunt, a smartphone application, and a paper map.

Most participants were interested in a shorter ARMHT; 64% selected quarter-day trips consisting of up to 3 hours or half-day trips between 4 and 5 hours (Figure 19). Additional responses captured by a comment box indicated that the overall trail length did not necessarily matter to some, as long as all parts of the trail had manageable lengths spaced between water and
land access points. One participant stated that it “Doesn’t matter how long it is. As long as it’s comprehensive, we would love to come back.”

Final comments and concerns about the ARMHT were very positive in supporting a heritage educational program along the Apalachicola River. Responses indicated that the area lacks a program that interprets the hidden historical resources in an engaging manager while maintaining an overall stewardship message. Almost 81% of respondents received the ARQ Web link invitation via email, and a much smaller percentage learned about the questionnaire through Facebook, Twitter, and word of mouth. Only two individuals took the survey more than once. The two repeat participants were likely part of the pilot study group.

In combination with data from the ARQ and in-depth background research into the study area, the ARMHT model provides direction and focus for implementers. Overall, results were encouraging for future model users to develop several different segments of an ARMHT. Whether a 3-hour driving tour with an interpretative map, a half-day boating trail with laminated brochures, or a multi-day self-guided podcast tour of the entire river, the ARMHT is adaptable and flexible for a variety of features and uses.
CHAPTER VII
PROPOSED TRAIL MODEL

The establishment of an ARMHT depends upon future trail implementers who will combine the wants and needs of their audiences with available visible heritage resources. Data from this thesis’s ethnographic research, including community immersion, group interviews, and a formal questionnaire, indicated several possible successful ARMHT formats. Based on the known resources at hand and the ethnographic results, my proposed vision of the ARMHT is detailed in this chapter. Future trail implementers should note that my proposed trail does not take into consideration such factors as budget or fabrication but rather demonstrates how data from this thesis can create a model trail that can be transformed into a heritage tourism product.

Design and Format

Considering the potential trail user’s wants and needs, available known heritage resources, and the location of a logistical infrastructure, I propose that the ARMHT consist of a 4-hour water-based trail for motorized vessels on the lower Apalachicola River. The proposed trail uses a website and water-resistant brochures to highlight interpreted heritage resources from several historic time periods. Interpretive themes carried throughout the trail emphasize the interconnectedness of the river’s natural and cultural resources while promoting conservation, stewardship, and responsible enjoyment.

The target audience for my proposed ARMHT is residents living along and visitors to the Apalachicola River. I would promote the ARMHT as a family-friendly trail to encourage a wide age range of users. I chose a family-friendly trail intended for residents and visitors because results from the ARQ indicated that participants thought that both year-round residents and visitors under the age of 64 would benefit the most from a new educational program.

At the time of this study, respondents indicated that they used or visited the river fairly equally throughout the year. Important to the potential local economic stimulus and trail usage, the ARMHT would be a year-round heritage tourism product with likely peak seasons during
the spring months from March to May. The trail’s potential to increase tourism dollars for river communities addresses respondents who indicated a need for boosting local economies. The possibility for the ARMHT to be used year-round takes into consideration the hesitation of some participants who stated that a new educational program that catered solely to the tourist seasons would have low visitation the rest of the year.

Almost 65% of all participants preferred a quarter-day or half-day trail ranging from 1 to 5 hours long. In conjunction with ethnographic results, the proposed ARMHT takes approximately 4 hours to complete at a leisurely pace. Since 4 hours is not long enough to include the entire Apalachicola River in a maritime heritage trail, the proposed ARMHT encompasses one section of the river.

I chose a water-based trail for the Apalachicola River because 83% of ARQ participants indicated an interest in a trail that was accessible via water over a land-based or solely Internet-based trail. Corresponding with participants’ wants, existing infrastructure at the time of the study was more applicable to a water-based trail than to a land-based trail. The river’s updated public-access boat ramps, visible river mile marker signs, easy maneuverability, and proximity to the heritage resources all provide a favorable setting for a water-based maritime heritage trail.

The ARQ included several predetermined water-based options for participants to indicate their current river uses and the type of ARMHT that they would prefer. Answer choices included motorized vessels such as boats, non-motorized vessels such as kayaks or canoes, and underwater activities such as snorkeling or scuba-diving. Since the most popular response for the preferred water-based trail was “boating,” I decided that the ARMHT should be designed for motorized vessels.

At the time of the study, almost 60% of respondents used or visited the Apalachicola River via a motorized vessel, an answer second only to car-based responses. Research indicated that a large population currently uses the river by boat, thus providing a large recreational population base for the ARMHT. Since people are already boating along the river, many might be interested in adding something new to their existing activities. By creating a motorized-vessel
ARMHT, future implementers would have to promote only the interpretive aspect of the trail, rather than trying to change people’s current recreation behaviors along the river. For example, creating a successful well-visited scuba-diving ARMHT would require more individuals to partake in the sport, more businesses to cater to scuba rental gear, and more advertising dollars.

The boating population represents a wide variety of recreational users. Since ARQ respondents continually emphasized the need for a maritime heritage trail to be combined with the many recreational uses of the river, a trail for motorized vessels addresses this desire. Recreational activities such as fishing, birding, swimming, picnicking, and cruising attract a wide population demographic. Unlike kayaks or canoes, motorized vessels would provide people of varying physical abilities and ages access to the ARMHT. In addition, boats are able to cover more distance in a shorter amount of time, making motorized vessels more suitable for a half-day ARMHT and allowing trail users the ability to experience a variety of resources. I assume that most trail users would trailer their boats to a boat ramp and would begin and end the trail at the same ramp rather than end the trail at a different ramp by arranging for transportation. Since trail users will essentially travel the length of the ARMHT twice during each trip, experiencing the ARMHT in descending or ascending river mile order does not matter.

In addition to individual private boat owners using the ARMHT, local businesses would be able to create opportunities for guided tours. Over 55% of all participants in the ARQ were interested in a maritime heritage trail that was a guided tour. At the time of the study, several guided water-based tourism ventures were located in the area, including sunset cruises, ecological tours, and fishing charters. The Apalachicola River’s established boating tourism industry could use the ARMHT to build upon current tours and to create new programs.

The proposed trail consists of two trail aids: a website and a brochure. Since 82% of respondents would use a website as part of an interpretive trail aid rather than solely as a virtual trail, I would establish an ARHMT website. From this website, interested parties could plan trips. A short promotional video would invite website visitors to explore the ARHMT virtually and learn about the significant cultural, environmental, and historical aspects of the Apalachicola
River. Addressing participants’ community wants regarding benefitting the local economy, I would encourage local economic stimulus through the website by listing local businesses such as restaurants, hotels, and boating stores near the ARMHT. Under each business would appear the address; the hours of operation; the payment methods; a short description; and, when applicable, a link to the business’ individual website. If local business owners that could promote their businesses on the trail website, might be likely to promote the ARMHT to customers and place trail advertisements in storefronts. In addition to the desktop version, the trail website would be mobile friendly, allowing potential users to access the site while physically experiencing the trail.

I also chose brochures as an interpretive trail aid because at the time of the study, 72% of participants were interested in using brochures as part of a maritime heritage trail. Although 72% of participants were also interested in onsite signage as a trail aid, I chose brochures over signs. Research indicated that hesitation to a maritime heritage trail included the infrastructure cost and maintenance in addition to the possibility that trail infrastructure would detract from the environmental aesthetics. Brochures were just as popular with participants as were signs, but brochures have little to no impact on the river’s biological appearance. Production and distribution of brochures would also most likely require less personnel and money than the production, installation, and maintenance of signs.

Brochures for the ARMHT would be made of water-resistant materials and be printed in full color. Each 8½ x 11 landscape-orientated brochure would highlight a trail site with interpretive text and would include historical photographs, maps, or excerpts from historical documents when available. Brochures could be easily fastened together to create an interpretive package while ensuring ease of use on a moving boat. Although each trail brochure would make up the ARMHT’s brochure package, ideally, every ARMHT brochure could stand alone. The trail’s interpretive brochure packages would be available for purchase or rent at a variety of local businesses throughout the lower Apalachicola River. Proceeds from brochure sales would go toward maintaining the trail’s website, reprinting brochures, and advertising and promoting the ARMHT.
Layout and Interpretation

Because of the length of the river, access points, available heritage resources, and an established tourism industry, the ARMHT would focus only on the lower portion of the Apalachicola River. The proposed ARMHT layout highlights heritage sites in the lower portion of the river within Gulf, Liberty, and Franklin Counties. The northern boundary limits of the trail would be at river mile 42, near the city of Wewahitchka, Florida. I chose this mile marker because Gaskin Park and Landing has a public boat ramp and facilities. The official website for Gulf County indicates that Gaskin Park is a family-friendly park with a playground, bathrooms, and facilities that accommodate pets, picnics, and grilling. The amenities at Gaskin Park are highly suitable for the ARMHT’s target audience: families.

The southern boundary limit of the trail would be at river mile 0, adjacent to Apalachicola, Florida. The public boat ramp in downtown historic Apalachicola is easily accessible and is near the Apalachicola Community Center, where ARMHT brochures could be sold, rented, or checked out. Apalachicola has several options for lodging, restaurants, shops, and convenience stores that trail users could take advantage of as needed or desired.

Although the order of the trail—whether starting or ending at Wewahitchka or Apalachicola—does not matter to the ARMHT, for the purpose of this thesis, I describe the location and type of heritage sites in descending river mile order. The trail brochure would identify the general river mile location of each site rather than giving the exact geo-referenced location. Starting at mile 42 on the west side of the river at Gaskin Park, the trail would highlight buried archaeological remains of a historic refuse dump. This site would depict the use of the Apalachicola River and its surrounding lands throughout the historic period from the First Spanish Period in the early 16th century to its current modern use as a public park and landing. Next, mile 36 would interpret the site of a historic log boat, illuminating one engineering design of a shallow-draft vessel used to transport people and goods along the river and its smaller tributaries. At mile 35, the trail would interpret two Confederate batteries located west of the river: Battery Gilmer and Battery Cobb. Historical and archaeological information on both
batteries would highlight the importance of the strategic geographical location of the river and would explain that access to the Gulf of Mexico and inland states during the Civil War was significant to both Confederate and Union strategies. Mile 34 would showcase the remains of a vernacular pull boat from the 1900s that was used to haul downed logs and snags, emphasizing the continual struggle for keeping the waters of the Apalachicola River navigable.

East of the river at mile 32, the trail would highlight the structural remains of a hunting cabin within the Apalachicola National Forest while paralleling modern and past human uses of the river and its surrounding forests. Mile 29 would draw attention to Battle Bend on the east side of the river, a floodplain oxbow lake created by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in 1969. The place name of Battle Bend evokes images of past conflicts, and the site provides evidence of prior river meandering being altered for modern navigation purposes.

At mile 25, the proposed ARMHT would feature the remains of a sidewheel steamship and would interpret the steamship’s role in transporting commodities and people along the Apalachicola River during the 19th century. East of the river at mile 23, the archaeological remains of an early 20th-century historic sawmill illuminates the lumber boom during this period. Between miles 22 and 21 is Brickyard Island, which historical records indicate is near the location of a trading post belonging to Panton, Leslie and Company. The Brickyard Island trail site could interpret the history of trade and interaction with native populations during the 18th and 19th centuries.

Next, Fort Gadsden Recreation Area, located on the east bank of the river at mile 20, would highlight the struggle for military control of the Apalachicola River during the War of 1812 and the First Seminole War. Forbes Island on the west side of the river at mile 18 would depict the political and economic struggle between native populations and Europeans. On the east side of the river at mile 15, archaeological evidence associated with historic Lower Creek and Seminole Native Americans can emphasize that although the ARMHT focuses on heritage resources and river use since the 16th century, evidence for prehistoric Native American occupation within the Apalachicola River Valley extends far earlier than that historic time period.
West of the river at mile 12, the remains of an apiary’s loading ramp and wooden platform would interpret 20th-century human entrepreneurship to harvest high-quality honey. The remains of a small rectangular wooden barge at mile 9 would demonstrate the variability in vessel construction and use along the river. The multiple ship types highlighted throughout the trail would reflect the variety of human uses of the river over time.

Between miles 5 and 4, a historic railroad trestle bridge would illuminate the railroad’s influence on local and statewide trade and commerce. West of the river at mile 1, the foundational remains of a lumber mill from 1871 that specialized in the processing of cypress trees would depict the different types of resources harvested from local forests. Between miles 1 and 0 is the historic waterfront city of Apalachicola. Lined with modern fishing vessels, Apalachicola would emphasize the river’s unique biodiversity and contextualize the development and significance of the seafood industry throughout time.

In total, the proposed ARMTH consists of 42 river miles and highlights 18 historical and archaeological sites. Spaced between one and six miles apart, the placement of featured trail sites would keep users engaged with interpretive text throughout the entire 4 hours. The visibility of many trail sites depends on the river’s water level; therefore, some sites may be visible only during low water levels. To overcome this obstacle, trail brochures must use historical photos or maps for each site. The trail’s website and brochures would trend the interpretive theme of the symbiotic relationship of environmental and historical resources as well as past and current lifeways along the river.

Limitations and Considerations

As mentioned previously, the results of this research indicate a variety of possible formats for a successful ARMHT. Balancing potential trail users’ wants with real-world practicality is a must for future trail implementers. For example, although ARQ participants chose hiking as the most popular preferred type of trail with 70% of respondents indicating interest, I posit that the current trail infrastructure does not lend itself to highlighting heritage resources within the preferred ARMHT timeframe of 1 to 5 hours. I also considered a driving trail since at the time of
the study, 72% of participants used or visited the river via car. Respondents showed significant interest in a driving ARMHT, with 57% indicating its appeal; however, paved public road accessibility within proximity along the length of the river is limited. In the future, if land-based logistical parameters become conducive to an ARMHT, implementers should consider tailoring a maritime heritage trail that captures this niche of potential trail users.

If the lower portion of the ARMHT were established first, future implementers could expand upon my proposed trail to accommodate the potential trail users who might want to spend a full day or multiple days exploring the ARMHT. At the time of the study, results of the ARQ indicated the following: 49% of participants were interested in a full-day trail between 6 and 8 hours; 36% of participants were interested in a multi-day trail between 1 and 4 days; and 29% of participants were interested in an extended multi-day trail consisting of 4 or more days. I recommend creating two 4-hour trail segments corresponding to the upper and middle portions of the Apalachicola River that connect with the proposed lower portion outlined in this chapter.

In addition to providing length to the ARMHT, three independent, cohesive trail segments could also attract a wider audience since anyone traveling along or over any section of the river would be near the trail. Multiple trail segments could encourage repeat use of the trail for individuals who have completed only one section of the ARMHT. For example, a family living in Chattahoochee at the north end of the river could vacation in Apalachicola at the mouth of the river and would be able to experience both the upper and lower sections of the ARMHT.

Future trail implementers should consider several factors before taking the ARMHT from the model stage to the production stage. Although I did not address the practicalities of developing interpretive text, designing trail signage, and creating interpretive materials for the ARMHT, many resources are available to guide these stages of implementation (Serrell 1996; Brochu 2003; Gross et al. 2006; Moscardo et al. 2007; Caputo et al. 2008). The common themes for developing effective interpretive text and materials include conciseness, simplicity, clarity, and aesthetics. The trail should have one or two interpretative goals that all components strive to meet.
The message of preservation and stewardship must be the underlying theme carried throughout every aspect of the trail. Interpretive materials should address site stewardship and best practices for users of the ARMHT, both at the beginning and end, and should remind users of appropriate heritage site etiquette. A popular statement succinctly addresses proper visitor practices: “Take only photos; leave only footprints.” If the ARMHT were adapted for underwater use for snorkelers or divers, implementers could modify the statement: “Take only photos; leave only bubbles.”

Ultimately, the value of the ARMHT, no matter what format, is more than a publicly supported recreational venture themed around history and archaeology. As echoed throughout every step of this ethnographic research, people innately hold true that the past belongs to everybody and that no one person “owns” history or its interpretation and meaning. Heritage tourism products such as maritime heritage trails share non-renewable cultural resources with the public while instilling a sense of the truly priceless nature of these resources in understanding and learning from past peoples and cultures.
CHAPTER VIII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

With the infusion of ethnographic research into the development of the ARMHT, this research provides an effective methodology for making the past relevant through public interpretation and heritage tourism. Maritime heritage trails allow for the interpretation of multiple archeological, historical, and natural resources, while social research of the study area and potential trail users addresses the needs of contemporary communities. Researching the historical context, identifying available heritage resources, and visually assessing potential trail sites provided the foundation for establishing the Apalachicola River’s interpretation potential. Information from community observations, community participation, free listing, group interviews, and cultural informants illuminated public opinions and attitudes. Data from the focus group, pilot study, and ARQ established parameters for trail design, layout, interpretive content, and interpretive materials. By allowing ethnographic data to steer and guide each stage of the ARMHT model, I was able to identify, adapt to, and address public wants and needs during the developmental stages. As demonstrated throughout this thesis, public interpretation of heritage resources that begins with community assessment creates the foundation for a successful community-relevant heritage tourism product.

Ethnographic Insight

Anthropologists seek to create unbiased research designs to diminish culturally skewed results. Although I was aware of my own personal biases and tried not to let them influence the development of the ARMHT, as a human being, I could not accomplish this task without constant input from others. Data from ethnographic and social research techniques provided a mechanism for creating a trail that considers a variety of specific local concerns and interests.

Throughout every stage of this research, information gained from ethnographic methods influenced decisions about the development of an ARMHT. Many of my initial thoughts for a model maritime heritage trail along the Apalachicola River did not address the public’s wants
and needs and were disconnected from current issues. Apart from the assumptions that an ARMHT must incorporate recreational aspects of the river and the environmental stewardship of the river, all of my other assumptions concerning the best interpretive themes and trail designs were incorrect. For example, because of the rural nature of many riverfront communities, the overall length of the river, and the logistical challenges associated with visitation, I thought most people would be interested in a trail that was solely Web-based. Data from the ARQ showed the opposite: A virtual trail was the least popular interpretive option. Further, I assumed that the majority of potential trail users would not have access to watercraft and would therefore prefer a land-based trail. Although the majority of participants currently use or visit the river by car, most preferred a water-based maritime heritage trail.

I presumed the best length of the trail would correspond to a full-day outing, rationalizing that if someone were going to take the time to travel to and use the ARMHT, then he or she would prefer a trail that took 8 hours to complete rather than a shorter timeframe. Once again, the ethnographic data disproved my preconceived notions. Many participants preferred a shorter trail or segment of trail that would take between 1 and 5 hours to complete.

I was sure that participants would want a trail focused on a specific historical period. I anticipated that I would gather data to prove a significant interest in one or two time periods and that other time periods would garner little to no interest. Although some periods did receive more interest than others, interest in all periods was well-represented. Qualitative data regarding which significant historical events the trail should highlight were broad and overarching. Instead of responses identifying interests in specific events throughout history, data showed that participants were interested in learning more about comprehensive themes throughout time, such as transportation and industry. Ethnographic research indicated that an ARMHT should include a variety of sites not restricted by temporal boundaries, rather than highlighting sites related to the early European contact periods, as I had initially imagined.

Concerning important modern-day aspects of the river, water rights and economic impact were not on the original list of potential options for the ARQ. The importance of these
aspects of the river was brought to light during community engagement and group interviews. I was unaware of the majority of public concerns about the Apalachicola River and a proposed ARMHT. Unlike my initial conclusions that the public would be concerned mainly with the cost of production and maintenance of the trail, ethnographic data revealed other hesitations about a maritime heritage trail. Many concerns about the ARMHT revolved around preserving the environmental viewshed of the river. Participants questioned the impact of increased river traffic, establishment of trail signage, and development of a tourist infrastructure on the remote wilderness environment and ambiance of the river. Participants wanted to make sure that sites along the trail did not infringe upon private property rights. Questionnaire responses also identified people’s worry that the trail would create new preservation regulations that might limit recreational usage of the river.

A common theme throughout this ethnographic research illuminated an internal conflict of many local residents. Those living along the river identified the desperate need for local economic stimulus that specifically included industries committed to training and hiring residents. Participants acknowledged the wonderful potential for heritage tourism in the area and its positive economic impacts; however, many respondents struggled with the idea of sharing the river with tourists, whom they perceived as outsiders, and with wanting to keep the river “hidden” for their own personal enjoyment.

Even with the concerns about an ARMHT, the majority of feedback from potential trail users was positive. Respondents indicated support for a new recreational education program that highlighted the history and archaeology of the river. Many participants said that a maritime heritage trail would fill a void in current educational programing endeavors while supplementing current environmental stewardship efforts. This research indicates that potential trail implementers have an established base for a community-backed educational product. Although the flexible nature of a maritime heritage trail is advantageous to heritage professionals, the endless possibilities for trail format, design, and content can create a recipe for an outreach
product that is disconnected from current society’s wants and needs. In this thesis, I argue that ethnographic research is the best way to overcome this shortcoming.

Recommendations and Adaptations

Whether the proposed model trail outlined in Chapter 6 or another trail format is adopted, I have several recommendations that future trail implementers should take into consideration before establishing an ARMHT. It is necessary to balance educating the public through in-person engagement and endangering sites with increased visitation and location exposure. A sensitive challenge for the ARMHT is “ensuring that increased tourism does not destroy the very qualities that attract visitors in the first place” (Cultural Heritage Tourism 2011b). This warning does not mean that every site should stay hidden from public access; however, opening site access freely without careful consideration of the integrity and stability of the site over time is also unacceptable.

In addition to site stability, site protection is an important aspect that trail implementers must take into account. Archaeologists and related researchers are able to obtain exact site location of known resources; however, this site location information is sensitive, and precautions must be taken to conceal exact locations of some endangered sites. Many times, protecting site location in interpreted materials is done by identifying the general location of a site—for example, “on the west bank of the river between mile markers 18 and 20”—rather than giving GPS or UTM coordinates. I recommend that future ARMHT implementers keep the specific site location general unless on-site interpretation is already in existence.

Future ARMHT implementers should also take into consideration property boundaries when deciding which sites are included in a trail. The Apalachicola River is surrounded by land under a variety of ownerships: national, governmental, military, commercial, and residential. I advise that sites included in the ARMHT have permission for inclusion by the appropriate landowner or land manager.

I want to emphasize that the ARQ is only one stage of the ARMHT ethnographic methodology. LeCompte and Schensul (1999b:69) remind questionnaire users that “although
surveys can be quite efficient and economical, there are real limitations to their utility and validly.” Questionnaire development should take place only after research into the study area, participant observation, community engagement, and group interviews. Although the ARQ limited participation to individuals over 18 years of age, I encourage ARMHT developers to conduct similar ethnographic research among the youth population within the area. Since the majority of ARQ respondents indicated that the youth demographic would gain the most from an ARMHT, youth input and insight is a crucial element for trail development and long-term success.

For the ARMHT to succeed, it must attract and educate not only visiting tourists but also the residents living around the maritime cultural resources. Implementers of the ARMHT need to continue to engage local river communities and include citizens in the implementation stages of the trail. One ARQ participant stated the following:

[Because] this is a rural conservative area, [concerned with] property rights, not familiar with such things/terms as a maritime heritage trail, [a trail] can become a scapegoat, [be] inflammatory, [or have] a backlash. [The ARMHT] must be presented very carefully to local communities; it takes time to go back and fix poorly planned efforts that fail for lack of appreciating the challenges of this community character, as experience has shown here before.

Ultimately, the citizens living closest to the Apalachicola River can become the most effective advocates for preserving and conserving the archaeological and historical resources that are in their backyards. If their input and concerns are not considered, however, these individuals can be the most vocal and determined of opponents.

The design of the ethnographic model developed for the ARMHT is adaptable in many ways. Most obvious are its uses for creating a maritime heritage trail specific to the Apalachicola River. An organization can create a heritage trail that stands alone as its own entity, or it can incorporate heritage interpretation elements into existing programs. The methods used in the
ARMHT model are easily transferable to maritime heritage trail development along other rivers worldwide. Lessons learned from this thesis also have relevance to other types of heritage trails and to archaeological heritage interpretation in general.

Although this research is focused on gathering opinions on the individual level, the ethnographic methodologies used for the ARMHT model can be adapted to address group-level concerns and interests. For example, instead of interviewing and administering questionnaires to individual residents, researchers can gain insight from key members of neighborhood associations regarding known wants and needs. Instead of trying to survey all individuals associated with a local historical society or cultural institution, organizational leaders who are in tune with current attitudes and interests can represent opinions of the entity as a whole.

In addition to the model’s usability for developing heritage trails, its adaptability has a much greater reach. Ideally, the establishment of any interpreted heritage product should begin with the mentality that the purpose of the product is the people, not the resources. Public interests, wants, needs, and concerns should be at the forefront of any interpretation development.

I hope that other researchers and interpreters interested in sharing the history and archaeology of maritime and terrestrial environments will adopt the ethnographic approach used to develop the ARMHT when creating public-interpreted sites. Whether heritage resources are underwater or on land, visible or hidden, or historic or prehistoric, community input for the development of public outreach tools is not only necessary but also critical to the long-term success of public site interpretation. Using ethnographic research, researchers can identify, assess, and address a community’s wants, needs, concerns, and issues before production of heritage interpretation. Visitor, citizen, and stakeholder opinions must steer all stages of development, design, and implementation.

By understanding how the past relates to the present, the public will begin to recognize the importance of preservation and conservation. This education, in turn, should create a communal effort for the protection of local maritime resources along the Apalachicola River.
Research has shown that “quality public interpretation and outreach can assist in managing and protecting archaeological sites in remote locations” (Jameson and Scott-Ireton 2007:3). In the end, the purpose of the ARMHT is to educate river communities and to instill in the members of those communities a sense of ownership and stewardship for their cultural and historical resources.

Overall, public archaeologists are moving in a new direction by assessing the materials and products used for general consumption. I encourage future researchers to begin the assessment process during the developmental stage rather than during the implementation stage. Ethnographic methods are a cost-effective and efficient means for public archaeologists and heritage tourism professionals to gather community-specific data during the developmental stages of any interpretive product. In the future, when more interpretive materials are guided by public opinion, research should compare the success of products developed with community influence to those created without local input. I am positive that heritage tourism products that use ethnographic data to steer interpretive content and design while addressing local concerns will have greater community acceptance, increased visitation over time, and better results for stewardship and conservation of resources than heritage tourism products that do not use ethnographic data.
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Institutional Review Board Approval
Ms. Irina Franklin
Pensacola, FL 32503

October 26, 2009

Dear Ms. Franklin:

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Research Participants Protection has completed its review of your proposal titled "Maritime Heritage Trails as Public Outreach Tools: An Ethnographic Model for the Apalachicola River," as it relates to the protection of human participants used in research, and granted approval for you to proceed with your study on 10-26-2009. As a research investigator, please be aware of the following:

* You will immediately report to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated problems involving risks to human participants.

* You acknowledge and accept your responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human research participants and for complying with all parts of 45 CFR Part 46, the UWF IRB Policy and Procedures, and the decisions of the IRB. You may view these documents on the Research and Sponsored Programs web page at http://www.research.uwf.edu/internal. You acknowledge completion of the IRB ethical training requirements for researchers as attested in the IRB application.

* You will ensure that legally effective informed consent is obtained and documented. If written consent is required, the consent form must be signed by the participant or the participant's legally authorized representative. A copy is to be given to the person signing the form and a copy kept for your file.

* You will promptly report any proposed changes in previously approved human participant research activities to Research and Sponsored Programs. The proposed changes will not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the participants.

* **You are responsible for reporting progress of approved research to Research and Sponsored Programs at the end of the project period 10-25-2010.** If the data phase of your project continues beyond the approved end date, you must receive an extension approval from the IRB.

Good luck in your research endeavors. If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact Research and Sponsored Programs at 850-857-6378 or irb@uwf.edu.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard S. Podemski, Associate
Vice President for Research and
Dean of Graduate Studies

Dr. Terry Prewitt, Chair
IRB for the Protection of Human
Research Participants

CC: William Lees, John Bratten
MEMORANDUM

August 11, 2010

TO: Ms. Irina Sorset
    Anthropology Department

FROM: Dr. Richard S. Podemski, Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

FROM: Dr. Carla J. Thompson, Chair, Institutional Review Board for Human Research Participant Protection

SUBJECT: IRB Modification or Extension Approval

Thank you for keeping us apprised of the progress made on your project entitled “Maritime Heritage Trails as Public Outreach Tools: An Ethnographic Model for the Apalachicola River.” The IRB has approved your request for an extension of the end date of your project to October 25, 2011.

Continued good luck in your research!

CC: Dr. William Lees
    Dr. John Bratten
Appendix B
Apalachicola River Questionnaire
1. Disclaimer

This electronic survey asks your opinion on several aspects pertaining to the Apalachicola River. The purpose of this survey is to determine past, current, and forward-looking views of the river. It will take about 20 minutes to complete. Results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated and will make a significant contribution to my research.
• Participation is completely voluntary
• Every participant’s identity will remain confidential unless permission is given by the participant
• Participants may elect not to answer particular questions
• Participants may terminate their involvement with the survey at any time
• Participants will not be contacted by the researcher for additional questionnaires or interviews unless otherwise agreed upon by the participant

2.

*1. What is your age bracket? 

☐ Under 18
☐ 18-24
☐ 25-44
☐ 45-64
☐ 65+

3. Under 18

Unfortunately, participants must be at least 18 years of age. Thank you for your willingness to participate!

4.

2. What is your gender?

☐ Female
☐ Male
☐ Prefer not to answer

3. What is your primary language?

☐ English
☐ Spanish
☐ French
☐ German
☐ Other (please specify)
4. Where do you currently live most of the year? (Please fill in below)

City/Town: 
State/Province: 
Country: 

5. Choose one option below that BEST describes your association with the Apalachicola River:

- Organization tied to the river (industrial, business, recreational, ecological, etc.)
- Institution interpreting cultural and historical resources (existing historical societies, museums, and similar local cultural entities)
- Individual living along the river
- City, county, state, or federal official
- Visitor, past resident, or researcher
- Other (please specify) 

6. If you fit into more than one category in Question 5, please provide a brief explanation: 

5.

7. Who does the river belong to? 

8. What do you think is the most important aspect of the river? 

9. From the options below, what is most important to you about the river:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological/Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What is most significant about the Apalachicola River in the
Past?
Present?
Future?

11. Who is responsible for preserving the river and its resources?

6.

12. How often do you use or visit the river?

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Other (please specify)

13. What time of year do you use or visit the river? (Check all that apply)

- Fall (September-November)
- Winter (December-February)
- Spring (March-May)
- Summer (June-August)

14. How do you use or visit the river? (Check all that apply)

- Car
- Motorized vessel
- Non-motorized vessel
- Bicycle
- Hiking
- Snorkeling/Diving
- Other (please specify)
15. Why do you use or visit the river?

16. Is there anything that deters you from using or visiting the river?
   - Yes
   - No
   - No Opinion
     If yes, please specify

17. Do you use or have you ever used any trails associated with the river? (hiking, biking, fishing, kayaking, etc.)
   - Yes
   - No
     If yes, please specify

18. Do you have any concerns regarding the river?
   - Yes
   - No
     If yes, please specify

19. What would you like to change about the river?

20. What would you like to keep about the river?
21. Do you think there is an aspect of the river that is under-appreciated by others?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please explain

22. Are you aware of any educational programs associated with the river?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please specify

23. Would you be interested in a new educational program?

- Yes
- No

Why

24. Do you think others would be interested in a new educational program?

- Yes
- No

Why

25. Who do you think would benefit most from a new educational program?

- Visitors
- Part-time residents
- Year-round residents
26. What age group do you think would benefit most from a new educational program?
- [ ] Youth (Under 18)
- [ ] Adults (19-64)
- [ ] Seniors (65+)

27. Which do you think are important aspects of the river to include in a new educational program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Ecology</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rights</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Are you familiar with or have you used any type of maritime heritage trail?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, please specify

29. What is your idea of a maritime heritage trail?

10.

There are many different definitions and forms of "maritime heritage trails" around the world. For my research, I define a maritime heritage trail as a trail highlighting:

*Maritime Cultural Resources
*Archaeological Resources
*Historical Resources

Please answer the following questions based on this definition.
30. How might a maritime heritage trail benefit the river and the people living along it?

31. How might a maritime heritage trail be a problem for the river and the people living along it?

32. Are you familiar with any historical sites or events associated with the river?
   - Yes
   - No
   - No Opinion
   If yes, please specify

33. Is there any part of the river's history that you think should be highlighted on the trail?
   - Yes
   - No
   - No Opinion
   If yes, please specify

11.
34. Which historical time periods below are you most interested in or would like to learn more about? (Check all that apply)

- Prehistoric, before 1513
- First Spanish, 1513-1763
- British, 1763-1783
- Second Spanish, 1783-1821
- Territorial Development, 1821-1845
- Statehood and Antebellum, 1845-1860
- Civil War, 1861-1865
- Reconstruction, 1866-1879
- Post-Reconstruction, 1880-1897
- Spanish/American War, 1898-1916
- World War I & Aftermath, 1917-1920
- Boom times, 1921-1929
- Depression and New Deal, 1930-1940
- World War II & Aftermath, 1941-1950
- Modern, 1950-present

35. What type of maritime heritage trail would interest you most? (Check all that apply)

- Water-Based
- Land-Based
- Virtual-Based (Internet)

Other (please specify)

36. What type of trail would you use? (Check all that apply)

- Biking
- Hiking
- Kayaking
- Boating
- Driving
- Virtual (Internet)

Other (please specify)
37. What type of trail aid would you consider using? (Check all that apply)

☐ Guided Tours
☐ Signs
☐ Pod-Cast (Downloadable Visual and Audio files)
☐ Brochure
☐ Website

Other (please specify)

38. What length of trail would be ideal for you? (Check all that apply)

☐ Quarter Day (0-3 hours)
☐ Half Day (4-5 hours)
☐ Full Day (6-8 hours)
☐ Multi Day (1-4 days)
☐ Extended Multi Day (4+ days)

Other (please specify)

12.

The goal of this research is to create a collection of interpretive texts and images, as well as model trail formats, which can be used to create several components of a maritime heritage trail. Although research will not produce a physical trail, potential future implementers of the model will have a complete interpretive package with insight into the public’s wants and needs.

39. Can you suggest any individuals or organizations that might be interested in using this maritime heritage trail model?

40. How did you hear about this survey?

☐ Twitter
☐ Facebook
☐ Newspaper
☐ Word of Mouth
☐ Email

☐ Other (please specify)
41. How many times have you taken this survey?
- Once
- More than once

42. Do you have any additional comments, questions, or concerns about the Apalachicola River, maritime heritage trails, or my research?

43. If you would like to be contacted for a follow up interview or survey, please provide your email address:

Email: 

13. Thank you

Thank you so much for your time! Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated and makes a significant contribution to my research. If you have any questions about the project, please contact me or my project advisor, Dr. William Lees at (850) 595-0050.

Please share this survey link with your co-workers, friends, family, and anyone who might be interested: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ApalachicolaRiverSurvey

Sincerely,
Irina Sorset
isorset@uwf.edu
University of West Florida
Graduate Student in Historical & Maritime Archaeology