

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY
ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY
1985-2010**



Courtesy of the United States Park Police, <http://www.nps.gov/uspp/images/gwmp%20aerial.jpg>

Final Report

**Prepared by
Robinson & Associates, Inc.
August 2011**

**GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION	
Purpose	2
Methodology	3
Executive Summary	4
CHAPTER I: CULTURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP	
New Memorials, 1985-2010	6
Arlington Ridge Park	13
Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial	16
Civil War Defenses of Washington	20
Clara Barton National Historic Site	21
Glen Echo Park	22
Fort Hunt Park	24
Cultural Landscapes	27
CHAPTER II: NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP	
Potomac River Preservation	30
Dyke Marsh	33
Natural Resource Inventories	37
Exotic Species Management	38
Deer Control	40
CHAPTER III: RECREATION AND VISITOR USE	
Mount Vernon Trail	42
Safety in the Park	44
CHAPTER IV: PARK OPERATIONS AND PLANNING	
Park Planning	52
Collaborative Planning with Park Neighbors	58
U.S. Park Police	64
Emergency Planning and Response	65
Interpretation and Education	66
The Changing Face of Maintenance	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	71
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Chronology of Superintendents	79
Appendix B: Legislation and Agreements	80

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP), which occupies 7,749.64 acres of land in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, is traversed by a planned and landscaped roadway system that extends 38.3 miles along the Potomac River. Initially conceived as a memorial to George Washington, the parkway was authorized by Congress in 1928. Construction of the road, known as the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway (MVMH), commenced in 1929. With the passage of the Capper-Cramton Act the following year, Congress authorized a “George Washington Memorial Parkway,” which incorporated the MVMH and was conceived to flank both sides of the Potomac River to Great Falls. Construction on the MVMH portion of the new roadway was completed in three years, opening in 1932 for the bicentennial of Washington’s birth. The northern sections of the GWMP authorized in 1930 were constructed from 1935 to 1965, while a final section was completed in 1970.

Since its inception the parkway has served as a grand entryway to the nation’s capital and as a steward to the Potomac River and its watersheds. The GWMP comprises twenty-seven sites replete with natural and cultural resources. While some of these sites were included in the original parkway authorization, others were separately legislated and incorporated under the Administration of the GWMP, such as Theodore Roosevelt Island and Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial. Approximately nine million visitors use the parks at GWMP annually, including the national and international monuments and memorials, natural and recreational areas, trails, a living history farm, historic homes, and an arts and crafts park. These sites, while each possessing a distinct history and individual merits, are united by the parkway and together represent broad themes in the nation’s history.

The history of the GWMP was initially examined by National Park Service Historian Barry Mackintosh and documented in his study, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History.” Mackintosh traced the development of the parkway from the late 1880s when a group of Alexandria residents advocated for the establishment of a road from Arlington Cemetery to “the tomb of Washington, known as Mount Vernon,” through its completion in the 1970s. The study also addresses subsequent park acquisitions as the park expanded both physically and in its outreach and public programming.

The purpose of this study is to update the administrative history of the GWMP, using Mackintosh’s report as a foundation. The updated administrative history will begin where Mackintosh left off and will document the park through the year 2010 (the “study period”). Also included in the appendices to this report is a comprehensive compilation of park enabling legislation and agreements as well as a list of park superintendents since 1965 when the administration of the GWMP was transferred to a separate superintendency under the National

Capital Region. This updated administrative history of the GWMP was completed by Robinson & Associates, Inc. for the National Park Service.

METHODOLOGY

A kick-off meeting for the project was held on 6 November 2009, at the offices of Robinson & Associates, Inc. to clarify and discuss the scope of work, the level of effort required by the various themes, and approaches to organizing the study. It was decided at the meeting that the report would be a stand-alone document, intended as a supplement to the Mackintosh study. As part of the expanded scope following the 75 percent draft, Robinson & Associates agreed to reproduce twenty-five copies of the earlier report. It was further determined that research would be limited to National Park Service archives/libraries and that GWMP officials would supply some of the relevant reports electronically.

Research conducted at the GWMP headquarters over a two-day period to obtain materials and examine references was followed by collaboration with the park to supplement the research and identify additional sources of information. A broad review of primary and secondary sources, relevant to specific themes cited in the scope of work and the general parkway context, was undertaken to provide the basis for an outline for the entire study. A preliminary outline was submitted 7 January 2010, followed by a more detailed outline submitted 26 February 2010. National Park Service comments from this draft expanded some topics beyond the original scope of work.

Robinson & Associates submitted the 75 percent draft to the NPS on 24 June 2010. The draft generally followed the approved outline and was designed to capture the evolution of the parkway over the study period and the larger issues it confronted. Rather than provide an exhaustive review of each individual site, broad overviews were provided to better understand the park network in the decades just before and after the turn of the twenty-first century. Themes were completed to the extent possible within the confinements of the research, as specified in the scope of work, and the reports provided by the NPS. Comments on the 75 percent draft were received on 29 July 2010.

A team meeting was held at the GWMP headquarters on 2 August 2010 to discuss the comments on the 75 percent draft and to provide direction on additional subjects for investigation in the 90 percent draft. The team agreed to hold a series of three two-hour charrettes to capture the nuances of some topics that were not documented in reports. Subsequent to this meeting the GWMP proposed a revised outline for the 90 percent draft that reflected the additional topics as well as a reorganization of the study.

The first two-hour charrette was conducted on 3 November 2010. Vincent Santucci, Chief Ranger, and Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager, provided information on four broad areas, including: the Long Range Interpretive Plan; post 9/11 security issues and special events; safety on the trails, river and roadway; and Fort Hunt Park. During a second charrette held on 29

November 2010, Dottie Marshall. Superintendent, Jon James, Deputy Superintendent, and Matthew Virta, discussed planning-related topics including the Alexandria Waterfront, the Alexander Point Bridge, Long Bridge Park, utility issues, and maintenance. Brent Steury, Natural Resources Program Manager, Jon James, and Matthew Virta shared information on natural resource management, with particular emphasis on the Potomac Gorge and Dyke Marsh, during the final charrette held on 14 December 2010.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1930, Michigan Representative Louis C. Cramton tried to raise support for the parkway in a press release cautioning that “the palisades of the Potomac are daily being blasted, serious industrial encroachments threaten, wooded areas are being destroyed, and power interests have seriously urged replacement of the unique and outstanding natural beauties of Great Falls and the gorge of the Potomac with man-made reservoirs of much more commonplace, artificial beauty.”¹

The growth of metropolitan Washington, D.C., and the associated development pressures have consistently posed a significant problem for the parkway and today in many ways the park continues to contend with the same issues cited by Cramton in 1930. During the study period the Washington Metropolitan area gained approximately 1.5 million residents and many businesses set up locations in the inner suburbs such as Crystal City and Rosslyn. This influx of people placed heavy demands on park services, from commuters on the parkway to bikers on the Mount Vernon Trail. The growth also led to important administrative issues such as policing the park, safety on the trails, river, and parkway, managing maintenance, and maintaining the parkway setting.

Development opportunities and new amenities for the region’s expanding population not only increased pressure on the GWMP, but also compelled park officials to be an active partner in local planning. At the end of the study period, the GWMP and local officials were collaborating on numerous projects in Maryland, Washington, D.C., and Virginia, including the MacArthur Boulevard Bikeway, the Potomac Interceptor Sewer Odor Abatement facilities, the 14th Street Bridge Rehabilitation, Arlington County Boathouse, the development of the Alexandria waterfront, and Arlington County Long Bridge Park. As stewards of the area’s cultural and natural resources, the GWMP sought to ensure protection of the park’s environment and setting while working with local development projects.

As development began to gradually encroach on the Potomac River, the GWMP joined with local and regional partners such as the Potomac Conservancy and The Nature Conservancy to protect the waterways and the natural environment of the park, and in particular, the Potomac Gorge. With the support of grants and a remarkable team of volunteers, the GWMP succeeded

¹ Jere L. Krakow, National Park Service, Denver Service Center, National Register of Historic Places – Registration Form, “George Washington Memorial Parkway,” 6 February 2010, 7:1-2.

in improving sites such as Great Falls, Dyke Marsh, and the Belle Haven Marina. The park's completion of several inventories of natural resources and participation in the BioBlitz to survey the Potomac Gorge greatly contributed to understanding the park's biodiversity and resulted in several park records in natural resources. The GWMP also participated in National Park Service education programs such as Bridging the Watershed and Parks as Classroom Programs to promote conservation and awareness of the parkway's diverse ecosystem.

During the study period the park also began to better compete for financial support from the Cultural Resources Preservation Program (CRPP) funding from Washington and National Capital Regional Offices and to obtain development compliance funding for National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 cultural resource reports in order to conduct Survey, Identification, and Evaluation Studies of its historic properties and cultural resources. The current cultural resources program manager estimates that during his tenure, nearly seventy studies, investigations, or reports of various sizes have been completed. These consist of numerous small in-house Section 106 related archeological investigations and several larger contracted archeological investigations (including an update to the archeological sites inventory), Cultural Landscape Inventories and Reports, and research efforts resulting in National Register of Historic Places nominations, Historic Resources Studies, and Historic Structures Reports.

A significant issue that affected the GWMP throughout the study period was the need for commemorative space as the monumental core of the nation's capital became inundated with requests for memorials. The spatial constraints within the parkway are best illustrated by the controversy over the proposed Air Force Memorial at Arlington Ridge and the contest over land known as Section 29 at Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial. In 2003, Congress amended the Commemorative Works Act to declare the Mall "a substantially completed work of civic art," which would likely increase pressures on regional parks such as the GWMP in the future.

One of the more significant challenges faced by the GWMP during the study period was enhancing public relations to better communicate the park's missions and accomplishments to visitors. As an urban park comprised of an unusual assemblage of diverse sites, the GWMP differs from most other national parks that are more specifically focused, such as Yellowstone National Park or Gettysburg National Military Park. Because the GWMP is composed of numerous sites – some seemingly unrelated – spread over a large geographic area, it has been difficult to present the parkway as a unified and interconnected park; often the public is unaware of the sites' shared history and mission. This perceived lack of cohesiveness makes it difficult to promote the park as an interrelated system and also makes it vulnerable to development because, often, would-be developers do not know they are infringing on a unified site. Despite the absence of a General Management Plan to guide the park mission, officials endeavored to better communicate the parkway's goals and commissioned several reports, including the "George Washington Memorial Parkway Long Range Interpretive Plan" and the *First Annual Centennial Strategy for George Washington Memorial Parkway*.

CHAPTER I: CULTURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

The historic properties and national memorials of the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) are places where park visitors come to celebrate the nation's heritage and to commemorate those events that define our history. Whether people hear a performance at the Netherlands Carillon or learn about the history of the Red Cross at Clara Barton's Glen Echo home, the experience connects them with the past. The historic and commemorative sites are common destinations for people traveling along the parkway and are among the most visible and visited within the GWMP network. This chapter will briefly discuss the evolving commemorative landscape and will explore efforts undertaken during the study period to preserve the historic properties and memorials of the parkway.

NEW MEMORIALS

By the last decades of the twentieth century the monumental core of Washington, D.C. possessed limited open space for new memorials. Yet, after the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in 1982, competition for these last remaining sites soared. In an effort to establish standards for the placement and design of new memorials on federal land, Congress passed the Commemorative Works Act of 1986. Under the Act legislation must be enacted to authorize a new memorial's location. The Act created a new National Capital Memorial Commission (NCMC), chaired by the National Park Service (NPS), to advise the Secretary of the Interior and the General Services Administration on policy and procedures for commemorative works in the District.² Generally, the commission's role is to review all proposals for memorials on NPS lands from proposed legislation through site selection and design. The Act also established two areas in which to locate new memorials. Area I, generally defined as comprising the Mall, the Washington Monument Grounds, and West Potomac Park, was identified as the location for commemorative works of subjects "of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the nation." Area II, generally defined as comprising all NPS and General Service Administration lands in the District of Columbia and close-in Arlington County outside Area I, was identified as

² In 2003, the name of the Commission was revised to the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission. The Commission is composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Architect of the Capitol, the Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, the chairman of the Commission of the Fine Arts, the chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration, and the Secretary of Defense. Members may appoint a representative.

the location for memorials related to subjects “of lasting historical significance.”³ The Act also included other restrictions. Only wars or branches of the armed services can be commemorated, not battles or individual units. Individuals or groups of individuals can be commemorated only twenty-five years after the death of the individual or of the last individual in the group. Also, the organization sponsoring the memorial has seven years to receive the building permit for the memorial after funding to build it has been secured or it loses its selected site; that is, the selected site is not granted permanently for the approved memorial.⁴ Congress amended the Act in 2003 to declare the Mall – from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial – “a substantially completed work of civic art.” Further, the amendment prohibited the location of new commemorative works (not already authorized) within this area in order to protect its integrity.⁵

The U.S. Air Force Memorial

The critical issue of diminishing space and competition for it was underscored in the 1990s when the U.S. Air Force sought a site to honor their veterans in the nation’s capital. As the only branch of the military without a memorial in Washington, the Air Force determined to establish one by 1997, to coincide with their fiftieth anniversary.⁶ To achieve this goal, the Air Force Memorial Foundation (AFMF) was incorporated as a nonprofit organization in 1992. The following year AFMF received the necessary congressional authorization to erect a memorial on federal land (Public Law 103-163).

The AFMF began their site selection process in 1994 and eventually chose three potential locations out of the eighteen that were initially investigated. A location on Arlington Ridge, managed as part of the GWMP, was determined to be the preferred choice for its close proximity to the Fort Myer parade ground – the site where Orville Wright took America’s first military flight in 1908.⁷ Two other memorials located on Arlington Ridge – the U.S. Marine Corps War

³ The section of GWMP land that encompasses Lady Bird Johnson Park, Theodore Roosevelt Island, and Arlington Ridge is located in Area I, the remaining property of the GWMP is located in Area II.

⁴ Robinson & Associates, “National Park Service, National Capital Region Administrative History, 1952-2005,” prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, 6 June 2008, 125.

⁵ 117 Stat. 1353.

⁶ Prior to 1947, the Air Force was a branch of the Army known as the U.S. Army Air Corps.

⁷ Arlington Ridge is a 27.5-acre site transferred to the GWMP in 1953. The site was originally intended to comprise three commemorative zones – the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, the Netherlands Carillon, and the “Freedom Monument,” a project that dates to the Eisenhower Administration and was never erected. Please see Susan G. Horner, National

Memorial (known commonly as the Iwo Jima Memorial) and the Netherlands Carillon – stood approximately 600 feet south and northeast, respectively, of the proposed location. The AFMF presented the site to review agencies for approval in the fall of 1994. After a second round of site selection, all three review agencies (NCCM, National Capital Planning Commission [NCPC], and Commission of Fine Arts [CFA]) approved the Arlington Ridge site by 1996. CFA’s chairman, J. Carter Brown, stated that the design was “enthusiastically approved,” and remarked that “its placement on the site and the sensitive relationship to the other nearby memorials and views from the mall could not be better.”⁸

Friends of Iwo Jima, a nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation of the Marine Corps War Memorial, disagreed with the review agencies’ findings after being briefed on the Air Force Memorial project in July of 1997. Marine Corps leaders and Friends of Iwo Jima were adamantly opposed to what they viewed as the insensitive proposed siting of the Air Force Memorial on Arlington Ridge and immediately took action to prevent its construction.⁹ By the end of July a bill to prohibit the construction of any monument, memorial or other structure at the site of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington was introduced in Congress by New York Representative Gerald Solomon. Several months later a similar bill was introduced in the Senate by Kansas Senator Pat Roberts. On 16 September Solomon and Friends of Iwo Jima filed a Temporary Restraining Order in addition to a declaratory and injunctive relief to prohibit the location, construction, or erecting of an Air Force Memorial in Iwo Jima Park (also known as Arlington Ridge Park). The civil suit was dismissed in a summary judgment in June 1998 and an appeal was filed the following month. The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit upheld the dismissal of the lawsuit in May 1999 and found that the appropriate legislation and regulations were adhered to in selecting and approving the proposed memorial for the Arlington Ridge site.

In the meantime, the NPS was actively engaging the public in the development of an Environmental Assessment (EA) to determine the potential cultural and environmental impacts of the memorial. Between 1992 and the release of the EA in 1999, at least nine public meetings

Register of Historic Places – Registration Form, “Arlington Ridge Park,” 18 December 2009. For further information on the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial and the Netherlands Carillon as they relate to GWMP, please see Barry Mackintosh, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History,” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1996) 178-184.

⁸ Letter, J. Carter Brown, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Robert G. Stanton, Field Director, National Park Service, National Capital Area, 26 February 1996.

⁹ Gilbert Stockman, “The Iwo Jima Invasion,” *Washington Post*, 14 September 1997, C.08.

and four congressional hearings and debates were convened.¹⁰ The EA concluded that since the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial was less than fifty years old – and thus not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) – the proposed project would have no adverse effect on the National Register qualities of the GWMP. The EA was supported by the District of Columbia and Virginia State Historic Preservation Officers as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.¹¹

The release of the EA sparked intense outcry from the Marine Corps community, including two dozen former Marine generals, who called on to the Secretary of the Interior to preserve the “serene and contemplative park” on Arlington Ridge.¹² In a letter to John Parsons, Associate Regional Director for Lands, Resources and Planning of NPS’s National Capital Region, Major General D.F. Bice, Director of Marine Corps Staff, outlined the opposition to the Air Force Memorial siting on Arlington Ridge and their objections to the EA. The Marine Corps argued that the EA process was “fatally flawed,” calling the EA’s finding of no adverse effect “outrageous and clearly unsupportable.”¹³ Bice contended that the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial would be eligible for listing in the NRHP in the near future and requested the NPS to immediately begin the process of nominating the memorial and Arlington Ridge Park. The Marine Corps also urged the Advisory Council to readdress the EA findings and the determination of eligibility of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial. Bice acknowledged that the NPS was “confronted with the challenge to make a decision unpleasing to the Air Force Memorial Foundation,” but urged officials to consider the “irreconcilable damage that the siting of the ... memorial would have on the current surroundings.”¹⁴

In addition to challenging the EA finding of no adverse effects, the Marine Corps and Friends of Iwo Jima further maintained that NPS violated the Commemorative Works Act, which states that “a commemorative work shall be so located as to prevent interference with, or encroachment upon, any existing commemorative work, and protect to the maximum extent possible, open

¹⁰ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, “Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Air Force Memorial, Arlington, VA” (Washington, D.C: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, January 1999), 5.

¹¹ Letter, Martha Catlin, Historic Preservation Specialist, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, to Audrey F Calhoun, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, National Park Service, 6 August 1996.

¹² Kate O’Beirne, “Memorial Daze – Controversy Over Plans for Air Force Memorial Near Washington D.C.,” *National Review*, 28 June 1999.

¹³ Letter, D.F. Bice, Major General, Director Marine Corps Staff, U.S. Marine Corps, to John G. Parsons, Associate for Lands, Resources, and Planning, National Capital Region, National Parks Service, 22 March 1999.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

spaces and existing use.” In its rebuttal, the AFMF argued that in siting the proposed memorial more than 500 feet from the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial behind a screen of mature trees, it complied with the regulations. The U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial would also be at a higher elevation than the proposed memorial and, at 78 feet, would rise 28 feet above the proposed design for the Air Force Memorial.¹⁵

As a result of the opposition and appeals of the Marine Corps, the eligibility of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial was reevaluated and the Keeper of the NRHP determined the memorial to be individually eligible for the National Register, and the Netherlands Carillon and Arlington Ridge Park to be eligible as contributing resources to the GWMP. Based on this finding, the Advisory Council directed the NPS in December of 1999 to reassess the proposed undertaking’s effect on the historic properties as redefined by the Keeper.¹⁶

The remarkable pressure on the NPS to settle the Arlington Ridge issue came to an end in October 2001 when the AFMF Board independently determined to find a new location for the proposed memorial. The AFMF cited the cost of additional litigation, the lengthy time required to build at Arlington Ridge, and the realization that the ongoing controversy put the entire project at risk as factors in deciding to pursue a new site.¹⁷

Finally, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, passed by Congress in December 2001, made available 3 acres of the Arlington Navy Annex, owned by the Department of Defense and situated west of the Pentagon, for the construction of the proposed Air Force Memorial.¹⁸ Section 2863 of the Act, “Alternative Site for the United States Air Force Memorial, Preservation of Open Space on Arlington Ridge Tract, and Related Transfer at Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia,” also prohibited the future construction of any additional structures on Arlington Ridge. This section of the Act had the unfortunate consequences of prohibiting already approved plans for the construction of a comfort station and visitor contact station at Arlington Ridge that were part of the NPS Line Item Construction Budget. It is the belief of the current GWMP Superintendent Dottie Marshall that since this prohibition was part of appropriations legislation, it is not of the nature to be in force in perpetuity and would not

¹⁵ Doyle Larson, “Plenty of Room to Honor the Air Force,” *Washington Post*, 21 September 1997, C10.

¹⁶ Letter, D. Klima, Director, Office of Planning and Review, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, to Terry Carlstrom, Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, 10 December 1999.

¹⁷ Air Force Memorial Foundation, “Happenings at Air Force Memorial,” <http://www.airforcememorial.org/memorial/chronology.asp>, accessed 11 November 2009.

¹⁸ Public Law 107-107, 28 December 2001, 115 Stat. 1332, Sec. 2863.

prevent these eventual improvements to the site.¹⁹ Section 2863 also provides that Arlington Ridge Park is not prohibited for eventual use as a location for in-ground burial sites and a columbarium for burial of individuals eligible for burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

The AFMF originally explored the Navy Annex location in the early 1990s; however, when the AFMF was told it would not be available for another ten years, the site was rejected.²⁰ Similar to the location on Arlington Ridge, the proximity of this alternative site to the Fort Myer parade grounds and Arlington Cemetery was desirable to the AFMF.

Plans for the new site progressed rapidly, with unanimous CFA and NCPC approvals in March of 2003 for the new Air Force Memorial design and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the project on the quality of the human environment in June 2004. To clear the site for the Air Force Memorial, the newly renovated officer wing of the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps was demolished by the Department of Defense. On 14 October 2006, the United States Air Force Memorial was dedicated – over nine years after the branch’s fiftieth anniversary.²¹ Arlington Ridge Park was individually listed in the NRHP in 2009, with the Netherlands Carillon and the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial as contributing resources within the park.

Memorial Avenue

The commemorative landscape along Memorial Avenue also evolved during the study period. Between 1959 – the year NCPC approved the concept of placing memorials along this ceremonial approach to Arlington Cemetery – and 1985, four of ten niches designed by the National Capital Parks office were filled.²² Since 1985, three additional memorials were added to Memorial Avenue – the American Armored Force Memorial, the Women in Military Service for America Memorial, and the Fourth Infantry (Ivy) Division of the U.S. Army Memorial. The first of the three be erected, the American Armored Force Memorial, was authorized by Public Law 99-620 in 1986, and dedicated in 1991. The memorial is located on the south side of Memorial Avenue, opposite the 101st Army Airborne Division Memorial. The centerpiece of the memorial, designed by sculptor Harold Schaller, is an 8’ x 10’ polished black granite stone with

¹⁹ Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in electronic mail to the author, 20 April 2011.

²⁰ Frederick Kunkle, “New Site Urged for Air Force Memorial; Plot near Pentagon Would End Friction with the Marines,” *Washington Post*, 29 November 2001, B.01.

²¹ It should be noted that the Navy Annex is not within the GWMP network and therefore the Air Force Memorial is not administered by the GWMP.

²² Mackintosh, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History,” 171-172. National Capital Parks was renamed the National Capital Region in 1962 when the regions were given geographic names.

a pictorial history of the Armored Force. To symbolize the military strategy of encirclement, the stone is enclosed within a low, gray granite elliptically-shaped wall etched with commemorative inscriptions.²³ On the north side of the wall, an opening flanked by two arrow-shaped buttresses provides visitors access to the memorial.

The most recent addition to Memorial Avenue honors the Fourth Infantry (Ivy) Division of the U.S. Army. Authorized by Public Law 74-55 in 1935 and completed in 2000, this memorial is located on the south side of the avenue, across from an unoccupied site reserved for a future memorial.²⁴ The distinctive ivy shoulder patch worn by the soldiers of this division inspired the memorial's design, which features a diamond-shaped bronze tablet, incised with four ivy leaves at the cardinal points. The tablet is mounted on an oval base covered with ivy. The ivy motif, a play on the Roman numeral IV, has historically been used as a symbol of the Fourth Infantry Division.

Of the newly erected memorials, the Women in Military Service for America Memorial (the "Women's Memorial") was perhaps the most transformative. Planning and construction began in 1986, when the memorial was authorized by Public Law 99-610, and spanned more than a decade. The memorial was advocated for by the Women in Military Service for America Memorial Foundation, led by President Wilma Vaught, a retired Air Force brigadier general. In 1988 the hemicycle – a retaining wall designed as a memorial gate to Arlington Cemetery by the architectural firm McKim, Mead & White – was selected as the site for the proposed memorial. Though the gate was dedicated in 1932, the Great Depression intervened and the granite retaining wall design elements were never finished; by 1986, the hemicycle was in deteriorating condition. As the ceremonial entrance to Arlington National Cemetery and visual terminus to Memorial Avenue, the hemicycle presented a prominent location that placed women within the broader context of the nation's history.²⁵ Architects Marion Gail Weiss and Michael Manfredi proposed "restoration and enhancement" of the neoclassical Memorial Gate and designed the memorial to fit behind the semicircular wall, requiring only minor changes to the hemicycle's façade.²⁶ The memorial project received \$9.5 million in grant funds through the Department of Defense to complete the wall restoration.²⁷

²³ Letter, Acting Associate Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service to Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, 17 December 1987.

²⁴ Public Law 74-55, 24 August 1935, 49 Stat. 647.

²⁵ Historic American Engineering Record, "George Washington Memorial Parkway," HAER No. VA-69, National Park Service, Washington D.C., 1994/1998, 184-186.

²⁶ Benjamin Forgey, "4 Finalists for Memorial," *Washington Post*, 13 June 1989, C.02. Please also see U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Cultural Landscape

One of the more significant modifications the architects designed for the hemicycle was four arched entryways inserted into formerly blank niches along the façade. These doorways provide access to the upper terrace as well as an underground complex inserted into the excavated hillside. This important element of the memorial features a 196-seat theater, exhibition space, gift shop, administrative offices, and a conference room. Inside the complex, visitors may access a computerized interactive registry of women veterans that provides the names and, in some cases, the personal recollections of American servicewomen. In the exterior design by McKim, Mead & White, the hemicycle received a fountain and reflecting pool, while the terrace above was embellished with a series of glass tablets inscribed with quotations provided by the veterans. Weiss and Manfredi's original design included a series of tall, thin glass pyramids on top of the wall to bring light to the exhibition space below, however the pyramids were not acceptable to the National Park Service and were not introduced during the design review process, instead glass tablets were substituted.²⁸

Because the foundation is not a government agency and therefore did not have access to military records of living veterans, fundraising was difficult for Vaught. Yet, ten years after the congressional approval, construction of the memorial and center began in 1996. When the memorial was dedicated on 8 October 1997, Vice President Al Gore, thousands of active-duty service women, women veterans, and their friends and families were in attendance to honor the 1.8 million women that had served in the U.S. military.²⁹

ARLINGTON RIDGE PARK

Concurrent with the Keeper of the National Register's eligibility determinations in 1999, efforts to document and restore the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial were underway. In the late 1990s

Inventory: Memorial Avenue Corridor, George Washington Memorial Parkway" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001), 3a:10.

²⁷ Marylou Tousignant, "Time for Recognition; Memorial Honoring Women who Served Their Country is Almost Ready to Open," *Washington Post*, 12 October 1997, B.01.

²⁸ Benjamin Forgey, "A Memorial Passes Muster," *Washington Post*, 18 October 1997, C.01.

²⁹ Marylou Tousignant, "In Honor of Their Own; All-Female Team Oversees Building of Women's Military Memorial," *Washington Post*, 26 September 1997, B.01.

a series of condition assessments were completed on the memorial that identified maintenance and preservation issues as well as health and safety concerns.³⁰

Following the initial project efforts, a Treatment Plan for the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial concluded in May 2001.³¹ The Treatment Plan evaluated and proposed restoration strategies for the memorial in five sections: the sculpture and memorial base; the plaza, reviewing stand, and walkways; the parade and memorial grounds; the existing electrical service; and construction of a new comfort station and visitor services center.

The NPS held a series of value analysis workshops in May 2001 and June 2002 to aid in preparing an implementation program for the Treatment Plan's recommendations. By the second set of workshops in 2002, the proposed comfort station was eliminated as a result of the 2001 National Defense Authorization Act, which, as previously discussed, prohibited any new structures on the Arlington Ridge Tract.

Alternatives were further developed according to results from geotechnical testing carried out in October 2003 and a 2002 Cultural Landscape Inventory for Arlington Ridge (revised in 2003). An Environmental Assessment for the rehabilitation of the memorial initiated in November 2003 and completed in June 2004 endeavored to increase public safety at the memorial, enhance visitor experience, protect park resources, provide access in compliance with the Americans with Disability Act, and increase operational efficiency. Based on the evaluations conducted since the Project Management Information System submittal of 1998, the Environmental Assessment alternatives sought to address the insufficient illumination of the memorial; the deterioration and settlement of the concrete panels on the plaza, approach walks, steps, pedestals, and parade ground reviewing stand; access ramps that did not comply with the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act; and the inadequate utilities. A \$3.3 million contract to restore the memorial was let in November 2005.

The Netherlands Carillon also underwent a restoration initiated to coincide with the fiftieth anniversary of Holland's liberation in 1945.³² Despite a restoration by the NPS in the 1970s and mechanical repairs in 1983 to correct structural issues, over the intervening twenty years the

³⁰ Greenhorne & O'Mara, "Environmental Assessment: U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial Rehabilitation," prepared for the Denver Service Center, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June 2004, 6.

³¹ John Milner Associates, Inc., *Treatment Plan and Design Services for the United States Marine Corps War Memorial, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Arlington, Virginia*, prepared for the National Park Service, May 2001.

³² Lan Nguyen, "US-Dutch Friendship Resonates in Arlington; WWII Liberation Marked at Restored Carillon," *Washington Post*, 6 May 1995, B.03.

tower had fallen into disrepair.³³ Although the carillon was slated for repair by the NPS, its low priority risked failing to complete the project in time for the May 1995 commemoration. To facilitate meeting this deadline, the GWMP entered into a fundraising agreement with the Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in the United States to provide the funding, and established the Foundation Nederlands Carillon Washington D.C. 1945-1995.³⁴ The Chamber raised over \$1.4 million – over 50 percent of the funds necessary – to restore the tower.

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the plans to renovate and repaint the 120-foot tower in November 1994 and approved the proposal to apply a darker paint color, “closer to the appearance of the nearby tree masses.”³⁵ In its support of the color scheme, the commission noted that despite their recommendation for a flat black paint during the 1970s renovation, the tower was painted light gray. The NPS selected the paint color “Hematite,” described as a “shade of black that compliments the dark patina of the bronze lions in front of the carillon.”³⁶

On 9 December 1994, a 70-ton crane began the repair work on the Netherlands Carillon. Thirty-seven of the forty-nine bells were taken down and shipped to Royal Eijsbouts, one of the three Dutch bell foundries that cast the original bells, for retuning and reshaping. Back in the Netherlands tuning analysis and corrective retuning was performed. According to Joost Eijsbouts, “some of the bells had deteriorated so much that it would have been easier to cast new ones.”³⁷

In 1995, the project scope of work was expanded by the NPS to include replacement of deteriorated structural steel and soffit panels, repair of deteriorated surface panels, and the installation of a new roof.³⁸ To assist the Chamber of Commerce in meeting the increased cost of the project, the NPS donated material, equipment, and labor. The tower restoration also included

³³ Homer, Arlington Ridge Park, 7:11.

³⁴ Memorandum, Audrey Calhoun, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, to Chief of Maintenance, George Washington Memorial Parkway, 13 November 1994.

³⁵ Letter, J. Carter Brown, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Robert Stanton, Regional Director, National Park Service, National Capital Region, 5 December 1994.

³⁶ Letter, Robert Stanton, National Park Service, National Capital Region, to J. Carter Brown, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, 6 February 1995.

³⁷ “Restoration of the Netherlands Carillon,” *Bulletin of the Guild of Carillonneurs in North America* vol. XLV, 1996, 47-48, located in the vertical files at George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters.

³⁸ Letter, Audrey Calhoun, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, to Kersen J. de Jong, Managing Director, the Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in the U.S., 13 February 1995.

replacement of the plaza stones with smaller ones to allow for expansion room, lead-based paint removal, gold paint on the tower's raised lettering, waterproofing of the clavier room, new vinyl floors, and a new heating and cooling system.

A rededication ceremony in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary was celebrated on 5 May 1995, with a recital at the carillon. A new, fiftieth bell, cast by Royal Eijsbouts, presented to President Bill Clinton by the Dutch Prime Minister Wim Kok, was formally sounded for the first time during the ceremony.³⁹ The fiftieth bell bears the inscription "Freedom and Friendship."

Eighteen bells of the carillon programmed to play automatically can be heard at noon and 6 p.m. daily. Carillonneurs perform concerts on Saturdays and national holidays from May through September.

ARLINGTON HOUSE, THE ROBERT E. LEE MEMORIAL

Analogous to the controversy over the Air Force Memorial site, which clearly demonstrates the scarcity of land available for new memorials in the District at the end of the twentieth century, a similar battle was being fought over a 24.44-acre wooded ravine at nearby Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial.⁴⁰ The area known historically as the Arlington Woods was identified as Section 29 when part of the cemetery was set aside by the Secretary of the Army in 1964 and later acquired by the NPS in 1975.⁴¹ By the mid 1990s, Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) was near capacity and on 22 February 1995, the Secretary of the Army signed an interagency agreement with the Department of the Interior to transfer a portion of Section 29 to the Department of the Army to expand ANC.

The interagency agreement divided Section 29 – then occupied by steep slopes and forest cover that predate Robert E. Lee's residency – into two areas known as a "preservation zone" and an

³⁹ "Restoration of the Netherlands Carillon," 48.

⁴⁰ Arlington House was built between 1802-1818 by George Washington Parke Custis as a memorial to his step grandfather, George Washington. In 1831, Custis' daughter, Mary Randolph Custis, married Confederate General Robert E. Lee. The Custis and Lee families continued to live at Arlington House until 1861, when the Civil War forced the family to flee.

⁴¹ See Mackintosh, "George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History," 126-129. Mackintosh covers the history of Section 29 until 1995. See also U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, "Cultural Landscape Report: Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial" (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001).

“interment zone.”⁴² The preservation zone included approximately 12 acres east of Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial. At the time of the interagency agreement, the preservation zone was regarded to have a high potential to yield archeological resources. In contrast, the 12.44 acres of the interment zone, west of Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, was described by the agreement to have no known cultural resources. The interment zone was slated to be transferred to the Army subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the requirements of Section 106 under the National Historic Preservation Act, while the preservation zone was to be studied and the portions not needed by the NPS for Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, were to also be transferred to the Army.

Congress passed Public Law 104-201 on 23 September 1996, which authorized the land transfer in the 1995 agreement, subject to Congress’ review of the summaries of a Cultural Landscape and Archeological Study (Cultural Investigations Report), environmental analysis, and Section 106 findings. In a joint agreement, the NPS and ANC funded and produced the mandated reports for the entire 24.44 acres. According to criteria established in the 1998 *Cultural Investigations at Section 29 at Arlington House*, the interment zone would be transferred if: “(a) it is shown that it contains no known cultural resources, (b) maintenance of its woodland in a park-like manner was unnecessary to provide a proper setting for Arlington House and (c) the zone is unnecessary for the proper administration and maintenance of the mansion and adjacencies as a national memorial.”⁴³ If areas of the preservation zone also met these criteria, they too could be transferred to the ANC.

The significant historic resources discovered and documented across much of the project area during the Cultural Investigations Report challenged the 1995 definition of the zones.⁴⁴ The investigation revealed that Section 29 was an archeological site of high integrity, with significant prehistoric deposits within the interment zone. Furthermore, it determined that the forest in the zone retained high integrity as it contained some vegetation dating to the Custis-Lee occupation. Analysis of the preservation zone concluded that it contained archeological resources and landscape features that are an integral setting for Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial also date to the Custis-Lee occupation. The forest vegetation, which serves as a buffer between the house and the ANC burial sites, was described as the most important characteristic of the site. The study advised that “only limited portions of the study area can be utilized for interments without adversely affecting cultural resources,” and further recommended that the entire preservation zone be preserved intact.

⁴² Garrow & Associates, Inc., “Cultural Investigations at Section 29 at Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, Arlington County, Virginia” (Baltimore, MD.: Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District Planning Division, 1998), ii.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 1-4.

A draft Environmental Assessment, informed by the Cultural Investigation Report, was completed in June 1999. The four proposed alternatives focused on transferring varying amounts of acreage. Approximately 9.6 acres would be transferred to the ANC in the preferred alternative, allowing the NPS to retain and preserve intact the most significant archeological and forest resources.

Despite opposition to the cemetery expansion from members of Congress, the NPS, Arlington County officials, the NAACP, and the Sierra Club, the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2002 authorized the transfer of 12 acres of land designated as the interment zone from Section 29 of Arlington Cemetery from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Army.⁴⁵ The bill also charged the Secretary of the Interior with managing the remainder of the tract “in perpetuity to provide a natural setting and visual buffer for Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial.”

As the controversy over Section 29 continued into the early twenty-first century, Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, which includes the house, north and south slave quarters, a flower garden, a kitchen garden with a 1880s potting shed (museum), and a 1920s comfort station, experienced worsening conditions.⁴⁶ A leaky basement and the ensuing destructive mold spores circulating throughout the mansion forced the NPS to restrict public access to some of the rooms at Arlington House.⁴⁷ In 2000, Virginia congressmen successfully secured a \$150,000 appropriation under the Save America’s Treasures Fund for renovation planning and staffing. With Arlington County’s bicentennial celebrations generating increased interest in the site, the NPS requested \$2.15 million from Congress for the 2002 fiscal budget to address the drainage issues plaguing the cellar; however, only \$1.562 million was received. Funds would also be used to restore two slave quarters behind the house in addition to upgrading utilities and climate control, installing a new fire detection and suppression system, constructing new restrooms, and improving the landscape and handicap accessibility. The NPS’ defined goals for the restoration project were to provide a safe environment for the visiting public where the history and

⁴⁵ Ann O’Hanlon, “Expansion of Arlington Cemetery Assailed,” *Washington Post*, 11 September 2001, B3. Also, Public Law 107-107, 28 December 2001, 115 Stat. 1332, Sec. 2863. It should be noted that this bill also authorized the Navy Annex as the alternate site for the Air Force Memorial.

⁴⁶ For information on the establishment of Arlington House see Mackintosh, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History,” 117-125.

⁴⁷ Frederick Kunckle, “Rot Advanced on Historic Home; National Park Service Wants \$2 Million for Repairs at Arlington House,” *Washington Post*, 16 May 2001, B.01.

significance of the site could be interpreted through a more accurate representation of the desired circa 1861 conditions.⁴⁸

Although the restoration project was initially proposed in 1998, it was not fully funded until 2003. Several reports were produced in conjunction with the restoration effort, including a 2001 Cultural Landscape Report; a 2002 Historic Structures Report for the slave quarters; a 2003 archeological compliance investigation; a 2004 Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation of Arlington House, the slave quarters, and grounds; as well as proposed draft revisions for the 1966 Master Plan. These reports informed and guided a series of mini-value analysis workshops conducted by an interdisciplinary project team in June and August 2004, and February 2005. The preferred alternative developed during the workshops was presented in the 2006 Environmental Assessment.

At the close of the study period, implementation of a three-phase rehabilitation of Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial was ongoing.⁴⁹ Phase I (completed fall 2009) included installation of a fire detection and suppression system throughout the mansion and north slave quarters, and installation of ductwork for climate management to protect the historic structures and furnishings. Phase II (to be completed Fall 2011) completes the climate management system and includes construction of a below-grade mechanical bunker, installation of new heating and cooling systems, demolition of the remaining mansion ductwork, and also concludes the installation of underground ductwork between the mansion and the mechanical bunker. Under Phase II, the 1920s comfort station will be demolished and a new, accessible comfort station is currently being constructed to the north of the kitchen garden. The complete rehabilitation of the north slave quarters (with the exception of the interior bookstore space), including a new roof, new plaster and stucco has already been accomplished under this phase. The rehabilitation returned much of the north slave quarter's interior to its circa 1860 layout. The remaining preservation and visitor service needs will be addressed in Phase III (unfunded as of summer of 2011), which will include rehabilitation of the south slave quarters, partial restoration of the spatial qualities of the original kitchen garden, and improvement of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility to buildings and grounds.

Concurrent to Phase II of the rehabilitation, considerable rehabilitation work has been undertaken on the interior finishings of the mansion. This includes abatement of chipping lead paint, repair and limited replacement of historic plaster, and coating of wall and ceiling surfaces

⁴⁸ The Louis Berger Group, "Environmental Assessment: Rehabilitation of Arlington House, Outbuildings, and Grounds," prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, 2006, I. The preferred alternative for the kitchen garden restoration recognizes that certain features from the post-Civil War era, such as the potting shed, have significance in their own right. The alternative proposes a gravel access road to the west of the north slave quarters to improve site circulation.

⁴⁹ This section excerpted from U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. "Cultural Landscape Report: Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial," 51.

with mineral coating. By summer of 2011, a portion of this work had been completed, with the remainder of the mansion interior scheduled to be completed by March 2012. It is anticipated that the historic museum collections will be returned to Arlington House, the Robert E Lee Memorial in the spring of 2012.

CIVIL WAR DEFENSES OF WASHINGTON

During the Civil War a complex system of fortifications, including sixty-eight forts and ninety-three batteries, was built by Union soldiers to protect the nation's capital from invasion by the Confederates.⁵⁰ The twenty-two remaining federally-owned defined earthworks are scattered throughout the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland, and are therefore administered by different units of the National Park Service, including National Capital Parks East, Rock Creek Park, and the GWMP. Fort Marcy is the only Civil War fortification located entirely within the bounds of the GWMP. In a Historic Resource Study of the Civil War defenses, the fifteen-acre park was identified as the best preserved, notable for its well-preserved fort and related outworks and trenches.⁵¹

At the turn of the twentieth century, the 1902 McMillan Plan advocated the preservation of the fortifications, characterized as a belt of green parkland around the city, and proposed the creation of a "Fort Drive."⁵² Despite numerous efforts to create a parkway connecting the fort sites, including several bills introduced in Congress, Fort Drive was never fully realized.

Over the study period there have been reoccurring efforts by the GWMP and the regional office to better preserve the earthworks and to communicate their importance to the public through interpretation and education. In the early twenty-first century, the approaching Civil War Sesquicentennial generated renewed interest in preserving the forts. By this time, early efforts to construct a car-oriented parkway had evolved into the concept of a trail system. In 2003, the NPS released the "Draft Fort Circle Parks Management Plan" that provided a framework for a continuous trail route to connect the Civil War sites to the surrounding communities and regional trail systems. The plan also recommended the system of fortifications be renamed the "Civil War Defenses of Washington" to more accurately convey their historic function to the public.

In response to the draft plan, the Committee of 100 on the Federal City sponsored two bus tours of the sites. NPS staff participated in the tours to share knowledge of the plan as well as the

⁵⁰ For history on the fortifications, please see: CEHP, Inc., "The Civil War Defenses of Washington: Historic Resource Study," prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, no date, found at National Park Service, History E-Library, http://www.nps.gov/history/online_books/civilwar/hrst.htm, accessed 11 November 2010.

⁵¹ Ibid, Part II, Chapter III, 9.

⁵² Ibid, Part II, Chapter III, 1-8.

resources. The committee outlined its findings from the tour and recommendations for the NPS in a written “Call to Action.”⁵³ According to the committee, the parks were in a deteriorated state and improvements were necessary in interpretation, public access, management, and public safety. Among the committee’s recommendations were to create a distinct unit within the NPS for the dedicated management of the resources and to establish a national heritage area.

Three years after the committee’s Call to Action, the Civil War Preservation Trust placed the “Washington Circle Forts” on its list of the ten most endangered Civil War battlefields in the country.⁵⁴ The Trust contended that the fortifications were being “absorbed” by encroaching development as Washington expanded over the twentieth century.

The National Park Service reacted to the Committee’s and the Trust’s appeals with efforts that included creating uniform signage, developing a trail between the forts, working with fort stakeholders outside of the NPS to develop biking trails, and at the GWMP, securing a grant to create an interpretive walking trail between Fort Marcy and Fort Ethan Allen (an Arlington County property).

CLARA BARTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Subsequent to the establishment of the Clara Barton National Historic Site in 1974, the park came under the administrative purview of the GWMP superintendent. An Historic Structures Report was produced in 1977 to determine the condition of the site.⁵⁵ Based on the report’s findings, extensive repairs and restoration of the house, including interior restoration, began in 1980. A considerable amount of scholarly research was also conducted to support and guide the interior restoration work, resulting in the 1983 Historic Furnishing Plan.⁵⁶ This plan analyzed existing furnishings and made recommendations for furniture, accessories, wall hangings, floor coverings, and window treatments for each room derived from accounts by Clara Barton and Dr. Julian B. Hubbell and their visitors. NPS implemented many of the recommendations presented in this report during the last decades of the twentieth century to enhance the visitors’ experience and more accurately interpret the house as it was during Barton’s residence.

⁵³ The Committee of 100 on the Federal City, “A Call to Action on the Fort Circle Parks Draft Management Plan,” 15 August 2003, found at <http://www.committeeof100.net/pdf/pub/C100FortCirclePlan.pdf>, accessed 11 November 2010.

⁵⁴ Civil War Preservation Trust, “History Under Siege: A Guide to America’s Most Endangered Civil War Battlefields 2006,” <http://www.civilwar.org/history-under-siege/2006-history-under-siege.pdf>, accessed 11 November 2010.

⁵⁵ For information on the establishment of the Clara Barton National Historic Site, see Mackintosh, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History,” 195-197.

⁵⁶ See Katherine Menz, “Historic Furnishing Plan: Clara Barton House.”

In an effort to expand the historical record at Clara Barton House, as well as to inform ongoing preservation and restoration projects in the twenty-first century, the GWMP completed a Historic Structures Report in 2004. The document was intended to update the 1977 report by identifying significant historic materials, features, and sections of the house, and by evaluating the existing structure for safety and compliance concerns. The GWMP was particularly interested in research clarifying Dr. Hubbell's role as Chief Field Agent of the American Red Cross, his room at Glen Echo, and Barton's adjacent sitting room. A private collection of Hubbell documents which shed light on his critical role in developing the American Red Cross were discovered as a result of this effort.

Based on the new research and findings, the Historic Structure Report concluded that the National Register and National Historic Landmark nominations, completed in 1972 and 1979 respectively, should be revised. The report argued that Criterion B should be updated to capture the significance of Hubbell and that the house should also be nominated under Criterion C as a "strong piece of vernacular architecture." Finally, it recommended that the period of significance for the site be broadened to 1891-1912.

The report also recommended expanding or partially revising the earlier Historic Furnishing Report. While the report supported the continued interpretation of the rooms currently on exhibit, it determined that additional rooms not yet on display lacked sufficient documentation for restoration or reconstruction.⁵⁷

At the current date, efforts are underway to rehabilitate the Hubbell Bedroom and Barton's adjacent Sitting Room based on the new research and funding obtained, in part, through an America's Scenic Byways Grant.

GLEN ECHO PARK

The use of Glen Echo Park for arts and crafts activities had generally been established by 1972, when community organizations, through agreements with the National Capital Region, used the park's buildings for visual and performing arts programs.⁵⁸ When the park officially became part of the NPS in 1976, some of the historic buildings were already in poor condition.⁵⁹ Efforts

⁵⁷ Oehrlein & Associates Architects, "Clara Barton National Historic Site, Historic Structure Report," vol. II (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2004), 3-4.

⁵⁸ For information on the establishment of Glen Echo Park, see Mackintosh, "George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History," 190-195.

⁵⁹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Final Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Glen Echo Park, Montgomery County, Maryland" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, February 2001), 1-5.

to stabilize the structures and implement a Management Facilities Program in 1984 failed and, consequently, the park began to consider alternative management options. Concerned local citizens established the Glen Echo Park Foundation in 1987, and unsuccessfully attempted to raise the funds needed to rehabilitate the buildings; by 1992 the NPS estimated the cost to stabilize and update the park to be approximately \$20 million.⁶⁰

In 1999, the Federal government, the state of Maryland, and Montgomery County jointly funded an \$18 million renovation of the 1933 Spanish Ballroom and Arcade buildings, along with other improvements. The following year the NPS entered into a cooperative agreement with Montgomery County to manage programs at the park. In conjunction with this agreement, a much-needed Management Plan for Glen Echo was finally adopted by the NPS in 2001.⁶¹ Under the plan, the NPS would retain some oversight of park activities; however, long-term maintenance duties would be administered by a volunteer board of directors from Montgomery County. Most importantly, with Glen Echo no longer dependent on federal funding, the cooperative agreement and the Management Plan helped protect the parks' long-term financial viability and, thus, its cultural resources.

Glen Echo's buildings benefited greatly from an \$18 million Cooperative Agreement partnership between the NPS, Montgomery County, and the State of Maryland. Each partner pledged a \$2 million per year expenditure over a three-year period to stabilize and rehabilitate twenty structures, nine of which are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. A majority of the funds were spent on the renovation of the 1933 Spanish Ballroom and the nearby North Arcade building. Repairs and improvements to the cultural landscape and area paving were also carried out with the funds.

To fulfill the Park Mission Goals articulated in the Management Plan, Montgomery County established the Glen Echo Park Partnership for Arts and Culture in 2002, which was charged with managing and maintaining park facilities, managing and operating park programs, fundraising, and marketing. For their part, NPS was responsible for providing historical interpretation, grounds maintenance, safety and security services, and resource protection. At the close of the study, programs such as puppet shows, dances in the Spanish Ballroom, a children's museum, theater, rides on the 1921 carousel, and classes in such subjects as dancing, pottery, painting, and photography drew approximately half a million visitors to Glen Echo each year.⁶²

⁶⁰ Frank Ahrens, "Last Tango for Spanish Ballroom? Park Service Gets Earful on Options for Glen Echo Park Facilities," *The Washington Post*, 4 February 1998.

⁶¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Final Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Glen Echo Park, Montgomery County, Maryland" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, February 2001), 1-5.

⁶² Glen Echo Park Partnership for Arts and Culture, "Glen Echo Park – Then and Now," www.glenecho.park.org, accessed 3 May 2010.

FORT HUNT PARK

One of the most exciting current research projects undertaken by the GWMP during the study period was the uncovering of an incredible amount of new information regarding Fort Hunt Park's clandestine World War II history.⁶³ The park sponsored an Historic Resources Study (2002) and Cultural Landscapes Inventory (2001, revised 2004) that related the World War II military intelligence activities that took place at the site, but not to the degree that has been recently unearthed through further research and interviews with veterans. The discovery of the extent of the tremendous history at the park came at a time when nationwide interest in World War II memorialization soared and the NPS had begun to recognize its role in preserving the war's history. While NPS emphasis and funding was initially focused on preserving sites in the Pacific, attention turned to the Washington D.C. area after a chance encounter between a park ranger and a visitor led GWMP officials to reveal Fort Hunt's remarkable contribution to World War II efforts.

The park, sited on a portion of land once occupied by George Washington's River Farm, was originally constructed as a Spanish-American War era coastal artillery battery at what was then known as Sheridan's Point.⁶⁴ Officially named "Fort Hunt" on 13 April 1899, the post was obsolete and abandoned by 1923. Over the subsequent two decades, Fort Hunt served various functions, including as a temporary tent city for World War I veterans participating in three "Bonus Marches" in the early 1930s, an African American Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) center, and as a Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camp from October 1933 until March 1942. In May of 1942, the Secretary of the Interior approved a special use permit for the Department of the Army to occupy Fort Hunt for the duration of the war, plus one additional year – thus beginning Fort Hunt's clandestine activities.

When Fort Hunt became a top-secret military intelligence center known as P.O. Box 1142, several programs operated out of the eighty-seven buildings on site – many newly erected for temporary use. Programs included MIS-Y (Military Intelligence Service-Y), which was a joint interrogation center for German prisoners of war (POWs) and MIS-X (Military Intelligence Service-X), which was responsible for aiding American POWs to escape German camps by sending "care packages" that contained concealed escape tools. A third program, MIRS

⁶³ This section was largely informed by Vincent Santucci, Chief Ranger, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 3 November 2010.

⁶⁴ For a history of Fort Hunt Park, please see: Matthew R. Laird, "By the River Potomac, An Historic Resource Study of Fort Hunt Park, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Mount Vernon, Virginia," prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2000. While the war may have provided the impetus to complete the construction of the battery, the decision to place a coastal artillery battery at the site was actually made nearly a decade before the war commenced, as part of an overall plan to increase coastal defenses over the entire country.

(Military Intelligence Research Section) supported interrogation efforts and tactical decisions. During P.O. Box 1142's operation from July 1942 through November 1946, 3,451 POWs were held and nearly 5,000 interrogations were conducted.⁶⁵ By the fall of 1946, with the war over and the operations at P.O. Box 1142 terminated, Fort Hunt was declared surplus by the War Department and the buildings were dismantled; in January 1948, the site was transferred back to the NPS. Because the veterans of P.O. Box 1142 signed a secrecy agreement and their work was classified, the site's World War II history was little known by NPS officials during the decades that followed.

The NPS regarded Fort Hunt as an "essential part of the federal parks serving the Washington Metropolitan area," and in the 1960s, officials focused on developing the park for recreational and public use purposes with funds from the Mission 66 program.⁶⁶ Cornelius W. Heine, Chief of the Division of Public Use and Interpretation of National Capital Parks, recommended installing picnic tables, fireplaces, drinking water, and nature trails. From 1963-64, an 8,000-square-foot picnic pavilion was erected on the site along with two comfort stations, interpretive waysides, and three softball diamonds. Fort Hunt Park, encompassing over 150 acres and boasting new public amenities, opened to the public in 1964.

Documents from P.O. Box 1142 began to be declassified in waves starting in 1977, and in 1992 Lloyd Shoemaker – a former employee at the complex – published his firsthand account of the clandestine programs in his book *The Escape Factory*. Yet it wasn't until a visitor to Fort Hunt Park connected the NPS with a former P.O. Box 1142 veteran, Fred Michele, that the GWMP began to uncover a greater extent of the park's wartime activities.⁶⁷ Since then, GWMP officials have worked to capture and document Fort Hunt's story and have conducted more than seventy-two interviews of veterans and others associated with the site, including two German POWs and three German scientists. Through these interviews the GWMP established Fort Hunt Park's critical role in significant twentieth-century events such as the Allied victory in the war, the engineering of the atomic bomb, the birth of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the cold war, and the space race.

The interviews of P.O. Box 1142 veterans, many of them former interrogators of captured Germans, were conducted during a time when interrogation techniques in this country were in question and were therefore valuable to current intelligence and military officials. Intelligence

⁶⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Cultural Landscape Inventory: Fort Hunt, George Washington Memorial Parkway" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001, revised 2004), 2b:10.

⁶⁶ Laird, "By the River Potomac, an Historic Resource Study," 120-121. See also U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Cultural Landscape Inventory: Fort Hunt, George Washington Memorial Parkway," 2b:13.

⁶⁷ Lloyd R. Shoemaker, *The Escape Factory: The Story of Mis-X* (New York: St. Martins Mass Market Paper, 1992).

agencies became interested in the research and the veterans' interviews to review past interrogation techniques for use in informing modern practices. The tremendous scholarship and research that came from the interview project earned the GWMP accolades from other federal agencies and helped the NPS establish new relationships.

In October 2008, GWMP officials organized a reunion at Fort Hunt Park for veterans of P.O. Box 1142. At precisely 11:42 a.m., a new flag pole – reestablished in its war time location – was dedicated to honor those soldiers who were heretofore unrecognized. Currently, the flag, an associated plaque, and a few wayside panels are the only interpretive tools on site to convey the significance of the park.

GWMP officials consider the capturing and documenting of the history of P.O. Box 1142 to be one of the most important projects at the park. To facilitate this effort, Virginia Congressman James Moran secured a special appropriation to initiate an interpretive plan. By the end of the study period a Site Development Plan (SDP) and Environmental Assessment for Fort Hunt Park were underway. Proposed plans include new facilities for educational and interpretive programming, new wayside exhibits, as well as installing old photographs and possibly war memorabilia donated by former veterans of P.O. Box 1142. The NPS also envisions engaging visitors in the World War II history by installing headphones on site, where visitors can listen to recordings of POW's conversations using actual transcripts obtained from the National Archives. For accuracy and authenticity, recordings would likely be spoken in German and visitors would be provided written English translations.

The NPS may have lost an opportunity to interpret one of the remaining buildings integral to P.O. Box 1142 in 1992, when a park restroom was demolished. A Section 106 review conducted in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act concluded that the restroom was “not considered in the historic area of the park, and the use was purely utilitarian.”⁶⁸ At the time of the report, officials believed the restroom had been constructed in the 1950s. However, 1930s and 1940s maps reveal a comfort station in this area, possibly constructed by Civilian Conservation Corps, and according to a GWMP cultural resource manager, recent scholarship indicates that the comfort station was used as living quarters for high value German POWs.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ George Washington Memorial Parkway, “Documentation of Restroom Removal, Fort Hunt Park, Virginia,” February 1992, document located at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters.

⁶⁹ Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in conversation with the author, 29 January 2010.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

The GWMP is unlike most other NPS parks in that it is guided by documented landscape plans.⁷⁰ The current GWMP approach to the park's cultural landscapes is to support the efforts of earlier landscape architects who designed the layout of the parkway to capture certain viewsheds, alignments, and the existing natural setting. By characterizing the parkway as a cultural landscape, the GWMP acknowledges that exotic species are part of the landscape plan.⁷¹ While some natural resource managers are uncomfortable with the use of nonnatives, the GWMP has determined it is appropriate to do so because cultural resource values are paramount.

For all new planting plans within the park, the GWMP does encourage the use of native species; however, there are instances when exotic species are an integral part of the design concept.⁷² For example, the Fourth Infantry (Ivy) Division Memorial – dedicated during the study period – utilizes English ivy, an exotic species, because it is the division's traditional insignia.⁷³ The GWMP must closely maintain and contain the ivy to ensure it does not harm surrounding vegetation.

The treatment of cultural landscapes as a cultural resource has been an evolution within the NPS. Cultural landscapes were not formally identified until 1988, when the NPS characterized landscapes as a type of cultural resource in *NPS Management Policies*.⁷⁴ Although the GWMP's first Cultural Landscape Report was written in 1986 (for the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway), the program was not fully integrated into the GWMP's practices until 1999. At present, the GWMP has identified seventeen cultural landscapes; of those identified, the following have initiated or completed the mandated Cultural Landscape Reports (CLR) and Cultural Landscape Inventories (CLI): Mount Vernon Memorial Highway CLR, Fort Hunt Park CLI; Arlington House CLR, Memorial Avenue CLI, Lady Bird Johnson CLI; North Parkway CLI, George

⁷⁰ This section is largely informed by Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

⁷¹ The NPS has defined exotic species as those that are nonnative (do not naturally occur in a place without human intervention) to the ecosystem they are within. For more information on exotic species management in the GWMP, please see Chapter II.

⁷² Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

⁷³ Please see Chapter I for further information on the Fourth Infantry (Ivy) Division Memorial.

⁷⁴ National Park Service, "An Overview of Cultural Landscapes Preservation," <http://www.nps.gov/csi/csihandbook/preservation/evolution.htm>, accessed 23 March 2011.

Washington Memorial Parkway Central Section Vegetation CLR, Arlington Ridge Park (CLI), Arlington House CLI, and Theodore Roosevelt Island CLI.

Documenting cultural landscapes has also informed and facilitated the management of exotic species within the park's cultural landscapes. In 2009, the NPS produced a Cultural Landscape Report for GWMP's central section (from Alexandria to Arlington Bridge) to identify, document, analyze, and make recommendations about the planting plans of the GWMP.⁷⁵ As part of this effort, the study briefly explored the impact of exotic species on the historically significant ecosystem of the GWMP. According to the report, a very few plant species from landscape architect Wilbur Simonson's original designs for the parkway are partially responsible for exotic invasives found along this section. Exotic invasive species employed by Simonson include vines used extensively along the guardrails and light posts along the parkway and in the landscape at Daingerfield Island (likely used to stabilize the area from erosion). Other dominant exotic invasive species employed by Simonson include Japanese honeysuckle and porcelainberry, while giant knotweed and common reed are exotic invasive plants that have invaded the park subsequent to its construction. Although Simonson's 1932 designs included both native and what he termed "harmonizing" plants, most exotic species on the 1932 MVMH Planting Plan are not invasive.

The Cultural Landscape Report recommended that exotic invasive species no longer be used within the park while existing specimens should be controlled or, if necessary, removed. For those exotic species not identified as invasive, the report argued that they could be appropriate for continued uses given their "historical status" within the parkway.⁷⁶ Superintendent Dottie Marshall determined to implement this recommendation and affirmed that since the GWMP, as a cultural landscape, has historically been a *designed* park, exotic species are acceptable unless they prove to be invasive.⁷⁷ Exotic species that are not part of the historic landscape plans are eradicated. GWMP officials continue to grapple with determining which exotic invasive list to follow, since multiple lists have been created by several federal agencies.

⁷⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, "Vegetation of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, Central Section: Alexandria to Arlington Memorial Bridge, Cultural Landscape Report" (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2009), 29, 48, 108, 282-283.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 283.

⁷⁷ Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in conversation with the author, 15 June 2010.

Cultural Landscape Studies

During the study period the park also began to better compete for financial support from the Cultural Resources Preservation Program (CRPP) funding from the Washington and National Capital Regional Offices to obtain development compliance funding for National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 cultural resource reports in order to conduct survey, identification, and evaluation studies of its historic properties and cultural resources. The current cultural resources program manager estimates that during his tenure nearly fifty contracted and in-house archeological investigations of various sizes have been conducted. These identified numerous new archeological sites and resources, ranging from Native American Indian petroglyphs and habitation sites to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century home sites, and a ropewalk to World War II military intelligence facilities and prisoner of war compounds.

An update of the archeological sites inventory for the GWMP was conducted in conjunction with the University of Maryland through Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units (CESU) funding. Some seventeen cultural landscapes have been identified and nine Cultural Landscape Inventories and Reports have been completed. At least eight major research efforts have been conducted resulting in completions of new studies or updates to National Register of Historic Places nominations, Historic Resources Studies, and Historic Structures Reports. Current in-house research on World War II military intelligence activities at Fort Hunt has demonstrated the national significance of this park site.

CHAPTER II: NATURAL RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP

NPS historian Barry Mackintosh maintained that “the parkway was conceived primarily as a means to another end: environmental conservation.”⁷⁸ While the GWMP faced serious issues of encroachment and development, as well as issues of competing use during the study period, park officials continued the tradition of environmental stewardship and made important strides towards cleaning up the parkway and its waterways. Essential to the GWMP’s achievements was the park’s cooperative approach to natural resource management that included academic, governmental, and nongovernmental partners.

Since 1985, the natural resource programs for the National Capital Region have been administered by NPS staff located at the Center for Urban Ecology (CUE) in a renovated park maintenance facility on MacArthur Boulevard. CUE was established by the NPS to help the region responsibly manage natural resources in their complex urban environment.⁷⁹ The interdisciplinary team of natural resource specialists at CUE provides technical assistance to park managers, implements and manages region-wide resource management programs, and educates NPS staff and the public in natural resource issues.

POTOMAC RIVER PRESERVATION

Because the GWMP is located within the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay watersheds, the park has a stewardship role in their conservation and preservation. In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson directed the Department of the Interior to produce a conservation plan for the Potomac that would clean up the river, provide adequate water for area residents and businesses, ensure flood protection, protect natural resources, and plan for recreational use. The Department of the Interior responded with a federal interdepartmental task force that included representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, in addition to its own bureaus and services. The report produced by this task force, called *The Nation’s River*, provided a brief history of the development and pollution of the Potomac watershed and an “Action Plan” of steps to be taken to return the Potomac to health.⁸⁰ The Potomac was considered “grossly polluted” in 1969, but advances in sewage treatment, tougher environmental laws, including the Clean Water Act of 1972 and controls of

⁷⁸ Mackintosh, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History,” 2.

⁷⁹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, “Center for Urban Ecology: Introduction,” Center for Urban Ecology website, <http://www.nps.gov/cue/cueintro.html>, and “Center for Urban Ecology: Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan,” http://www.nps.gov/cue/strategic_plan.html, accessed 4 January 2011.

⁸⁰ U.S. Department of the Interior, *The Nation’s River: A Report on the Potomac* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1968), 18-19, 40-53, 107-128.

sediment and storm-water runoff, helped to turn the tide against “point source” pollution – that is, pollution from a single location, such as a factory or a sewer pipe – by the end of the 1970s. Algae blooms and fish kills had begun to decline by the mid-1970s, nutrients in the rivers decreased and dissolved oxygen – important for fish populations – had begun to rise. Efforts to continue the cleanup since the 1980s to the end of the study period shifted to nonpoint source pollution: runoff from farmland and new development, heavy metals from a variety of sources, and other pollutants.⁸¹

In addition to pollution and ecological threats, the river also encountered threats to its historic setting. During the study period, development in close proximity to the shoreline, and associated clear-cutting (tree removal) had an impact on the natural landscape character of the Potomac River and, in particular, the 15-mile river corridor from Great Falls to Theodore Roosevelt Island known as the Potomac Gorge. The gorge incorporates 9,700 acres in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, including sections of both the GWMP and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historic Park. Known as one of the country’s most biologically diverse areas, the Potomac Gorge supports more than 200 rare species and natural communities.⁸²

In 1998, the Potomac River was designated as an American Heritage River. This program initially selected ten rivers as American Heritage Rivers based on their historic, economic, and cultural significance. Objectives of the initiative included natural resource and environmental protection, economic revitalization, and historic and cultural preservation. The designation of the Potomac River also served as an impetus for community organizations and the NPS to actively promote and restore the river.

Since the last decade of the twentieth century, the NPS has collaborated with the District of Columbia, public interest groups, and local communities to restore the Potomac River; an important partner in this effort includes the Potomac Conservancy. A group of individuals concerned with the changing view along the Potomac Gorge established the nonprofit Potomac Conservancy in 1993.⁸³ The conservancy, based in Silver Spring, Maryland, operates as a regional land trust, using conservation easements to help landowners achieve conservation goals. In exchange for the reduced taxes, the easement prohibits landowners from subdividing a lot, cutting trees, and building additional structures.

⁸¹ Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, *Healing a River: The Potomac, 1940-1990* (Rockville, Maryland: Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, 1990), 6-18.

⁸² “Site Conservation Planning for the Potomac River Gorge: A Partnership Between Two National Parks and the Nature Conservancy,” *Crossing Boundaries in Park Management: Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Research Management in Parks and on Public Lands*, edited by David Harmon (Hancock, Michigan: The George Wright Society, 2001), n.p.

⁸³ The Potomac Conservancy, “Learn About What We Do,” www.potomac.org/site/what-we-do/, accessed 13 May 2010.

In addition to easements, the Potomac Conservancy promotes preserving and protecting the river through advocacy, citizen education and engagement, and recreation events. In 2001, the group began actively patrolling the river using volunteers on canoes and kayaks to monitor for environmental hazards and changes to the landscape, such as clear-cutting. Since 2007, the Potomac Conservancy has issued the “State of the Nation’s River” to raise awareness about the conditions of the Potomac River and its threats.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC), established in 1951, and concerned with conservation globally, is another important partner involved in the stewardship of the Potomac Gorge. Recognizing the common goal and potential benefits of joining efforts to care for the rare species and natural resources of the gorge, the District of Columbia/Maryland chapter of the TNC approached the NPS to initiate a partnership. In 2002, the NPS awarded a grant in support of cooperative planning with TNC, and designated both the GWMP and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal as beneficiaries of the funding.⁸⁴ At the end of the study period, in 2010, the GWMP was in its last year of funding and formal partnership with TNC. Over the eight-year grant period, the GWMP used the funding for various programs including the protection of rare seeps and rare arthropods, and an effective program of exotic plant eradication in the gorge led by Mary Travaglini at TNC.

The grant also supported the development of a Site Conservation Plan (SCP) for the Potomac Gorge that focused on identifying conservation targets, analyzing target threats, and developing mitigation strategies.⁸⁵ The measure for this cooperative effort, using established protocols and guidance, was to evaluate resources in terms of biodiversity. This approach is rarely adopted by the NPS, yet was used for the SCP because of the remarkable biodiversity found in previous inventories of the gorge.

As part of the SCP, a “threat analysis” of stresses and sources of stress was conducted and determined that of the seven conservation targets considered by the SCP – Riparian Communities, Groundwater Invertebrates, Terrace Communities, Anadromous Fish, Upland Forest, Tributary Stream Systems, and Wetlands – only tributary stream systems held a “very high” threat status. The SCP further identified the primary source of threats to the Potomac as: roads/utility corridors, development, park facilities/operations/maintenance/use, deer browsing, and cultural resources.⁸⁶ In an effort to address this threat and improve the water quality in

⁸⁴ “Site Conservation Planning for the Potomac River Gorge: A Partnership Between Two National Parks and the Nature Conservancy,” n.p.

⁸⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, “Potomac Gorge Survey, 60-day Notice of Intention to Request Clearance of Collection of Information,” Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 13 March 2008.

⁸⁶ In some cases, cultural resources pose potential threats to the ecosystem. For example, at the GWMP historic culverts in the northern section not only create a break in stream habitat, but can also cause downstream erosion, which increases sedimentation. Also, the roadway has recently been found to have a disruptive impact on nesting songbirds due to noise level. Dan

tributary streams, the NPS conducted a survey of the gorge's neighbors in 2008 to understand how the behaviors of the local landowners affect the water quality. Results of the survey will inform future conservation endeavors.

In developing and implementing conservation strategies, the SCP placed strong emphasis on involving key stakeholders, for example, local governments, nongovernmental organizations, user groups, etc. The SCP also advocated three broad methods to conserve the Potomac Gorge including: (1) land and water conservation, including acquisition of full or partial interest in land or water; (2) public policies, including at the local, regional, and national level; and (3) compatible economic development.

At the close of the study period, restoration of the Potomac Gorge was also being facilitated by coordination between the NPS and Maryland State Highway Administration. A \$500,000 congressional appropriation for environmental restoration work in the gorge, included in the 2005 transportation bill, will be used to map and control invasive species that are spread by roads, develop improved floodplain maps, and protect water quality.⁸⁷

DYKE MARSH

Despite being designated as a wildlife preserve in 1959, the long-term survival of the 485-acre tidal wetlands in the Potomac River just south of Alexandria, known as Dyke Marsh, remained in doubt at the turn of the twenty-first century.⁸⁸ Currently, the life span of Dyke Marsh is projected to be between forty to sixty years unless the park can secure funding to address and reverse prior damage.⁸⁹ Dyke Marsh continues to deteriorate as a result of thirty years of dredging that exposed the marsh to the wave energy of northeastern-tracking storms.⁹⁰

Sealy, Acting Chief, Natural Resources and Science, National Capital Region, Center for Urban Ecology, in discussion with the authors, 5 January 2011.

⁸⁷ The Nature Conservancy, "Nature Conservancy Applauds Support for Potomac Gorge Environmental Restoration Project, www.nature.org, accessed 14 April 2010.

⁸⁸ For information on Dyke Marsh prior to 1990, see Mackintosh, "George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History," 153-164.

⁸⁹ Brent Steury, Natural Resources Program Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 14 December 2010.

⁹⁰ Dyke Marsh was dredged for sand and gravel by Smoot Sand and Gravel Corp from 1940 to 1976. Please see: The Louis Berger Group, Inc., "Archeological Assessment for Dyke Marsh Preserve George Washington Memorial Parkway, Fairfax County Virginia," prepared for the George Washington Memorial Parkway, National Park Service, January 2009, 24.

Additional threats such as invasive species, rising water levels, and erosion caused by boat wakes also endanger the marsh. The site does, however, retain its landscape integrity, according to an Archeological Assessment completed to inform the development of the wetland restoration and the site's long-term management.⁹¹

The primary cause of Dyke Marsh's erosion was the dredging and subsequent destruction of a promontory that historically jutted out at the south end of the marsh.⁹² The promontory was one of the first areas of the marsh to be dredged, exposing a nearly six-kilometer stretch of the Potomac River that follows the exact path of northeastern-tracking storms. With the promontory removed, these storms now release all of their energy onto the Dyke Marsh itself, causing the marsh to lose about an acre of land with each northeastern-tracking storm. Over the last forty years, approximately 30 acres of marshland have been lost to erosion. The GWMP determined it was essential to establish a breakwater to replace the historic promontory and break up the northeastern-tracking storms. Once the breakwater is in place, the park will be able to build out the rest of the marsh as fill material is available. With cost estimates ranging from 13-16 million dollars just for the breakwater, the project is cost prohibitive at this time.

Over thirty years after dredging in Dyke Marsh ended, the GWMP began a process to develop and plan for restoration and long-term management of the marsh and other associated wetland habitats. Since a 1974 congressional mandate requiring the GWMP, in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers, to restore Dyke Marsh remained unfunded, park officials successfully competed for \$500,000 of funding for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to guide the GWMP in restoring up to 270 acres of Dyke Marsh. Although the GWMP had initiated and begun work on the EIS near the end of the study period, the Army Corps of Engineers determined that additional studies needed to be conducted before the EIS could be completed. Through scrupulous use of park operating accounts, the park was able to fund all of the costs to complete the necessary Army Corps of Engineers studies. These studies will conclude in FY2012. GWMP officials are hopeful that once the EIS is complete, mitigation monies from other Army Corps of Engineer projects may become available to the GWMP to restore Dyke Marsh, acre by acre, as a mitigation site.

In addition to environmental threats, a long history of poaching and hunting also jeopardize the natural resources at Dyke Marsh.⁹³ Perhaps the most common form of poaching at the marsh is

⁹¹ The Louis Berger Group, Inc., "Archeological Assessment for Dyke Marsh Preserve," 36.

⁹² This section was largely informed by Brent Steury, Natural Resources Program Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, and Jon G. James, Deputy Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 14 December 2010.

⁹³ This section was largely informed by Brent Steury, Natural Resources Program Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, and Jon G. James, Deputy Superintendent,

turtle poaching, although a variety of illegal fish poaching, including the use of long lines, drag nets, cage traps, and bow hunting have been discovered. Poachers typically sneak into the marsh in the night, set traps and return before sunrise to steal the turtles, which are then sold commercially. The GWMP caught and prosecuted poachers twice during the study period.

Several agreements between the GWMP and Virginia have been enacted to manage hunting on the edge of the marsh that borders state lands. For example, in a 1995 agreement, the GWMP surrendered its rights to own and operate duck blinds to Virginia, allowing the state to manage a set of eight floating duck blinds. The agreement was intended to help control the number of blinds at the marsh, as well as prohibit a private citizen from bidding on and operating hunting blinds at their own discretion. Although the agreement was removed in 2001, the state is still managing the blinds without an agreement in place.

While hunting is illegal inside the boundaries of Dyke Marsh, an agreement between the GWMP and Virginia permits people to hunt in the state waters at the edge of the marsh. To regulate hunting near Dyke marsh, the state manages hunting buoys and issues annual permits for people to hunt water fowl (ducks and geese). Despite these efforts, in the recent past hunters have been caught moving the buoys inside the boundaries of the marsh to expand the hunting area, forcing GWMP officials to report the violations to the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries.

The existing marsh boundary markers, which are often placed on poles, as well as the state managed hunting buoys, have proven to be insufficient and are too easily displaced by poachers and weather, particularly ice storms. The GWMP has explored several methods to more clearly and permanently communicate the boundaries of the marsh to visitors. To aid in this, the park is currently creating a map that delineates the site's boundaries and also explains its rules and regulations. A copy of this map will be distributed to anyone launching from Belle Haven Marina at Dyke Marsh. The GWMP also plans to replace the current boundary markers with U.S. Coast Guard-approved buoys appropriate for the shallow water of the marsh. The state-managed hunting buoys, like most buoys manufactured today, are intended for deeper water. At present, the GWMP is exploring custom buoys as a long-term solution to marking the boundaries of Dyke Marsh.

Other threats to the marsh and its natural resources identified during the study period, include environmental hazards posed by the deteriorating Belle Haven Marina, a site also administered by the GWMP, situated on the west bank of the Potomac River in a corner of Dyke Marsh. The marina was first threatened with closure in 1995 when NPS studies estimated renovations to repair the marina to be \$2.2 million.⁹⁴ After it was determined that only \$500,000 of essential repairs were needed to keep the marina open, a county loan, a state grant, and private donations

George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 14 December 2010.

⁹⁴ Mackintosh, "George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History," 164.

were allocated to the project. However, the county subsequently retracted the loan for budgetary reasons and the repairs were never carried out. The marina once again faced closure in 2001. At the urging of U.S. Representative James P. Moran, Congress appropriated \$100,000 to complete an Environmental Assessment evaluating whether the marina should be restored, scaled back, or closed down.⁹⁵

With the Environmental Assessment underway, Belle Haven Marina took a more active role in environmental stewardship of the river and became certified as a Virginia Clean Marina in 2003. The Clean Marina Program, spurred by the American Heritage River Initiative, is a public-private partnership between the NPS and the D.C. Department of Health focused on encouraging marinas and boat operators to minimize environmental impacts through employing preferable boating practices, such as developing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan.⁹⁶ To become certified as a Clean Marina, the program requires applicants to fulfill a ten-step compliance process. Belle Haven Marina continued to operate as a Clean Marina through the end of the study period, employing environmentally preferable boating practices.

At the end of the 1990s, Dyke Marsh benefited from a recreation enhancement project stemming from environmental mitigation following the massive 1993 Colonial Pipeline Company oil spill. Approximately 407,000 gallons of diesel fuel were released into Sugarland Run when the pipeline burst in Reston. The \$3.6 million settlement, reached in 1997, included a civil fine and additional monies to restore or rehabilitate natural resources damaged by the spill.⁹⁷ Through collaborative efforts between the Colonial Pipeline Company, the NPS, Fish and Wildlife Service, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Washington, D.C., seventeen restoration projects in and around the Sugarland Run and the Potomac River were developed. Of particular importance to the GWMP were new viewing facilities and a wetland interpretation center at Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve, including a boardwalk terminating in an observation platform providing views of the Potomac River and the marsh.⁹⁸ The NPS selected this project because the existing system

⁹⁵ Frederick Kunkle, "Hope Remains to Turn Tide on Closure; Despite Reprieve from Park Service – and Support from Users – Marina's Future Still Endangered," *Washington Post*, 4 April 2002, T.04.

⁹⁶ Ecology and Environment, Inc., "Clean Marina Guidebook: A Product of the Clean Marina Initiative," prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, revised August 2004, 1-2, 3-2.

⁹⁷ Eric L. Wee, "Oil Pipeline Company Agrees to Settlement; Plan Included 17 'Restoration' Projects in N. VA.," *Washington Post*, 23 October 1997, v.01.

⁹⁸ The boardwalk was rebuilt following Hurricane Isabelle with a slightly modified configuration.

of social trails did not provide adequate access to the marsh, and the vegetation and wildlife were not sufficiently protected.⁹⁹

The marsh has also benefited from the efforts of Friends of Dyke Marsh – an active partner in cleaning up and protecting the site. Since 1976, the group has helped organize exotic plant control teams and trash pick-up at the marsh, and has also planted trees and reported poaching incidents. The Friends were also instrumental in introducing a congressional resolution, passed in 2010, that recognized Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve as a unique and precious ecosystem.¹⁰⁰ Additionally, they produced a film about Dyke Marsh titled “On the Edge,” which premiered at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The bill also commended the Friends of Dyke Marsh for its longstanding commitment to promoting conservation and environmental awareness and stewardship.

NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORIES

In 1998 Congress passed the NPS Omnibus Management Act, which mandated park superintendents to conduct science-based decision making to manage and protect the ecosystem.¹⁰¹ To provide assistance, the Act funded the “Natural Resource Challenge” – an ambitious undertaking intended to aid the NPS in managing natural resources. The \$750 million appropriation was used to systematically inventory and monitor park resources to establish baseline information and provide information to park decision makers about the long-term trends in the condition of park resources.¹⁰² The NPS mission to manage and protect resources could only be achieved if parks knew exactly what resources they had and the condition the resources were in. The inventory was a ten-year undertaking during which time the GWMP researchers studied five natural resource groups: mammals, fish, reptiles, amphibians, and vascular plants.

⁹⁹ U.S. Department of the Interior, George Washington Memorial Parkway, “Record of Decision and Finding of No Significant Impact: Construction of a Raised Boardwalk and Improvements to Wildlife Viewing Areas at Dyke Marsh,” 23 June 2000.

¹⁰⁰ 111th Congress, S.Res.297, 7 May 2010.

¹⁰¹ This section was largely informed by Brent Steury, Natural Resources Program Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, and Vincent Santucci, Chief Ranger, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 14 December 2010 and 3 November 2010 respectively.

¹⁰² U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Natural Resource Program Center, “Strategic Plan for Natural Resource Inventories FY 2008 – FY 2012,” (Fort Collins, CO.: Natural Resource Program Center, National Park Service, 2009) vii-ix.

The Natural Resource Challenge also partially funded the Potomac Gorge BioBlitz, a joint venture between the NPS and TNC conducted in June 2006. The BioBlitz was hosted by Glen Echo Park and involved both the GWMP and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. Survey teams comprising 140 volunteers completed a 48-hour intensive survey to document undersurveyed organisms. The BioBlitz proved to be an important project for the park, establishing new park and Virginia state records for different taxonomic groups new to the GWMP and C&O Canal. An entire issue of *Banisteria*, a scholarly journal focused on the natural history of Virginia, was devoted to the Potomac Gorge BioBlitz.¹⁰³

The GWMP also competed annually for and secured Park Block Grant Funds used to study invertebrates. While the funding limit is currently \$20,000 annually, it varies each year and per project, with at least one inventory project funded each year. These inventories, completed in collaboration with the Smithsonian Institution and a team of entomologists, have revealed an enormous diversity of rare organisms in the park. Several new species, previously unknown to science, have been identified through these efforts, including six species in the last seven years. In addition to new species discoveries, several new park records and range extensions were also recorded.

EXOTIC SPECIES MANAGEMENT

The NPS has defined exotic species as those that are nonnative (do not naturally occur in a place without human intervention) to the ecosystem they are within. While the impact of exotic species to the environment is not always known, many displace native species, hybridize with them, rob native species of pollinators, or induce exotic insect or fungal pests. Exotic *invasive* species are nonnative species that cause (or are likely to cause) economic, environmental, or human health harm. However, many native species are also poisonous.

One of the most critical environmental threats faced by the NPS nationally is the spread of exotic invasive species that take over and degrade natural ecosystems.¹⁰⁴ The economic toll is also staggering, with one Cornell University study estimating the annual cost to Americans to be approximately \$137 billion.

¹⁰³ For further documentation on the biodiversity of the park and records new to Virginia, please see: Brent W. Steury, John Glaser, and Christopher S. Hobson, "A Survey of Macrolepidopteran Moths of Turkey Run and Great Falls National Parks, Fairfax County, Virginia," *Banisteria* 29 (2007): 17-31. See also: Brent W. Steury, Sam W. Droege, and Erick T. Oberg, "Bees (Hymenoptera: Anthophila) of a Riverside Outcrop Prairie in Fairfax County, Virginia," *Banisteria* 34 (2009): 17-24.

¹⁰⁴ National Invasive Species Council, 2001, "Meeting the Invasive Species Challenge: National Invasive Species Management Plan," 10-11.

By the end of the 1990s the NPS implemented a strategic plan for managing exotic species within the park system, outlined in their 1996 document *Preserving Our Natural Heritage*.¹⁰⁵ At that time the NPS estimated that 7 million of the NPS's 83 million acres were infested with nonnative plants. *Preserving Our Natural Heritage* focused on multiagency and multijurisdictional cooperation to institute integrated pest management techniques.

The year after *Preserving Our Natural Heritage* was published, 500 scientists and resource managers demanded the executive branch take action against the threat of exotic invasives in a letter written to Vice President Al Gore arguing “we are losing the war against invasive exotic species, and their economic impacts are soaring. We simply cannot allow this unacceptable degradation of our Nation’s public and agricultural lands to continue.”¹⁰⁶ The result was an Executive Order requiring all federal agencies to address the problems of exotic invasives, issued by President Clinton in 1999.¹⁰⁷ A new entity called the Invasive Species Council established by the order was charged with providing national leadership and oversight on exotic invasive species and ensuring all federal agency activities are coordinated and effective.¹⁰⁸ Strategies and guidance developed by the council were presented in the 2001 document, *Meeting the Invasive Species Challenge: National Invasive Species Management Plan*.

While nearly 30 percent of the flora in the Baltimore-Washington region is nonnative, recent studies of the GWMP indicate that only 25 percent of the park’s flora is nonnative, and of those relatively few would be considered invasive. This characterization includes formal components of the park, and most of the cultural landscape areas. Exceptions include the formal gardens at Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, the hybrid azaleas at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Grove, and the herbaceous plantings at Glen Echo Park, primarily because the plantings change annually.

Management of the natural ecosystem, including treatment of exotic invasive and nonnative plants is generally realized through collaboration between NPS personnel, partnerships with interest groups such as The Nature Conservancy, and volunteers. Within the NPS, pest management activities are coordinated by the National Capital Region’s Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program. The IPM program is responsible for ensuring all treatment actions are in compliance with all federal and state policies and regulations, while also providing technical assistance in pest treatment. In addition to the IPM, there is a regional Exotic Plant Management Team (EPMT), tasked with surveying, mapping, and developing treatments for

¹⁰⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, “Preserving our Natural Heritage: A Strategic Plan for Managing Invasive Nonnative Plants on National Park System Lands” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, August 1996), 2-3.

¹⁰⁶ National Invasive Species Council, “Meeting the Invasive Species Challenge,” 10.

¹⁰⁷ Executive Order 13112.

¹⁰⁸ National Invasive Species Council, “Meeting the Invasive Species Challenge,” 14.

nonnative plants. The EPMT has been instrumental at the GWMP, devoting a substantial amount of time to the management of exotic species along the parkway.

The GWMP maintains two natural resource staff members – a biotech and a biologist – who are certified pesticide applicators. With TNC focused on the Potomac Gorge, the GWMP biotech successfully organized volunteers to work on exotic plant issues in other areas of the park. For example, the GWMP recently organized a team to treat the road-edge habitat, funded by a \$100,000 National Park Service grant. While the road edge is not typically a concern from a natural resource perspective – as rare plant communities are generally not found there – the road edge is the environment park visitors see as they use the main line of the parkway.

In 2009, the GWMP treated 147 acres of exotic species and were able to expand their treatment area for the first time to some of the more problematic portions of the park such as the kudzu-infested steep slopes of the gorge. Some of the recent major accomplishments the GWMP had in exotic species management was the near-total elimination of *Phragmites australis*, an aggressive tall exotic grass, from Dyke Marsh and Dangerfield Island.

DEER CONTROL

During the study period, the white-tailed deer population, native to the region, grew substantially.¹⁰⁹ Although the GWMP has fewer deer in comparison to nearby parks, the abundance of white-tailed deer now greatly exceeds the carrying capacity of the environment, and therefore potentially threatens the park's natural resources. Some parks in the region have already established programs to cull deer, including Catoctin Mountain Park, and others, such as Rock Creek Park are currently conducting Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) to evaluate approaches to controlling deer. In the near future, the GWMP may need to join together with other area parks to complete a similar EIS.

The combination of a large deer population and exotic invasive species can have significant impacts on the natural environment at the GWMP. For example, researchers from the Smithsonian Research Center in Front Royal discovered that there is nearly no seedling regeneration at Great Falls Park due to the invasive plants and an overabundance of deer who prefer oaks and hickories. Without the seedlings to replace the large trees that will eventually die, in time, the oak/hickory forest at Great Falls may become a maple forest – a species less favored by the white-tailed deer and other species adapted to oak/hickory forests.

In the beginning of the twenty-first century, the GWMP began using “Program Distance” to count the deer in the park annually. Using laser range finders and spotlights, the deer are counted from the back of a truck at night. The data obtained from these counts are then entered

¹⁰⁹ This section is largely informed by Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

into Program Distance to produce a deer density estimate. The estimate has varied widely each year. When compared to other regional parks, however, the counts at the GWMP are among the lowest in the region.

CHAPTER III: RECREATION AND VISITOR USE

While American pastimes have shifted since the parkway's inception from activities such as pleasure driving to hiking and biking, recreational sites continue to be an integral component of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. These sites not only draw visitors to the park, but also increase awareness of the park's cultural resources, environmental concerns, and the parkway itself. The diversity of recreational opportunities within the park – trails, living history, cultural activities, etc. – enables the park to engage a wide audience to experience and learn about local and national history. During the study period, these sites have persevered, and in some cases, expanded despite financial constraints. This chapter briefly discusses the evolving recreational uses of the park and some of the obstacles they encountered.

MOUNT VERNON TRAIL

An important recreational feature of the GWMP is the 18-mile, multi-use Mount Vernon Trail (MVT), described in a 1990 federal study as “the ‘flagship’ of recreational trails throughout the country, used to develop new trail standards and as a place to test materials.”¹¹⁰ Owing to public advocacy (largely led by former Alexandria City Councilwoman Ellen Pickering) and strong political support, construction began on the trail in 1972, with the first section laid out between 14th Street Bridge and Alexandria.¹¹¹ The following year the trail was extended to Mount Vernon, and by 1975, the trail, initially gravel, was paved. As a result of a 1977 study recommending the MVT in Alexandria be removed from West Boulevard to avoid traffic incidents, a 2-mile segment north of Fort Hunt that took trail users off West Boulevard in Alexandria was created.

As part of trail improvements in the mid-1980s, a northern extension of the MVT from Memorial Bridge to Theodore Roosevelt Island was completed. Included in the project was the first pedestrian overpass to cross the GWMP, constructed for \$1.3 million to provide access to Rosslyn. Shortly thereafter, Crystal City was linked to the MVT when a closed pedestrian tunnel that ran under the tracks near National Airport was rehabilitated for use as a trail connector in 1992.

¹¹⁰ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Denver Service Center, *Paved Recreation Trails of the National Capital Region: Recommendations for Improvements and Coordination to Form a Metropolitan Multi-Use Trail System* (Denver, CO.: Denver Service Center, Eastern Team, National Park Service, 1990).

¹¹¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, “Timeline of Mount Vernon Trail Construction,” <http://www.nps.gov/gwmp/mvt-history.htm>, accessed 1 June 2010.

Not only did recreational use of the MVT soar during the study period, but increasingly, the trail was used as a commuter route by area residents seeking to improve severe traffic congestion and diminished air quality.¹¹² Due in part to these environmental concerns, bicycle use in general increased 79 percent between 1988 and 1999 according to one study. Since the MVT only extended the southern portion of the trail, users could not connect to the various county and state trails of northern Virginia. In fact, the GWMP lacked a nonmotorized transportation route to connect visitors with the northern park sites. By the mid 1990s, agencies and organizations began to recommend extending the MVT from its terminus at the Theodore Roosevelt Island to Interstate 495 at the American Legion Bridge.¹¹³

In 1995, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government (MWCOC) issued the *Bicycle Plan for the National Capital Region, Metropolitan Washington Council of Government and the National Capital Region Planning Board*. In addition to the trail extension, MWCOC also proposed a multiple-use bridge paralleling the American Legion Bridge to provide access to recreational trails on the Maryland side of the Potomac River.

Echoing the MWCOC recommendations, the Virginia Bicycling Federation (VBF) and the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) presented the NPS and GWMP an unsolicited proposal, *Extending the Mount Vernon Trail from Key Bridge to the American Legion Bridge (I-495) Options and Recommendations*, in January 1998. The proposal identified several routes that included the use of streets and public parkland within Arlington County and Fairfax County. Later that year a feasibility study was conducted by the NPS in response to the unsolicited proposal.¹¹⁴ The study identified “technically feasible” alternatives to be used as a foundation for planning and developing a potential trail extension in conjunction with Arlington and Fairfax Counties.

The MVT extension was also recommended by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) in its 2003 effort to develop bikeways throughout the region, *Northern Virginia Regional Bikeway and Trail Network Study*. At the close of the study period, an Environmental Assessment undertaken by NPS in cooperation with Fairfax and Arlington Counties was in progress to analyze the impacts of the proposed trail extension and to develop a preferred alternative.¹¹⁵ The NPS temporarily dismissed one of three alternatives after determining it would not fully satisfy the project’s need without further development of county plans, and is

¹¹² Greenhorne and O’Mara, “Draft Mount Vernon Trail Extension, Environmental Review,” prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, June 2006, 1-2.

¹¹³ *Ibid*, 4-5.

¹¹⁴ LDR International, “Mount Vernon Multi-Use Trail Extension Feasibility Study,” prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2002, 7-10.

¹¹⁵ Greenhorne and O’Mara, “Draft Mount Vernon Trail Extension,” 5.

therefore currently considering two alternative routes for the trail extension. Both alternatives would construct a new trail through Turkey Run Park and Pimmit Run Stream Valley, potentially causing adverse impacts to natural and cultural resources, including rare plant species and archeological sites.¹¹⁶

SAFETY IN THE PARK

While visitor risk management is an important priority across the NPS parks, it is particularly challenging within the GWMP due to the wide variety of activities offered at the park, as well as the range in experience level and types of park visitors.¹¹⁷ To coordinate and guide overall park strategies in risk management the NPS released *Director's Order #50C: Public Risk Management* (D.O. 50C) in 2010. The document charges individual park superintendents with identifying and mitigating risks within their jurisdictions, yet also cautions them to “balance public recreation and safety with preservation of the protected natural, historic, or cultural setting.”¹¹⁸

GWMP superintendents must consider river, road, and trail safety. Over the study period, the GWMP made great improvements in overall park safety and established several systems that have been instrumental in decreasing accidents. The park received numerous regional and District of Columbia awards for their safety initiatives, enabling the parkway to secure some funding. Agencies felt the GWMP approach to safety was transferrable and the methodologies could be applied in other parks.

Potomac River Safety

While the NPS strives to prevent visitor injuries and fatalities, officials also believe that park partners and visitors share responsibility in injury prevention. At the beginning of the study period, in 1985, the NPS, along with the District of Columbia, the states of Maryland and Virginia, and Montgomery, Fairfax, and Arlington counties, signed a regional pact aimed at

¹¹⁶ Ibid, i.

¹¹⁷ This section was largely informed by Vincent Santucci, Chief Ranger, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 3 November 2010.

¹¹⁸ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, “Director’s Order # 50C: Public Risk Management” U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2010, 2.

enhancing security on the Potomac River through better coordination and cooperation.¹¹⁹ In compliance with the agreement, the agencies developed a chain of command and communication network for rescue operations. The NPS had jurisdiction over the shoreline and surrounding land, and was also responsible for providing assistance and support to the local agencies.

A decade later regional officials, including the NPS, the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Fairfax, Montgomery, and Loudoun counties, and the U.S. Park Police, collaborated again in a series of meetings and workshops in 2005, in response to the high rate of deaths on the river during the previous year.¹²⁰ With so many agencies sharing jurisdiction over parts of the river, the group - known as the Potomac River Safety Task Force - determined that better coordination and more consistent training among the agencies was needed. In an effort to centralize and provide interagency access to data on when and where drowning or near drowning occurred, a Potomac Gorge Search and Rescue Atlas was prepared and distributed to all emergency providers. The task force identified the NPS communications center in Hagerstown, Maryland as an information clearinghouse to be used during emergency events. Officials also agreed to install twenty-five warning signs along the Potomac Gorge written in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Other safety measures resulting from the interagency workshops included preventive search and rescue patrols conducted by commissioned and noncommissioned park rangers and U.S. Park Police, the incorporation of river safety into NPS interpretive programs, and annual press events to provide widespread public safety awareness.¹²¹

With no preventable drowning from 2004 to 2009, the interagency efforts appeared to be successful in improving river safety. However, when the river claimed the lives of six drowning victims in 2009, the Task Force called for a renewed effort to raise the visiting public's awareness of the dangers associated with the river, and focused efforts on the most dangerous section of the Potomac Gorge. In an effort to reach a wide audience, the NPS National Capital Region Communications Office produced a four-minute video presentation in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese with the key message "if you enter the river, you will die."¹²²

¹¹⁹ United Press International, "Potomac River Safety Pact Signed by Local Authorities," *Washington Post*, 24 October, 1985.

¹²⁰ David Snyder, "Groups Campaign to Improve Safety on the Potomac River," *Washington Post*, 9 June 2005.

¹²¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "National Park Service Press Release: National Park Service with other Partner Organizations Renew Effort to Eliminate Potomac Gorge Accidental Drowning and Increase Hiking Trail Safety Awareness," http://www.nps.gov/uspp/522PrGh20_rsKue.htm, accessed 19 October 2010.

¹²² National Parks Traveler, "If You Enter the River, You Will Die," <http://www.nationalparkstraveler.com/2010/05/if-you-enter-river-you-will-die5897>, accessed 19 October 2010.

Mount Vernon Trail Safety

By the mid 1980s the MVT served a high volume of users – approximately 500,000 annually – and improvements were needed.¹²³ The heavy traffic along the trail caused hazardous conditions, as hikers, bikers, and runners competed for space, causing the NPS to increase bike patrol from one to five rangers in 1984. According to an emergency nurse at Mount Vernon Hospital, between five and ten cyclists were treated on a typical summer weekend.¹²⁴

After an MVT accident on the 4th of July in 2006, park officials decided to bring specialists and interest groups together to provide safer recreational opportunities on the trail. Modeled on the task force developed for river safety the previous year, the GWMP organized the MVT Safety Task Force in 2006. This multi-agency group evaluated the demographics, cultural groups, diversity of users, design features, accident statistics, and people’s behavior to determine how accidents occur, and how to reduce them.

The park, in conjunction with its recreational partners, developed creative solutions to safety issues through four distinct Safety Task Force Committees that focused on: recreational use and management, education and media, design and maintenance, and partnerships. These committees had a notable impact on the trail community by organizing safety awareness events, bicycle bell giveaways, trail map giveaways, and a volunteer trail patrol to assist with information, injuries, and bike repairs, and also through improvement proposals such as a sign plan, anti-skid surfaces for bridges, and additional trail connections.

Additional efforts made by the GWMP to address heavy traffic and hazardous conditions on the trail included straightening and/or leveling dangerous curves, posting 15-mile-per-hour signs, and painting yellow lines on the road to demarcate lanes. According to a park ranger responsible for the trail, center striping proved to be the most effective way of increasing safety and awareness along the path.¹²⁵

Roadway Safety

Park planners conceived and constructed the GWMP according to early twentieth-century parkway principles that emphasized recreational use rather than transportation. A brochure once given to visitors when they entered the parkway highlighted this mission by advising, “Park roads are for leisurely driving only. If you are in a hurry, you might do well to take another route

¹²³ Marc Lacey, “Ranger Mounts A 2-Wheeler; Patrol Keeps VA Trail Safe for Bicycle Riders,” *Washington Post*, 14 August 1987, C.01.

¹²⁴ Virginia Mansfield, “Bike Paths to be Linked; Connector Planned for Heavily Used Trail Raises Safety Issues,” *Washington Post*, 2 July 1987, V.01.

¹²⁵ Stephen Turnham, “Crowding Turns N. Va. Bike Trails Into Beaten Paths,” *Washington Post*, 7 November 1991, V.02.

now, and come back when you have more time.”¹²⁶ Yet, the roadway’s primary purpose – to link George Washington’s home to Washington D.C. – has been increasingly adapted to meet the region’s expanding transportation demands. As the NPS tried to maintain and improve the roadway to support the large volume of commuters, safety issues often conflicted with the original mission and historic setting of the parkway. Preserving parkway features such as narrow lanes, grassy medians, and discreet signs while improving safety was one of the greatest challenges confronted by the GWMP during the study period. Safety on the GWMP has been informed primarily by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the NPS.

Since 1926, the NPS has partnered with FHWA in the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of park roads. The interagency agreement signed by the NPS and what was then known as the Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) established that “park designers set aesthetic standards of workmanship, location, and design of roads while bureau engineers provided the latest technology.”¹²⁷ According to the former director of the NPS, Conrad Wirth, the BPR was “very sympathetic to the policies of the [NPS].”¹²⁸

A new interagency agreement signed between the NPS and FHWA in 1983 charged the NPS with developing park road and parkway design, construction, maintenance, and safety standards, while FHWA was responsible for planning assistance, research, engineering studies, traffic engineering, project development and contract administration.¹²⁹ This new interagency agreement stipulated that all aesthetic, environmental, and cultural resource protection concerns identified by the NPS must be addressed by the FHWA.

Concurrent with the interagency agreement, NPS organized a task force to review the *Park Road Standards*, first published in 1967 to establish “an ethic for road design.”¹³⁰ The NPS issued its revised *Park Road Standards* handbook in 1984 to establish technical guidelines for park roadways as they related to allowed speeds and traffic volumes, while also addressing associated environmental concerns. The standards, as revised, were intended to be flexible to allow individual parks to make determinations on their particular needs and circumstances. The document also clarified the distinct role of the parkway in stating that the “purpose of park roads

¹²⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Park Road Standards*, 7-8.

¹²⁷ Matthew Virta, “Preserving a Parkway While Protecting the Public: A Journey Along a Road Not Yet Taken?” Prepared for the presentation at the 2010 Preserving the Historic Road conference, September 9-12, 2010, in Washington D.C., 6. The BPR was transferred to the Department of Transportation and assigned to the Federal Highway Administration in 1966.

¹²⁸ National Park Service, History E-Library, *Historic Roads in the National Park System*, http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/roads/shs5.htm, accessed 10 October 2010.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

remains in sharp contrast to that of the federal and state highway systems. Park Roads are not intended to provide fast and convenient transportation...” The NPS *Management Policies 2006* as well as *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* provide additional guidance on park road design and preservation.

The distinct mission of the federal parkways was further recognized by the Federal Lands Highways Program, established by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (P.L. 97-424).¹³¹ This program made Highway Trust Fund money available for repairing and constructing federal agency roads. The Federal Lands Highways Program recognized that “because of the resources preserved in federal land management areas, and the type of tourist use in such areas, the roads in certain instances do not have to be constructed to normal highway standards.”

Design and construction of the Parkway has also been guided, in part, by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). AASHTO’s 1954 roadway engineering guidance manual, “A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets” (known as the Green Book) continues to be influential. While it is regarded to be the standard in road design, the GWMP’s Cultural Resources Program Manager cautions that the manual “wasn’t intended to present a set of rigid standards...but to provide guidelines based on current research to which the roadway planner could aspire if the situation allowed and circumstances warranted such implementation.”¹³² The Green Book is supplemented by AASHTO’s 2002 “Roadside Design Guide,” which examines fixed roadside objects. Over the study period, the combination of FHWA, AASHTO, and NPS influences have shaped the evolution of the Parkway.

The first rehabilitation of the GWMP occurred on the roadway’s MVMH section between 1984 and 1986. The project, undertaken by the NPS and the Federal Highway Administration, cost \$20 million – and repaired or completely replaced the aging concrete road surface. The new concrete was mixed and finished to mimic the original surface. Other improvements to the parkway included reconfiguring access points for better safety.

Upgrades over the years have also replaced original guard rails, bus shelters, and light fixtures with features to conform to modern safety codes – resulting in a less rustic and more streamlined park environment.¹³³ In the mid 1990s, the segment of the parkway between Theodore

¹³¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Park Road Standards*, i. The Highway Trust Fund was established by the 1956 Highway Revenue Act to finance the United States Interstate Highway System. Today it comprises three accounts: highways, mass transit, and leaking underground storage tanks.

¹³² Virta, “Preserving a Parkway While Protecting the Public,” 7.

¹³³ Historic American Engineering Record, “George Washington Memorial Parkway,” 177-192.

Roosevelt Memorial Bridge and Spout Run Parkway was widened to carry heavier loads of traffic, and longer merge lanes were constructed. Spout Run Parkway was also improved at this time. The construction removed a large section of wooded median, as well as a number of trees on the banks above the parkway. Retaining walls and guard walls along this section of the parkway were constructed of concrete with stone facing, which the NPS and FHWA then considered appropriate to parkway design principles. The new Spout Run guardrails were constructed of wood backed with steel, reminiscent of the rustic logs that flanked the original parkway.

In 1996 and 1997, a pair of fatal automobile accidents along the North Section of the GWMP drew intense media and public scrutiny, causing some to question the safety of the parkway.¹³⁴ The 1996 accident occurred after two cars traveling at speeds in excess of 70-miles per hour, hit a stone curb and crashed into the oncoming traffic. The median at the point of the accident was 6-8 feet wide and lacked the protective measures found on interstate highways when the median is narrower than 30 feet. Subsequent to the accidents, the GWMP superintendent met on Capitol Hill with northern Virginia representatives Frank R. Wolf and James P. Moran, U.S. Park Police, and the Federal Highway Administration. Although the NPS initially resisted modifying the parkway and defended their policy of limiting alterations, they agreed to construct safety barriers in parkway medians less than 15 feet wide.

In 1998, a feasibility study conducted by the Virginia Department of Transportation examined additional safety issues and traffic concerns affecting the GWMP, the 14th Street Bridge corridor, and Interstate 395. These investigations, in addition to other NPS and federal studies, determined that the GWMP's highest accident rate occurred at the northbound ramp that exits from Interstate 395 onto the parkway. The resulting Memorandum of Agreement, executed in December 2000, between the Federal Highway Administration, District of Columbia Department of Public Works, Virginia Department of Transportation, and the NPS, initiated the environmental planning and design of the safety and operational improvements of the Boundary Channel Bridge (more commonly known as Humpback Bridge) and its interchange with the GWMP.¹³⁵

Humpback Bridge, completed in 1932, did not meet modern traffic demands and exceeded its original design expectations with more than 75,000 vehicles traversing the structure daily. To improve safety for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists, the NPS proposed to demolish and replace the bridge with one that would incorporate original architectural features and materials in its design. The ongoing bridge replacement project extends from the 14th Street Bridge to the Navy-Marine Memorial on the west shore of the Potomac River, crossing the jurisdictional line between D.C. and Virginia, and is being coordinated between the NPS, the Commission of Fine

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Federal Highway Administration, "Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division, projects," <http://www.epl.fhwa.dot.gov/files/projects/traffic/gwmp-1a97/Background.doc>, accessed 1 November 2010.

Arts (CFA), the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), and the D.C. and Virginia State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs).

The replacement bridge, under construction since January 2008, will utilize the stone facing retained from the demolished Humpback Bridge, on the Potomac River and, primarily, the Columbia Marina sides to retain the historic appearance of the bridge. Since the new bridge is slightly larger, having five vehicular lanes rather than the original four as well as a bike lane, the additional new stone needed will be matched and blended with the original. The replacement bridge will also retain the same location as the original Humpback Bridge.

The new bridge will carry the Mount Vernon Trail over the Boundary Channel along the Potomac River side to connect with the west side of the GWMP and provide access to the Columbia Island Marina. The new trail will be slightly wider, increasing from approximately 6 feet to 10 feet, and the addition of a barrier to separate trail users from vehicular traffic will enhance safety. Two new sections of trail placed in a north and south tunnel passing beneath the replacement bridge will accommodate pedestrians and trail users. Additional improvements include the new merge lane from the 14th Street Bridge and lower grades to improve sight distance.¹³⁶

As part of the project, the existing seven-space parking lot for the Navy-Marine Memorial will be removed. While this will restrict vehicular access to the memorial, the elimination of pedestrian crossing at this site will improve safety along the roadway. Access to the memorial will be from Columbia Island Marina parking lot and the tunnel under the parkway.

At the end of the study period, a rehabilitation proposal for the north section of the parkway from Spout Run to Interstate 495 sparked intense discussion of balancing roadway safety design with preserving the historic setting and resources of the GWMP. This project – a cooperation between the NPS and FHWA – first approved and entered into the NPS Federal Lands Highway Program in 1999, was intended to address high volumes of traffic, resulting safety issues, and drainage problems.¹³⁷

By 2005, conflicts between the NPS preservation mandates and the FHWA safety directives led to a “Choosing-By-Advantages” workshop held by the NPS. The goal of the workshop’s interdisciplinary team was to “effectively balance resource protection, safety, and the visitor experience,” and the team’s recommended options informed the planning process and,

¹³⁶ Robert Thomson, “GW Parkway Work Starts Monday,” *Washington Post*, 3 January 2008.

¹³⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service George Washington Memorial Parkway, “GWMP North Section Rehabilitation, Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect,” (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2008), 1.

eventually, the 2008 Environmental Assessment.¹³⁸ The primary disagreement between the agencies centered on the replacement of the existing historic stone guide walls, which, according to AASHTO guidelines, were roadside hazards that do not meet modern crash-worthy standards. However, their proposed replacement violated preservation standards and would have a negative impact on the historic integrity of the parkway, including impeding views and changing the character of the walls. Because of these potential impacts, the NPS requested a design exception from the FHWA to retain the existing guide walls in July of 2005, and argued that there was a lack of supportive accident data to justify the project. The request, however, was denied and the Environmental Assessment's preferred alternative proposed to replace and lengthen the masonry guide walls with concrete core stone veneer walls with flared ends and with steel-backed timber guardrails.¹³⁹

Additional upgrades and safety improvements proposed by the Environmental Assessment included: constructing acceleration and deceleration lanes, constructing new concrete curb, replacing and adding drainage inlets, roadway and ramps would be milled and overlaid, shoulder rehabilitation, and the Route 123 interchange would be reconfigured. Numerous public comments in response to the Environmental Assessment from private citizens and preservation organizations and agencies, including the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR, the State Historic Preservation Office), objected to the project. The VDHR called the demolition of the guide walls "a staggering blow to the integrity of the parkway...Not only will their demolition and replacement result in the loss of an overwhelming amount of historic material, it will also result in the loss of the very views and vistas that the Parkway was designed to celebrate."¹⁴⁰ At the end of the study period, the NPS and FHWA were actively collecting additional accident data for the GWMP to better inform the safety analysis of the rehabilitation of the north section of the Parkway. This is being done with the intention of identifying areas of highest concern on which to focus safety improvements based on the data, rather than contend the overall the parkway does not meet modern highway safety standards.

¹³⁸ Ibid, 5.

¹³⁹ Virta, "Preserving a Parkway While Protecting the Public: A Journey Along a Road Not Yet Taken?" 12-13.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, 18.

CHAPTER IV: PARK OPERATIONS AND PLANNING

PARK PLANNING

Since its inception, the GWMP has operated without a comprehensive General Management Plan and is currently guided by existing laws and NPS-wide policies and guidelines. In the absence of a General Management Plan, GWMP administrators have struggled to present a more unified vision of the park's twenty-seven discrete sites that serve a diverse range of purposes. To that end, the GWMP presented the *First Annual Centennial Strategy for George Washington Memorial Parkway* in August 2007 in anticipation of the agency's Centennial and the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway.¹⁴¹ Although brief, the report detailed six centennial action strategies that focused on enhancing visitors' experience, educational and research opportunities, safety, and cohort partnerships. Site-specific strategies included pursuing interpretation initiatives at Fort Hunt Park and completing a General Management Plan for Great Falls Park.

The *Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* for Great Falls Park, released in June 2005, presented a vision for managing the 800-acre park for the succeeding ten to fifteen years.¹⁴² With nearly 500,000 visitors a year, the plan's primary concern was the protection of park resources while providing quality visitor experience. The draft plan provided guidance on issues of stewardship, education, recreation, and administration, including: managing and preserving natural and cultural resources; determining the appropriate levels and locations for visitor interpretation and education in the park; determining the appropriate levels and locations of recreational activities such as picnicking, kayaking, horseback riding, biking, climbing, fishing, and boating in the park; managing trail use and connection to trails outside of the park; managing traffic and associated elements; and determining the most advantageous locations to support administration and operation functions with respect to minimizing resource disturbance.

As indicated in the *Centennial Strategy*, creating partnerships was a critical component of park planning for the GWMP during the study period. More broadly, the NPS found that engaging partners was an effective way of extending and efficiently using limited park resources. As a result, legislation establishing some parks has mandated partnerships to accomplish their

¹⁴¹ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "First Annual Centennial Strategy for George Washington Memorial Parkway," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, August 2007).

¹⁴² U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *George Washington Memorial Parkway, Great Falls Park, Virginia: Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, June 2005), 1.1-1.4.

missions.¹⁴³ NPS' 2001 Management Policies directed parks to pursue cooperative agreements for the management of natural and cultural resources and for interpretation. For example, Glen Echo Park, as previously discussed, is an area of cultural and natural features saved from development by its inclusion in the National Park System and its operation through cooperative agreements with Montgomery County and the State of Maryland. The Claude Moore Colonial Farm is also an important partnership model, whose success is due in large part to the unique collaboration between the GWMP and Friends of Turkey Run Farm, Inc., discussed later in this chapter.

Cooperative agreements with organizations such as the Potomac Conservancy and the Nature Conservancy (discussed in Chapter II) have enabled the GWMP to work toward and achieve some of its environmental goals. Another important partnership endeavor in environmental stewardship, "Bridging the Watershed," is a cooperative effort undertaken by the Alice Ferguson Foundation, the NPS, and area schools that began in 1998. With a grant from the National Park Foundation, Bridging the Watershed was developed as a model education program to be integrated into the science curricula of area high schools throughout the National Capital Region. The program consists of classroom preparation followed by observation, data gathering, and problem solving. The students receive guidance in the classroom and in the field from their science teachers and from park rangers. At the GWMP, study sites are located at Mine Run at Great Falls, Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve, Theodore Roosevelt Island, and Turkey Run.¹⁴⁴ Students can participate in four curriculum models including the assessment of invasive species in the park, the effect of pollution on invertebrates in the watershed, the impact of litter in the parks, and an assessment of water quality. Expanding GWMP's efforts and engaging diverse audiences for the Bridging the Watershed project was highlighted as a Centennial action strategy.

In addition to park-wide planning the GWMP engaged in planning for several individual sites including Jones Point Park, Mount Vernon Circle, and Claude Moore Colonial Farm. These planning efforts resulted in improved access, amenities, and recreation opportunities for park visitors.

Jones Point Park Improvements

When it was completed in 1961, the six-lane, elevated Woodrow Wilson Bridge (WWB) traversed a 10.32-acre section of the Jones Point Park (JPP), located in the southeastern corner of the City of Alexandria.¹⁴⁵ The portion of JPP on which the bridge was constructed was

¹⁴³ Robinson & Associates, Inc., "National Capital Region, Administrative History," 46.

¹⁴⁴ Alice Ferguson Foundation, Bridging the Watershed, "George Washington Memorial Parkway," <http://www.bridgingthewatershed.org/btw/gwmp.shtml>, accessed on 4 June 2010.

¹⁴⁵ For information on the establishment of Jones Point Park and the associated Woodrow Wilson Bridge, see Mackintosh, "George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History," 150-153.

administered by the Federal Highway Administration while the remaining land was administered by GWMP.

Although the bridge provided the first link between the Virginia and Maryland suburbs, it was not intended or anticipated to be a major commuter road. Yet by 1969, eight years after its completion, the bridge carried more than its design capacity of 75,000 vehicles and by 1988, it transported double.¹⁴⁶ Despite ongoing bridge improvements since the 1980s, engineers determined in 1992 that the bridge was six years from the end of its useful life.¹⁴⁷

Extensive studies of the bridge project ensued, including a Final Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation in 1997 and a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation in 2000. The construction of the new twin, six-lane replacement bascule bridges began in 2000, guided by the 1997 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and the Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision (ROD). The project also required the Federal Highway Administration to convey the 10.32-acre parcel of the JPP traversed by the bridge to the NPS to facilitate construction and maintenance of the bridge. The transfer of this land, which joined the three previously discontinuous sections of the JPP, brought the entire park under the jurisdiction of the NPS and increased its total size to approximately 65 acres.

The MOA and ROD outlined proposed improvements to the JPP as part of the mitigation measures for impacts to the park resulting from the WWB replacement project. The City of Alexandria challenged the ROD in 1997 in a civil action suit against the U.S. Department of Transportation. A settlement agreement determined that the redevelopment of the JPP would be in accord with specific stated design programs. The proposed improvements, focused on recreational opportunities, were presented in the 2001 *Jones Point Park Environmental Assessment: Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project Mitigation Measures*. The Environmental Assessment was also intended to update the 1984 *Development Concept Plan for Jones Point Park* as well as guide future developments at the park.

Although the Environmental Assessment was signed by the NPS on 10 September 2001, the events of the terrorist attacks the following day prevented it from being finalized. As a result of consequential new security concerns, particularly relating to parking and vehicular access to the JPP, the Transportation Security Administration completed the 2002 *Vulnerability Reduction Design Considerations for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Replacement Project*. This report was used by the NPS, the Federal Highway Administration, and Virginia Department of

¹⁴⁶ The Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project, "History of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge," www.wilsonbridge.com, accessed 10 November 2009.

¹⁴⁷ Alice Reid and Stephen C. Fehr, "The Rush Hour of Decision on Replacing Wilson Bridge; Congress Weighs Funding as Time Runs Short for Span," *Washington Post*, 26 April 1992, A.01.

Transportation to develop security plans that were then integrated with the park program and design.

A new Environmental Assessment, developed with extensive coordination between the NPS, the City of Alexandria, and the Federal Highway Administration, was released in 2006. Mitigation measures proposed focused on historic resources, natural resource/environmental concerns, and improving recreation opportunities within the park.¹⁴⁸ The two historic resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places located within the project include the Jones Point Lighthouse and the D.C South Cornerstone.¹⁴⁹ Rehabilitation was proposed for the exterior façade of the lighthouse and missing exterior features were replaced. The lighthouse's interior exposed structural system was repaired and a fire suppression system was installed.¹⁵⁰ The rehabilitation will reverse and correct previous restoration attempts that did not comply with historic preservation standards. The D.C. Cornerstone – in poor condition prior to the WWB replacement project – will receive be stabilized through rehabilitative treatments. The south sea wall containing the lighthouse yard and cornerstone, is proposed to be restored to its historic appearance and repaired and stabilized to protect against invasive water action.

Additional mitigation measures include a new interpretive plan for the JPP, prepared by the Interpretive Plan Group for Cultural Resources comprised of representatives of the NPS, the City of Alexandria, historians, archeologists, architectural historians, and landscape architects working in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration. The JPP Interpretive Plan identified thirteen locations for proposed interpretive design elements, to highlight the site's Federal, military, industrial, environmental, and Native American history. Of particular importance were new interpretive efforts planned for the remains of the World War I Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation (VSC) site, which included one of the shipways and the finishing pier.

Environmental concerns were also addressed through mitigation, including on-site wetland mitigation and tree loss replacement with native species. Efforts were also focused on maintaining the existing tree canopy and protecting the existing forested area. Drainage throughout the park was improved by inserting a new culvert and upgrading the existing ones.

¹⁴⁸ U.S. Department of Transportation, "Environmental Assessment: Jones Point Park, Woodrow Wilson Bridge Replacement Project," prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, August 2006, 18-20.

¹⁴⁹ On 15 April 1791, the D.C. Cornerstone was the first of forty boundary markers laid for Andrew Ellicott and Benjamin Banneker's survey of the boundaries of the District of Columbia. Together the stones delineate the original boundaries of the city. The Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) constructed a concrete vault around the cornerstone in 1912.

¹⁵⁰ Lighthouse rehabilitation funds from the WWB project's mitigation budget were limited to the exterior renovation work. The interior renovation was funded by a \$640,000 congressional add-on from Senator James Moran.

As a result of mitigation efforts, recreational opportunities at the JPP were expanded and/or enhanced. A new promenade/boardwalk was created through the rehabilitation of a fishing pier and two additional fishing piers were constructed. The preferred alternative included a tot-lot and an 80 x 40 yard multi-use field north of the parking area, and a 110 x 60 yard multi-use field south of the WWB. Park visitors also benefited from a new vehicular access road to parking areas and a new guardhouse. Users of the Mount Vernon trail can access the JPP at the new end of Royal Street.

Mount Vernon Circle Parking and Improvements

Since 1932, Mount Vernon Memorial Highway – the first portion of the GWMP – has connected George Washington’s Mount Vernon Estate and Gardens (“Mount Vernon”) with the south end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, transporting an increasing number of vehicles to the historic home. The GWMP, which begins south of the traffic circle at Mount Vernon (“the circle”), is flanked by parking lots that support Mount Vernon and are owned and maintained by the NPS.¹⁵¹ With a capacity of 424 vehicles between the three parking lots, limited parking space resulted in an ongoing struggle to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians.¹⁵² In recent years, the NPS has allowed overflow parking on the circle, which can hold an additional 150 vehicles. As congested roads and parking deficiencies became increasingly hazardous for visitors and damaging to the GWMP cultural landscape, especially the turf and elm trees of the circle, an Environmental Assessment was undertaken to address the conditions and provide improvements.

A preferred parking alternative was agreed to on 16 June 2004, in a meeting between the Federal Highway Administration, NPS, Mount Vernon, and the Stakeholders Participation Panel.¹⁵³ To accommodate existing and future parking demands, the west parking lot was expanded and an overflow parking lot was proposed for construction behind the wall on Mount Vernon property west of Route 235. The alternative also proposed a new multi-use trail beginning at the south end of the existing Mount Vernon Trail (MVT), which terminates in the East Parking Lot. The MVT, originally created to provide recreation, was, over time, informally incorporated into the pedestrian circulation at the circle and beyond. The new extension of the trail, intended to

¹⁵¹ Mount Vernon is owned and managed by the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association (MVLVA).

¹⁵² Audrey F. Calhoun, “Finding of No Significant Impact for Mount Vernon Circle Parking and Trail Improvements/Environmental Assessment, George Washington Memorial Parkway,” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, December 2004), 7.

¹⁵³ The Stakeholders Participation Panel comprised eleven citizens appointed by Fairfax County Supervisor Gerry Hyland (including himself) to represent the interests of the surrounding Mount Vernon community.

continue this circulation system, employs a highly textured surface that forces cyclists to walk their bikes (rather than ride) over this segment. While improving pedestrian flow, the new trail segment helps to provide continuity for the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, as it approaches the historic site from the south.

Claude Moore Colonial Farm at Turkey Run (Claude Moore Farm)

The Claude Moore Farm, originally Turkey Run Farm, was established during the “living farm movement,” advocated for by the NPS in the 1960s and 70s.¹⁵⁴ On such historical farms, according to a 1972 definition, “men farm as they once did during some specific time in the past. The farms have tools and equipment like those once used, and they raise the same types of livestock and plants used during the specified era. The operations are carried out in the presence of visitors.”¹⁵⁵ NPS Director George Hartzog backed the idea, seeing such demonstrations as a way to balance the overrepresentation in the National Park System of, as he said, “birthplaces and battlefields” and offering opportunities for visitors to participate in education recreation.

Claude Moore Farm has been run by the Friends of Turkey Run Farm, Inc. (the Friends) since 1981. The current thirty-year, no-fee lease agreement between the Friends and the GWMP is in effect through September 2011. Under the Friends’ stewardship, the farm has benefited from construction improvements and increased public awareness through educational programming.¹⁵⁶ In an effort to ensure the long-term financial viability of the farm, the Friends raised funds to construct a new rental picnic facility in 1984, known as the Pavilions of Turkey Run. The Pavilions and the additional rental revenue it generated enabled them to augment their \$500,000 endowment while offering additional programs to the community.

Other significant improvements to the farm during the study period include the replacement of the badly deteriorated eighteenth-century farm house and the maintenance/administrative facilities in 1990. This project was made possible by a \$225,000 construction grant from Congress.

In 1998 and 1999, the GWMP superintendent met with the farm’s staff to consider a new site for the existing “Environmental Living Program,” which offered students the opportunity to

¹⁵⁴ For information on the establishment of Claude Moore Colonial Farm, see Mackintosh, “George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History,” 189-190.

¹⁵⁵ Robinson & Associates, “National Park Service, National Capital Region Administrative History,” 119.

¹⁵⁶ Education Programs are discussed in Chapter IV under “Interpretation and Education.”

experience living and working on an eighteenth-century farm since 1977.¹⁵⁷ A location was identified near the Administration and Maintenance Area that offered improved orientation for participants and attractive terrain. To create a small, localized space for a 20' x 30' open-air structure and a 16' x 16' storage shed, minimal tree and understory clearance was required. By 2000 an Environmental Assessment was in progress and a short, 8'-wide entry road was installed connecting the site with the existing fire road; the new site was opened shortly thereafter.

Following the 2001 terrorist attacks, the possible security threats to federal sites, including the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center for Federal Highway Administration (TFHRC) and the George Bush Center for Intelligence (CIA), adjacent to the Claude Moore Farm, were reevaluated. At the time of the investigation, Colonial Farm Road – the eastern boundary of the farm – served as an entrance road from Georgetown Pike to the TFHRC and the CIA facilities, thus requiring employees and visitors to the federal installations to traverse GWMP property. Conversely, GWMP and farm staffs traversed an access road on the TFHRC property to reach the Administration and Maintenance area of the farm. Because the farm and NPS did not have the resources to adequately identify each visitor and delivery truck, the access road was determined to be a significant vulnerability. Subsequent to a 2002 Environmental Assessment that examined alternatives to address the security and boundary issues, a new separate Administrative Access Road for the farm was installed from Colonial Farm Road, requiring a land exchange between GWMP and TFHRC. TFHRC's management also chose to construct a guard booth at the Colonial Farm Road Gate on land administered by the Federal Highway Administration.

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WITH PARK NEIGHBORS

As a long, linear park that borders numerous jurisdictions, GWMP officials frequently collaborate with neighboring local governments and communities in planning for areas adjacent to the park and issues concerning land-use agreements. Examples over the study period include issues related to the Alexandria Waterfront, the Arlington County Boathouse, Alexander's Point Bridge, Arlington County Long Bridge Park, the Arlington County Potomac Interceptor Sewer Line Replacement, and the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC WASA) Odor Abatement Facilities.

Alexandria Waterfront

Land ownership and boundary issues concerning approximately two miles of land along the Alexandria waterfront were contested by the Federal government, the Commonwealth of

¹⁵⁷ Ann Brazinski, Natural Resource Specialist, George Washington Memorial Parkway, to Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, electronic mail, 24 February 2000.

Virginia, and private landowners in the 1970s as the city of Alexandria initiated planning efforts for the waterfront. As early as the seventeenth century, disputes occurred between Maryland and Virginia concerning the ownership and jurisdiction of property along the western shore of the Potomac River, including what is now known as the Alexandria Waterfront.¹⁵⁸ The cession of lands to the Federal government in 1791 for the creation of the District of Columbia and the subsequent receding of some of that land in 1846 caused additional confusion. A 1931 Supreme Court decision resolved this land ownership issue by identifying the high-water mark – established when Maryland ceded land to the Federal government – as the legal boundary between the District of Columbia and Virginia. The jurisdictional boundary was modified by a 1945 Act of Congress (59 Stat. 552), which established the Potomac River’s western pierhead line as the boundary.

The boundary issue resurfaced when the city began building the waterfront out into the Potomac River floor, which is essentially owned by the Federal government.¹⁵⁹ In 1973, the United States filed a suit against the City of Alexandria and private property owners claiming ownership of all the land east of the high-water mark along the waterfront. The litigation resulted in a settlement agreement for each separately owned parcel. Subsequent agreements set development heights and use limitations on how the city of Alexandria would develop the waterfront.

Since the 1973 litigation, two planning guidelines have been created for the development of the waterfront – one by the city and another by the NPS. A joint-use plan developed by the city and the NPS in 1981 established that the Federal government would relinquish fee ownership of the waterfront property and would instead act as stewards, using access and scenic easements to protect the public interest in how the waterfront is developed.¹⁶⁰ Often the GWMP, as the closest federal entity, serves as the arbiter between the city and the public to resolve conflicting visions for the waterfront development, balancing the city’s objective to maximize commercial revenue with residents’ desire for a more verdant setting.¹⁶¹ Currently the city is in the master planning process to outline the final development of the Alexandria Waterfront.

¹⁵⁸ Office of Land Use Coordination, National Park Service, National Capital Region, “Alexandria Waterfront: Land Use Agreements” (U.S. Department of the Interior: Washington, D.C., 1992), 1-2.

¹⁵⁹ Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

¹⁶⁰ Office of Land Use Coordination, “Alexandria Waterfront: Land Use Agreements,” 2.

¹⁶¹ Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

Arlington County Boathouse

In response to soaring public demand, Arlington County pursued the creation of a boathouse along the Potomac River, preferably within Arlington County, to accommodate the county's three high school rowing programs and an option for public facilities. Once built, the boathouse would be operated by a nonprofit foundation dedicated to the school rowing program. Contrary to Arlington officials' erroneous belief that the county had a deeded right to Potomac River access, the NPS, as the sole property owner of the Potomac River shoreline in Arlington County, is the only entity able to provide this access. The continued pressure on the GWMP to provide access to the river compelled park officials to consider the dual missions of the park – to support recreation while preserving natural and cultural resources.

In the late 1980s two NPS reports identified numerous locations for a boathouse; however, none of these locations were along the Virginia side of the shoreline.¹⁶² In 1993, Arlington County appointed a Water-Based Recreational Facility Task Force to study the feasibility of a water-based recreational facility located on NPS lands, in Virginia. The resulting study, *Feasibility Study for a Boathouse Facility Located between Theodore Roosevelt Island and Francis Scott Key Memorial Bridge*, released in 1995, concluded that the county's preferred site was adjacent to the entrance to Theodore Roosevelt Island, known as the lower Rosslyn site. The NPS opposed this location, stating in a letter to Virginia Congressman, James Moran that the site conflicted with the park's legislated mandate to preserve the scenic and historic values of the parkway and the Potomac, as well as being intrusive to the natural setting of the island – a presidential memorial.

Several alternative sites developed by the NPS in 2000 were presented at a public scoping meeting.¹⁶³ Of the sites explored, a location known as the Upper Rosslyn site was the only alternative not located on federal lands. With both entities in favor of this site, the county began negotiations with the private property owners to purchase the parcel. While the county was in land negotiations, Congressman Moran, a strong supporter of river access for the county, secured a \$100,000 Congressional appropriation for the NPS to study the feasibility of establishing a boathouse along the Arlington shoreline. The *Facility and Site Analysis for a Boathouse on the Potomac River in Arlington County and Vicinity* was released by the NPS in 2001. The study did not provide sufficient information to either persuade the NPS to change its position on the location of a boathouse at Theodore Roosevelt Island, or support environmental documentation

¹⁶² The Louis Berger Group, Inc., "Arlington County Boathouse, Environmental Assessment, *Internal Draft*," prepared for the National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, June 2006, 6-7.

¹⁶³ Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, "Briefing Statement: Arlington County Boathouse," 12 January 2010.

required to select a preferred alternative. To address these issues, Congress provided \$587,000 in 2003 to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

After five years of unsuccessful negotiation to obtain the private property integral to the Upper Rosslyn site, Arlington County's staff presented to the NPS a new conceptual boathouse proposal for the Lower Rosslyn Site in August 2009. Congressman Moran requested \$250,000 in 2010 to study the new proposal for the Lower Rosslyn site. Under consideration is a removable floating dock for non-motorized boats to be located in proximity to the Theodore Roosevelt Island parking lot. Although the NPS explained several constraints that would need to be addressed before moving forward, the Park is committed to exploring the location.¹⁶⁴

Alexanders Point Bridge

As part of the 14th Street Bridge corridor improvements and parkway safety improvements, a new entryway to Columbia Island (also known as Lady Bird Johnson Park) was planned to extend from the Virginia shoreline near the Pentagon reservation, across Boundary Channel.¹⁶⁵ Alexanders Point Bridge would provide access to Columbia Island for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles. The construction of the bridge would also enable the removal of the current interchange between the south bound parkway and Interstate 395 at Columbia Island – a component of the corridor improvements intended to address traffic congestion. Because this closure would severely limit access and circulation options for Columbia Island visitors such as the marina users, the GWMP has refused to close the ramp until the Alexanders Point Bridge is constructed and operating.

With the proposed access changes, the public will be reliant upon access from Boundary Channel Drive, which is a part of the Pentagon roadway network. Since the terrorist attacks prompted the Pentagon to move their perimeter farther out, GWMP officials are concerned that the Pentagon will withdraw their approval of the bridge. Similar issues have recently arisen in relation to the GWMP's Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove (LBJ Grove), whose ceremonial entrance is located on Pentagon-controlled land. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) drafted when LBJ Grove was constructed essentially permitted the GWMP to have perpetual use of the parking lot while the Pentagon would maintain ownership of the property. Although the MOA does not have a suspension date, the Pentagon has periodically ignored the agreement and attempted to prevent park visitors from parking by erecting signs and closing the parking lot for construction projects. In 2009 the GWMP met with Pentagon officials to discuss the MOA and determined that it likely is not legally sufficient. Consequently, the GWMP is currently writing a

¹⁶⁴ Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.* The name of the bridge was chosen to memorialize Alexanders Island, an island in the boundary channel that no longer exists due to utility work and dredging.

cooperative agreement that will outline each group's responsibilities, rights, and authorities in the management of the parking lot.

At the close of the study period Alexanders Point Bridge was still in the preliminary design stage and funding was not yet identified for its construction. The GWMP estimated that funding will not be available until some time after 2020.

Long Bridge Park

Long Bridge Park, formerly known as the North Tract Project, is a joint effort between the GWMP and Arlington County to create a seamless park integrating neighborhood, county, and state parks that would provide high quality indoor and outdoor recreation.¹⁶⁶ The 46-acre site is adjacent to Roaches Run Waterfowl Sanctuary at the northern end of Crystal City in Arlington. Planning was initiated in 2001 in response to the county's desire to have access to the parkway, the Potomac River, and the Mount Vernon Trail. At the time there was poor access to and throughout the Gravelly Point and Roaches Run areas as well as insufficient interpretation of the natural and cultural resources of Gravelly Point and the nearby CSX railroad. Safety issues related to pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the parkway and the railroad were also a primary concern. To address this, the GWMP is considering pedestrian parkway crossing at either the 14th Street Bridge or the CSX railroad bridge as part of the 14th Street Bridge Corridor Plan.

Within the past decade the GWMP received a \$250,000 congressional add-on to jointly plan Long Bridge Park as it affects Gravelly Point and the associated portion of the MVT. Both the county and the Park want to connect in an appropriate manner to their respective sites and are working together to ensure that each of their facilities complement the other in providing a better overall experience for the public. The agencies would also like to explore opportunities to observe and interpret wildlife, possibly through the construction of a viewing platform.

Property needed by Arlington County to construct Long Bridge Park was constrained by indentures between the U.S. government (administered by the NPS) and the Richmond Fredrick Railway Company (RF&P). In October 2009, the Washington Support Officer (WASO) Solicitor met with the County's attorney and counsel to discuss the indentured property in question. The solicitor determined an overlook behind the Roaches Run Waterfowl Sanctuary would be allowable as a "way" under the indenture's "roads and ways" clause.

A Cooperative Agreement was approved by Arlington County in September 2005 to allow the transfer of \$98,000 from the NPS to the county to develop an Environmental Assessment that would develop alternatives to improve access, circulation, visitor facilities, and interpretation. At the close of the study period the Environmental Assessment was ongoing.

¹⁶⁶ This section was largely informed by Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

Utility Projects

As a long and linear parkway, a number of public utilities – gas, sewer, water, electric, etc. – run beneath the roadway. Most of the utilities are managed by a permit, right-of-way, or easement, constituting a large operation within the management of the GWMP. Two major projects related to these utility lines occurred during the study period – the first involved the Dulles Interceptor Sewer Line and the associated D.C. Water and Sanitation Authority (WASA) Odor Abatement Facilities constructed along the Clara Barton Parkway and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal (C&O Canal). The Dulles Interceptor Sewer Line, laid during the building of the Washington Dulles International Airport, originates at the airport, crosses through Great Falls Park to the Maryland side of the Potomac River, and continues along the C&O Canal and the Clara Barton Parkway, until it terminates at the Blue Plains Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Community outrage over the ineffectiveness of small venting structures along the line of sewer pipe meant to control odors resulted in lawsuits brought against D.C. WASA. At the end of the study period the District proposed, and is attempting to develop, odor abatement facilities designed as small structures that draw out and filter air through carbon filters. Two locations for the facilities are located along the GWMP, one near Interstate 495 and the American Legion Bridge, and the other near the Little Falls Pumping Station. An Environmental Assessment completed in 2002 was developed to explore impact, cost benefits, and public benefits. D.C. WASA intends to mitigate the effects of the project through architecture, landscaping, and minimizing the footprint of the facilities. A concurrence to a “No Adverse Effect” finding was provided by the Maryland State Historic Preservation Office in 2003 based on mitigating design elements.

The second major project is underway along the Arlington County Potomac Interceptor Sewer Line, an early twentieth century line, which runs along the Arlington Heights neighborhood in Virginia. As the line nears the end of its functional life, Arlington County is pursuing a replacement project that has the potential to significantly impact the GWMP. While the sewer line traverses much of the GWMP, including Arlington Ridge Park and Arlington National Cemetery, the replacement project will particularly affect Memorial Avenue where there is a cultural landscape and various monuments and memorials that must be considered. During the rehabilitation of Memorial Avenue in the early twenty-first century, a sleeve was inserted below the new roadway in anticipation of the new sewer line, to prevent the GWMP from disrupting Memorial Avenue a second time. Preparation for the sewer line project affected several oak trees and a section of holly hedge that will be replaced, as stipulated in the Environmental Assessment Finding of No Significant Impact and by the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 memorandum of Agreement signed by the NPS, Virginia State Historic Preservation Office, Arlington County, and the Arlington National Cemetery in 2005.

U.S. PARK POLICE

As of March 2008 the Park Police comprised 592 sworn officers, ninety civilian employees, and thirty private security guards who patrolled NPS sites in the Nation's capitol as well as the Statue of Liberty and the Golden Gate Bridge. With the number of Park Police at a twenty-year low, officers struggled during the first decade of the twenty-first century to provide protection to national landmarks while also serving as an urban police department.¹⁶⁷ Staffing shortages within the agency have affected the officers' ability to effectively patrol the GWMP roadway, where it is responsible for public safety and law enforcement.

A 2000 counterterrorism study commissioned by the NPS, *National Park Service: Strategic Counter-Terrorism Plan*, concluded that the agency was understaffed and poorly funded. The report, submitted to Congress in October 2000, recommended the number of officers be increased to 820. The Park Police received media attention when, in 2003, Park Police Chief, Teresa C. Chambers, disclosed a \$12 million budget shortfall and also told reporters that the force should be increased to 1400. Chambers was subsequently placed on administrative leave.¹⁶⁸ According to the NPS, Chambers violated rules prohibiting public comment regarding ongoing budget discussions and another barring lobbying.

Subsequent to the 2000 counterterrorism findings and the heightened security awareness following the 2001 terrorist attacks, a Fraternal Order of Police survey was conducted in 2007. The resulting report, based on more than 100 interviews of law enforcement staff and forty surveillance visits conducted by the Department of the Interior's inspector general's team, determined that the agency's staffing deficiencies, poor infrastructure, and inadequate equipment resulted in "deficient security at national icons and monuments and an inability to effectively conduct police operations."¹⁶⁹ The report's accounts of some officers' inattention to duty drew significant media attention.

Through the end of the study period, the NPS responded to the reports by allocating more than \$4 million to the Park Police for new equipment and by pledging to increase the number of officers to 630.

¹⁶⁷ Mary Beth Sheridan, "Park Police Face Senior Staffing Shortages," *Washington Post*, 25 February 2008, A.1.

¹⁶⁸ Stephen Barr, "We Must Have a Rule Against That Here Somewhere," *Washington Post*, 9 December 2003, B.2.

¹⁶⁹ Michael E. Ruane, "Park Police Rebuked for Weak Security; Widespread Flaws Put U.S. Landmarks at Risk. Report Says," *Washington Post*, 4 February 2008, A.1.

EMERGENCY PLANNING AND RESPONSE

The attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001, which came one year after the NPS issued its *Strategic Counter-Terrorism Plan*, underscored the critical need for security throughout the park networks. Immediately after the Pentagon attack, when some anticipated other targets to be hit in the capital, senior leadership in the Department of the Interior, including Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton and NPS Director Fran Mainella, increased security at some major monuments and memorials.¹⁷⁰ As a precaution, the GWMP was temporarily closed, along with other NPS sites such as the Washington Monument and the Ellipse. The park police became involved at the Pentagon, coordinating security, directing traffic, searching for survivors, and transporting the injured to area hospitals.

On the day of the attacks, the GWMP headquarters was designated by Chief Ranger Einar Olsen as a staging area for the National Capital Region's law enforcement rangers. Officers from regional parks found their way to the parkway to help. Among the first duties of this group was to provide safe escort for about fifty adults and children from the Pentagon day care center, who had evacuated the building after the attack and were taken to the Lyndon B. Johnson Memorial Grove on Columbia Island. The rangers organized the transportation for the group to a Virginia Department of Transportation facility nearby, where they provided security until parents could retrieve their children.

It is important to note that September 11th fundamentally changed how the GWMP operates.¹⁷¹ In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks the NPS and Park Police reevaluated and enhanced security measures within the park. In the post-9/11 environment the task of protecting the park's and its neighbor's resources could not be done in isolation, therefore the GWMP collaborated with other regional jurisdictions in emergency planning. The GWMP also had a major role in emergency strategy discussions with the Department of Homeland Security because the parkway is the primary evacuation route going west from the D.C. metro area in the event of a disaster. As a central component in emergency planning for the region, GWMP staff are trained and prepared to deal with responding to a crisis and keeping the parkway open.

Around 2005, GWMP officials recognized the importance of implementing an Incident Command System (ICS) to function as a multi-agency communication center. In the event of an emergency, representatives for each agency would gather at the ICS in Anacostia where a coordinated response would be managed. The Unified Command staff is required to have a certain level of ICS training.

¹⁷⁰ Janet A. McDonnell, *The National Park Service: Responding to the September 11 Terrorist Attacks* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Center for Cultural Resources, 2004), 2-8.

¹⁷¹ This section was largely informed by Vincent Santucci, Chief Ranger, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 3 November 2010.

Shortly after it was established, the ICS was first tested during the annual Fourth of July festivities – one of the largest events hosted by the NPS. Attendance in the park is typically high for the holiday, as many avoid the large crowds on the National Mall, and instead take advantage of the GWMP's exceptional viewing areas for the fireworks. Yet while the Mall is a contained area and therefore more easily protected, the GWMP poses security challenges because of the multitude of access points on the Virginia side that make it more difficult to secure. The ICS was successful in terms of preparation, planning, and lowering accident rates.

Hurricane Isabelle

In 2003, Hurricane Isabelle brought increased water levels in the Potomac River as well as tidal surges causing major flooding that covered both the north and south bound lanes of the parkway.¹⁷² Damage was suffered throughout the park, including the complete destruction of a boardwalk at Dyke Creek Marsh, damage to the Jones Point Lighthouse, and the loss of many trees. GWMP's approach to the emergency response was successful and the initial actions and decision making contributed to saving park resources. Immediately after the event, a park-wide staff effort convened on the park to document all of the damage and resulting issues from the hurricane, with assistance from park police in helicopters above. GWMP staff generated a significant record of existing conditions that was submitted for federal assistance. In the long term, the GWMP recouped many of the losses – repairs were completed throughout the park, the boardwalk was rebuilt at Dyke Marsh, and trees were replanted.

INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION

One of the central missions of the GWMP is to promote opportunities for the public to learn about and experience park resources. Yet, at the end of the twentieth century the GWMP was one of the least understood parks within the park system despite being one of the top ten most visited. Without a General Management Plan, the individual sites did not convey a cohesive message and the park suffered from an identity crisis. In the second half of the study period, efforts were concentrated on developing a comprehensive approach to interpretation to help the public to understand the complex resources of the park. GWMP officials recognized that interpretative methods needed to focus on connecting broad themes and concepts with the park's resources in ways that were relevant to today's visitors to create a more meaningful experience.¹⁷³ Planning for the park's first Long-Range Interpretive Plan (LRIP), which began

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Department of Interpretive Planning, Harpers Ferry Center and the George Washington Memorial Parkway, *George Washington Memorial Parkway, Long-Range Interpretive Plan* (Harpers Ferry, West Virginia: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, November 2005), 4, 14-17.

in 1988 and spanned eighteen years, was a significant challenge because the park resources were not clearly defined. In examining the existing conditions at the park units, planners determined that “some GWMP units seem almost autonomous” and noted the absence of a central visitor’s center to distribute parkway-wide information.

When the LRIP was published in 2005 it not only helped to create an identity for the GWMP but also created a marketing concept that could be used to engage and inform the public. For example, in conjunction with the publication of the LRIP, the NPS created a series of logos for individual sites used to promote various park events and to visually represent the site’s role within the park. The GWMP also enhanced staff training and increased park ranger interactions with the public.

The LRIP was intended to serve as an overall framework over a ten-year period to guide program planning, media planning, and design and production phases that endeavor to demonstrate the interrelatedness of the park’s sites. Parkway-wide recommendations focus on outreach and marketing, developing and updating NPS publications, wayside exhibits, regional partnerships, and implementing a mobile visitor center; recommendations were also made for individual sites. The LRIP encouraged the use of new technologies, such as creating an online journal (blogging) site, developing an online curriculum-based distance learning program, and setting up a virtual parkway visitor center with theme-related exhibits. The emphasis on new technology was also expressed in the aforementioned *Centennial Strategy*, which advocated creating bilingual (English/Spanish) pod casts focusing on park sites and themes.

Education has long been a component of the park’s mission and a mode of interpretation. For several decades, the Claude Moore Colonial Farm has offered programs focused on eighteenth-century farm life including the Farms Skills Program and Environmental Living Program. More recent additions to the educational opportunities at the farm include the Horticulture Education Program and the Apprentice Program. In 1992, the NPS began integrating their interpretive programs into the education curriculums of local school districts through the creation of the Parks as Classrooms Program. The program was designed to promote parks as learning laboratories and to provide children and educators with more interactive opportunities to experience and understand the National Park System. Several GWMP sites partnered with local school districts to implement the Parks as Classrooms Program, including Theodore Roosevelt Island, Dyke Marsh, Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, and the Clara Barton House.

The study period also witnessed an evolution in the themes explored for interpretation, as well as increased attention to historical accuracy. This is evident at Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, where the NPS, in conjunction with upgrades such as climate control, and fire detection and suppression, is rehabilitating the North and South Slave Quarters back to their 1861 appearance after discovering that previous reconstructions were inaccurate. Interpretation of African American history throughout the NPS entered a new phase during the latter half of the study period as historic sites endeavored to more truthfully depict slave life and racial hierarchies. At Arlington House, the slave quarters – which had long been used as a storage shed – were examined in a 2002 Historic Structure Report and a 2004 Historic American Building

Survey. Visitors can learn about the lives of the people who lived and worked at the mansion through an exhibit devoted to slavery housed in the slave quarters. *Presenting Race and Slavery at Historic Sites, Arlington House, Robert E. Lee National Memorial*, a 2004 cooperative research project between the NPS and the Center for the Study of Public Culture and Public History of The George Washington University, examined how race and slavery were interpreted, represented, and displayed at Arlington House at the beginning of the twenty-first century.¹⁷⁴ While the report concluded that the comprehensive history of the site was not adequately conveyed, the researchers posited that the ongoing work on the slave quarters would provide new opportunities to present a broader historical narrative at the mansion. The LRIP also identified African American themes to be developed and interpreted at Theodore Roosevelt Island (the site of U.S. Colored Troops camps during the Civil War) and at Glen Echo Park (the site of civil rights activities and racial unrest in the 1950s and 60s).

Recent scholarship also expanded and enhanced interpretation at the Clara Barton National Historic Site. New research on Dr. Julian B. Hubbell's role at Glen Echo, discussed in Chapter I, enhanced the visitors experience at the Clara Barton Site, and the house benefited from the ongoing revision of the 1983 historic furnishings plan. The Historic Structures Report completed for the house in 2004 recommended updating the National Register of Historic Places nomination to expand the understanding and to more accurately interpret the relationship between the house, its occupants, and the creation of the American Red Cross.

As discussed in Chapter I, Fort Hunt Park is actively pursuing new interpretive concepts for Fort Hunt Park. At the close of the study period in 2010, the park initiated a project to develop a Site Development Plan (SDP) and Environmental Assessment for Fort Hunt Park to evaluate ways to enhance visitor experience.

CHANGING FACE OF MAINTENANCE

The issue of how grounds maintenance should be achieved – with federal employees or through contracting – dramatically transformed both the overall structure and execution of maintenance operations at the park during the study period.¹⁷⁵ Beginning in the early 1990s the Chief of Grounds, Adam Badowski, started exploring new approaches to more effectively manage the grounds program. At that time, the GWMP hired a substantial workforce (often twenty-five to thirty laborers) for summer maintenance. This practice proved to be inefficient as summer

¹⁷⁴ Kevin Strait, "Presenting Race and Slavery at Historic Sites, Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee National Memorial," prepared for the National Park Service and the Center for the Study of Public Culture and Public History of George Washington University, 2004, 17-19.

¹⁷⁵ This section is largely informed by Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in a charrette held at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters, 29 November 2010.

employees generally began work in June – yet grounds work was typically needed as early as March. The lag in hiring left the permanent workforce scurrying to complete the work. Badowski sought to address this problem by selectively implementing contracts while keeping a permanent workforce for the “monument core” from Sprout Run to the City of Alexandria line. This approach allowed the GWMP to apply its resources towards maintaining the high standards the monument core, arguably the most visible section of the park, so that the mowing cycle was no more than ten days and grass was less than 2 or 3 inches in height. The permanent workforce not only cared for the monument core, but also assisted in tasks such as snow removal and other seasonal jobs. Sites outside the core, such as the Clara Barton Parkway, Glen Echo, and Great Falls were contracted out.

The park retained a balance of contract employees and permanent employees until 2003 when the Bush Administration began exploring contracting within the National Capital Region maintenance program under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76, which established a federal policy for the competition of commercial activities. Although the Administration was specifically looking at the National Mall and Memorial Parks, and the White House, the GWMP was swept into the process. The Director of the NPS, Fran Mainella, worked with the OMB to minimize the impact of the contracting initiative resulting in a grounds maintenance package that included GWMP (including the monument core), National Mall and Memorial Parks, the White House, Rock Creek Park, and East Potomac Park.

While GWMP officials regard the contracting initiative as successful, it dramatically changed the overall composition of the maintenance organization and slowly reduced the number of permanent maintenance workers. According to Superintendent Dottie Marshall, Circular A-76 failed to realize that employees of land management agencies are rarely dedicated to one function, but rather are tasked with multiple responsibilities throughout the year. For example, due to the loss of grounds maintenance employees, the GWMP does not have enough replacement drivers for a snow event lasting more than 48 hours and therefore would not be able to clear the snow.

Another result of the attrition is the loss of in-house skilled workers as well the loss of trail crew – at the close of the study period the GWMP had only one person assigned to trail work. The battle for dwindling maintenance resources not only affects overall park operations but individual sites sometimes do not receive adequate care. Site employees perform day-to-day duties, but lack trained, skilled workers such as electricians and masons, and must rely on the limited general maintenance staff to carry out these tasks.

The contracting initiative has also changed what some perceive to be the public “face” of the parkway. Often grounds maintenance workers were ambassadors to the public, as they were typically the first – or only – point of contact for park visitors. This interaction with the public is lost with contract employees, who are often unable to give directions.

Despite this attrition in grounds staff, there is a decided cost benefit to contracting out maintenance operations. GWMP officials note a significant downturn in injuries and related

continuation of pay under workers compensation. Contracting has also allowed the GWMP to eliminate grounds maintenance equipment and their upkeep, a considerable savings for the park.

Over the study period, GWMP maintenance operations were also affected by the full implementation of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) regulations. While these laws were enacted in the 1960s, the NPS generally used a categorical exclusion for routine maintenance to satisfy compliance regulations. Starting in the early 1990s the cultural resource and natural resource GWMP staff began questioning maintenance practices and argued for compliance to be conducted on long-standing maintenance practices. One of the more visible park practices in question was vista clearing. Natural resource managers essentially prohibited maintenance staff from clearing vistas until Environmental Assessments were executed, whereas cultural resource managers argued vista management was part of maintaining the cultural landscape, even if it had not been performed for awhile and larger trees would be affected. Because the maintenance staff felt Environmental Assessments were not their job responsibility, vistas were no longer cleared. As a result, the park either lost or is in danger of losing many of the vistas on the parkway, especially along northern sections. This problem has been exacerbated by the attrition of a workforce skilled in clearing those vistas.

By the end of the study period, GWMP officials adapted to the changing nature of how parks are able to carry out maintenance in relation to A-76 and contracting efforts. Although work is completed more efficiently, the park must justify its maintenance staff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahrens, Frank. "Last Tango for Spanish Ballroom? Park Service Gets Earful on Options for Glen Echo Park Facilities." *Washington Post*, 4 February 1998.
- Alice Ferguson Foundation, Bridging the Watershed. "George Washington Memorial Parkway." <http://www.bridgingthewatershed.org/btw/gwmp.shtml>. Accessed on 4 June 2010.
- Barr, Stephen. "We Must Have a Rule Against That Here Somewhere." *Washington Post*, 9 December 2003.
- Calhoun, Audrey F. "Finding of No Significant Impact for Mount Vernon Circle Parking and Trail Improvements/Environmental Assessment, George Washington Memorial Parkway." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, December 2004.
- CEHP, Inc. "The Civil War Defenses of Washington: Historic Resource Study." Prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, no date. Found at National Park Service, History E-Library. http://www.nps.gov/history/online_books/civilwar/hrst.htm. Accessed 11 November 2010.
- The Committee of 100 on the Federal City. "A Call to Action on the Fort Circle Parks Draft Management Plan." 15 August 2003. Found at <http://www.committeeof100.net/pdf/pub/C100FortCirclePlan.pdf>. Accessed 11 November 2010.
- Cultural Resources, Inc. "An Historic Resource Study of Fort Hunt Park George Washington Memorial Parkway, Mount Vernon, Virginia." Prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, August 2000.
- Department of Interpretive Planning, Harpers Ferry Center and the George Washington Memorial Parkway. *George Washington Memorial Parkway, Long-Range Interpretive Plan*. Harpers Ferry, West Virginia: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, November 2005.
- Ecology and Environment, Inc. "Clean Marina Guidebook: A Product of the Clean Marina Initiative." Prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, revised August 2004.
- Federal Highway Administration. "Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division, Projects." <http://www.epl.fhwa.dot.gov/files/projects/traffic/gwmp-1a97/Background.doc>. Accessed 1 November 2010.
- Forgey, Benjamin. "4 Finalists for Memorial." *Washington Post*, 13 June 1989.

--- "A Memorial Passes Muster." *Washington Post*, 18 October 1997.

Garrow & Associates, Inc. "Cultural Investigations at Section 29 at Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, Arlington County, Virginia." Baltimore, MD.: Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District Planning Division, 1998.

Glen Echo Park Partnership for Arts and Culture. "Glen Echo Park – Then and Now." Glen Echo Park Partnership for Arts and Culture website, www.glenecho.park.org. Accessed 3 May 2010.

Greenhorne and O'Mara. "Draft Mount Vernon Trail Extension, Environmental Review." Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, June 2006.

Greenhorne & O'Mara. "Environmental Assessment: U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial Rehabilitation." Prepared for the Denver Service Center, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June 2004.

Historic American Engineering Record. "George Washington Memorial Parkway." HAER No. VA-69, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1998.

Homer, Susan G. National Register of Historic Places – Registration Form. "Arlington Ridge Park." 18 December 2009.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. *Healing a River: The Potomac, 1940-1990*. Rockville, Maryland: Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, 1990.

John Milner Associates, Inc., *Treatment Plan and Design Services for the United States Marine Corps War Memorial, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Arlington, Virginia*. Prepared for the National Park Service, May 2001.

Krakov, Jere L. National Park Service, Denver Service Center. National Register of Historic Places – Registration Form. "George Washington Memorial Parkway." 6 February 2010

Kunkle, Frederick. "Hope Remains to Turn Tide on Closure; Despite Reprieve from Park Service – and Support from Users – Marina's Future Still Endangered." *Washington Post*, 4 April 2002.

--- "New Site Urged for Air Force Memorial; Plot Near Pentagon Would End Friction with the Marines." *Washington Post*, 29 November 2001.

--- "Rot Advanced on Historic Home; National Park Service Wants \$2 Million for Repairs at Arlington House." *Washington Post*, 16 May 2001.

- Lacey, Marc. "Ranger Mounts A 2-Wheeler; Patrol Keeps VA Trail Safe for Bicycle Riders." *Washington Post*, 14 August 1987.
- Laird, Matthew R. "By the River Potomac, An Historic Resource Study of Fort Hunt Park, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Mount Vernon, Virginia." Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2000.
- Larson, Doyle. "Plenty of Room to Honor the Air Force." *Washington Post*, 21 September 1997.
- LDR International. "Mount Vernon Multi-Use Trail Extension Feasibility Study." Prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2002.
- The Louis Berger Group, Inc. "Archeological Assessment for Dyke Marsh Preserve George Washington Memorial Parkway, Fairfax County Virginia." Prepared for the National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, January 2009.
- "Environmental Assessment: Rehabilitation of Arlington House, Outbuildings, and Grounds." Prepared for the National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, 2006.
- Mackintosh, Barry. "George Washington Memorial Parkway: Administrative History." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1996.
- Mansfield, Virginia. "Bike Paths to be Linked; Connector Planned for Heavily Used Trail Raises Safety Issues." *Washington Post*, 2 July 1987.
- McDonnell, Janet A. *The National Park Service: Responding to the September 11 Terrorist Attacks*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Center for Cultural Resources, 2004.
- National Invasive Species Council, 2001. "Meeting the Invasive Species Challenge: National Invasive Species Management Plan."
- National Park Service, History E-Library. "Historic Listing of National Park Service Officials, Superintendents of the National Park System Areas, George Washington Memorial Parkway." http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/tolson/histlist7g.htm. Accessed on 6 January 2010.
- . *Historic Roads in the National Park System*. http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/roads/shs5.htm. Accessed 10 October 2010.
- National Park Service, "Cultural Landscapes Program." <http://www.cr.nps.gov/phscl/cl.htm>. Accessed 23 March 2011.

- National Parks Traveler. "If You Enter the River, You Will Die."
<http://www.nationalparkstraveler.com/2010/05/if-you-enter-river-you-will-die5897>.
Accessed 19 October 2010.
- The Nature Conservancy. "Nature Conservancy Applauds Support for Potomac Gorge
Environmental Restoration Project. www.nature.org. Accessed 14 April 2010.
- Nguyen, Lan. "US-Dutch Friendship Resonates in Arlington; WWII Liberation Marked at
Restored Carillon." *Washington Post*, 6 May 1995.
- O'Beirne, Kate. "Memorial Daze – Controversy Over Plans for Air Force Memorial Near
Washington D.C." *National Review*, 28 June 1999.
- Oehrlein & Associates Architects. "Clara Barton National Historic Site, Historic Structure
Report." Vol. II. Washington D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service,
2004.
- Office of Land Use Coordination, National Park Service, National Capital Region. "Alexandria
Waterfront: Land Use Agreements." U.S. Department of the Interior: Washington, D.C.,
1992.
- O'Hanlon, Ann. "Expansion of Arlington Cemetery Assailed." *Washington Post*, 11 September
2001.
- The Potomac Conservancy. "Learn About What We Do." www.potomac.org/site/what-we-do/.
Accessed 13 May 2010.
- Reid, Alice and Stephen C. Fehr. "The Rush Hour of Decision on Replacing Wilson Bridge;
Congress Weighs Funding as Time Runs Short for Span." *Washington Post*, 26 April
1992.
- "Restoration of the Netherlands Carillon." *Bulletin of the Guild of Carillonneurs in North
America* vol. XLV, 1996. Located in the vertical files at George Washington Memorial
Parkway Headquarters.
- Robinson & Associates, Inc. "National Park Service, National Capital Region Administrative
History, 1952-2005." Prepared for the National Park Service, National Capital Region, 6
June 2008.
- Ruane, Michael E. "Park Police Rebuked for Weak Security; Widespread Flaws Put U.S.
Landmarks at Risk, Report Says." *Washington Post*, 4 February 2008.
- Sheridan, Mary Beth. "Park Police Face Senior Staffing Shortages." *Washington Post*, 25
February 2008.

- Shoemaker, Lloyd R. *The Escape Factory: The Story of Mis-X*. New York: St. Martins Mass Market Paper, 1992.
- “Site Conservation Planning for the Potomac River Gorge: A Partnership Between Two National Parks and the Nature Conservancy.” *Crossing Boundaries in Park Management: Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Research Management in Parks and on Public Lands*. Edited by David Harmon. Hancock, Michigan, The George Wright Society, 2001.
- Snyder, David. “Groups Campaign to Improve Safety on the Potomac River.” *Washington Post*, 9 June 2005.
- Stockman, Gilbert. “The Iwo Jima Invasion.” *Washington Post*, 14 Sept 1997.
- Steury, Brent W., John Glaser, and Christopher S. Hobson. “A Survey of Macrolepidopteran Moths of Turkey Run and Great Falls National Parks, Fairfax County, Virginia.” *Banisteria* 29 (2007): 17-31.
- Steury, Brent W., Sam W. Droege, and Erick T. Oberg. “Bees (Hymenoptera: Anthophila) of a Riverside Outcrop Prairie in Fairfax County, Virginia.” *Banisteria* 34 (2009): 17-24.
- Thomson, Robert. “GW Parkway Work Starts Monday.” *Washington Post*, 3 January 2008.
- Tousignant, Marylou. “In Honor of Their Own; All-Female Team Oversees Building of Women’s Military Memorial.” *Washington Post*, 26 September 1997.
- Turnham, Stephen. “Crowding Turns N. Va. Bike Trails Into Beaten Paths.” *Washington Post*, 7 November 1991.
- United Press International. “Potomac River Safety Pact Signed by Local Authorities.” *Washington Post*, 24 October, 1985.
- “Time for Recognition; Memorial Honoring Women who Served Their Country is Almost Ready to Open.” *Washington Post*, 12 October 1997.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. “Center for Urban Ecology: Introduction.” <http://www.nps.gov/cue/cueintro.html>. Accessed 3 January 2011.
- “Cultural Landscape Inventory: Fort Hunt, George Washington Memorial Parkway.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001, revised 2004.
- “Cultural Landscape Inventory: Memorial Avenue Corridor, George Washington Memorial Parkway.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001.
- “Cultural Landscape Report: Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial.” Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2001.

- “Director’s Order # 50C: Public Risk Management.” U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2010.
 - “Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Air Force Memorial, Arlington, VA.” Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, January 1999.
 - . “Final Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, Glen Echo Park, Montgomery County, Maryland.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, February 2001.
 - “First Annual Centennial Strategy for George Washington Memorial Parkway.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, August 2007.
 - “National Park Service Press Release: National Park Service with other Partner Organizations Renew Effort to Eliminate Potomac Gorge Accidental Drowning and Increase Hiking Trail Safety Awareness.” http://www.nps.gov/uspp/522PrGh20_rsKue.htm. Accessed 19 October 2010.
 - *The Nation’s River: A Report on the Potomac*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1968.
 - “Potomac Gorge Survey, 60-day Notice of Intention to Request Clearance of Collection of Information.” Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 13 March 2008.
 - “Preserving our Natural Heritage: A Strategic Plan for Managing Invasive Nonnative Plants on National Park System Lands.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, August 1996.
 - “Timeline of Mount Vernon Trail Construction.” <http://www.nps.gov/gwmp/mvt-history.htm>. Accessed 1 June 2010.
 - “Vegetation of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, Central Section: Alexandria to Arlington Memorial Bridge, Cultural Landscape Report.” Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2009.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Denver Service Center. *Paved Recreation Trails of the National Capital Region: Recommendations for Improvements and Coordination to Form a Metropolitan Multi-Use Trail System*. Denver, CO: Denver Service Center, Eastern Team, National Park Service, 1990.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway. “Great Falls Park, Virginia: Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, June 2005.

- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service George Washington Memorial Parkway. "GWMP North Section Rehabilitation, Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2008.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Natural Resource Program Center. "Strategic Plan for Natural Resource Inventories FY 2008 – FY 2012." Fort Collins, CO: Natural Resource Program Center, National Park Service, 2009.
- U.S. Department of Transportation. "Environmental Assessment: Jones Point Park, Woodrow Wilson Bridge Replacement Project." Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, August 2006.
- Wee, Eric, L. "Oil Pipeline Company Agrees to Settlement; Plan Included 17 'Restoration' Projects in N. VA." *Washington Post*, 23 October 1997.
- The Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project. "History of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge." www.wilsonbridge.com. Accessed 10 November 2009.

Unpublished Works

- George Washington Memorial Parkway. "Documentation of Restroom Removal, Fort Hunt Park, Virginia." February 1992. Document located at the George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters.
- The Louis Berger Group, Inc. "Arlington County Boathouse, Environmental Assessment, *Internal Draft*." Prepared for the National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, June 2006.
- Strait, Kevin. "Presenting Race and Slavery at Historic Sites, Arlington House, Robert E. Lee National Memorial." Prepared for the National Park Service and the Center for the Study of Public Culture and Public History of George Washington University, 2004.
- Virta, Matthew. "Preserving a Parkway While Protecting the Public: A Journey Along a Road Not Yet Taken." Prepared for presentation at the 2010 Preserving the Historic Road Conference, September 9-12,

Correspondence

- Acting Associate Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service to Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, letter, 17 December 1987.

Bice, D.F., Major General, Director Marine Corps Staff, U.S. Marine Corps, to John G. Parsons, Associate for Lands, Resources, and Planning, National Capital Region, National Parks Service, letter, 22 March 1999.

Brazinski, Ann, George Washington Memorial Parkway, to Dottie Marshall, Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, electronic mail, 24 February 2000.

Brown, J. Carter, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Robert G. Stanton, Field Director, National Park Service, National Capital Area, letter, 26 February 1996.

Brown, J. Carter, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Robert Stanton, Regional Director, National Park Service, National Capital Region, letter, 5 December 1994.

Catlin, Martha, Historic Preservation Specialist, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, to Audrey F Calhoun, superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, National Park Service, letter, 6 August 1996.

Calhoun, Audrey F., Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway, to Chief of Maintenance, George Washington Memorial Parkway, memorandum, 13 November 1994.

Klima, D., Director, Office of Planning and Review, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, to Terry Carlstrom, Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, 10 December 1999.

Stanton, Robert, National Park Service, National Capital Region, to J. Carter Brown, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, letter, 6 February 1995.

Virta, Matthew, Cultural Resource Manager, George Washington Memorial Parkway, in conversation with the author, 28 January and 15 June 2010

Charrettes Held at the George Washington Memorial Headquarters

3 November 2010. Attendees: Vincent Santucci, Chief Ranger; Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager; David Lasserma, Park Ranger, Cultural History; Alicia Caporaso, Intern, Cultural Resources; Janel Crist Kausner, Historian, Robinson & Associates, Inc.

29 November 2011. Attendees: Dottie Marshall. Superintendent; Jon G. James, Deputy Superintendent; Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager; Alicia Caporaso, Intern, Cultural Resources; Janel Crist Kausner, Historian, Robinson & Associates, Inc.

14 December 2011. Attendees: Brent Steury, Natural Resources Program Manager; Jon G. James. Deputy Superintendent; Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager; Alicia Caporaso, Intern, Cultural Resources; Janel Crist Kausner, Historian, Robinson & Associates, Inc..

**Appendix A:
Chronology of Superintendents
George Washington Memorial Parkway¹⁷⁶**

Floyd B. Taylor, Supt. ¹⁷⁷	5/23/1965	6/27/1971
David A. Richie, Supt.	7/25/1971	1/19/1974
Charles A. Veitl, Supt. ¹⁷⁸	6/23/1974	12/31/1977
Don H. Castleberry, Supt. ¹⁷⁹	5/21/1978	12/13/1980
John F. Byrne, Supt.	2/22/1980	1/13/1990
William R. Shields, Acting Supt.	1/14/1990	2/10/1990
Kitty L. Roberts, Supt.	2/11/1990	1993
Audrey Calhoun, Supt.	9/12/1994	10/31/2005
Jon G. James, Acting Supt.	1/8/2006	3/4/2006
Mel Poole, Acting Supt. ¹⁸⁰	3/5/2006	6/8/2006
David Vela, Supt.	5/28/2006	1/6/2008
Jon G. James, Acting Supt.	5/25/2008	09/23/2008
Dottie Marshall, Supt. ¹⁸¹	1/4/2009	Present

¹⁷⁶ Partially excerpted from National Park Service, History E-Library, “Historic Listing of National Park Service Officials, Superintendents of the National Park System Areas, George Washington Memorial Parkway,” http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/tolson/histlist7g.htm, accessed on 6 January 2010.

¹⁷⁷ Includes Administration of Custis-Lee Mansion, VA; Great Falls Park, VA; Great Falls Park, MD; Theodore Roosevelt Island, D.C.; C & O Canal (Georgetown D.C. to Seneca MD); Jones Point Park, VA; Netherlands Carillon, VA; U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, VA; Arlington Memorial Bridge, D.C.-VA; and Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial. Include Prince William Forest Park, VA, from 5/23/1965 to 7/01/1968.

¹⁷⁸ Includes Clara Barton National Historic Site.

¹⁷⁹ Includes Lady Bird Johnson Park & Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove, D.C.; Glen Echo Park, MD; and Clara Barton National Historic Site, MD.

¹⁸⁰ The current GWMP Deputy Superintendent Jon G. James temporarily and informally served as Superintendent until Mel Poole, then Superintendent of Catoctin Mountain Park, was formally designated Acting Superintendent.

¹⁸¹ Marshall was appointed Superintendent in June 2008, but was asked to remain serving as Associate Regional Director for Administration at the National Park Service National Capital Region through the end of 2008.

**Appendix B:
Legislation and Agreements
George Washington Memorial Parkway**

25 August 1916	The Organic Act to establish the National Park Service	P.L. 64-235	39 Stat. 235
16 February 1924	A Joint Resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to the Navy and marine services, to be known as Navy and Marine Memorial Dedicated to Americans Lost at Sea	P.L. 68-05	43 Stat. 14
26 June 1934	A Joint Resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expense of erecting the completed Navy and Marine Memorial Monument	P.L. 73-48	48 Stat. 1243
6 June 1925	Park, Parkway and Playground System of the National Capital, of the National Capital Park Commission, its composition, etc.	P.L. 68-200	43 Stat. 463
30 April 1926	Amendment to 6 June 1924, Act transferring control of Parks in District of Columbia from Chief of Engineers of the Army to the Director of Public Building and Public Parks of the National Capital, and adjacent areas in Maryland and Virginia	P.L. 69-158	44 Stat. 274
23 May 1928	An Act to authorize and direct the survey, construction and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon with Arlington Memorial Bridge	P.L. 70-493	43 Stat. 671

23 January 1930	A Joint Resolution to amend sections 3 and 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington." This amendment deals with the condemnation and compensation disputes in process of acquiring lands for the construction of the highway	P.L. 71-34	46 Stat. 59
-----------------	--	------------	-------------

29 May 1930	Capper-Cramton Act, for the acquisition, establishment and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway	P.L. 71-284	46 Stat. 482
8 August 1946	Amendment to Act of 19 May 1930, relative to Federal expenditures	P.L. 79-699	60 Stat. 960
30 August 1954	Construction of bridges over the Potomac River authorized, excerpts from	P.L. 83-704	68 Stat. 961
22 May 1956	Amendment to Act of 30 August 1954, specifying jurisdiction of acquired land for Parkway purposes	P.L. 84-534	70 Stat. 184
27 August 1958	Exchanges of land authorized for parkway purposes	P.L.85-774	72 Stat. 931
4 October 1961	National Capital Transportation Agency authorized to acquire property adjacent to parkway	P.L. 87-355	75 Stat. 776
21 August 1958	An Act to amend the Act of 29 May 1930, with respect to the stream valley parks in Maryland	P.L. 85-707	72 Stat. 705

4 March 1931	An Act to authorize a suitable memorial in connection with the park and playground system of the National Capital or the George Washington Parkway, to the late Stephen T. Mather	P.L. 71-861	46 Stat. 1528
--------------	---	-------------	---------------

21 May 1932	An Act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital. Receiving a gift from the Roosevelt Memorial Association, the island known as Barbados, Analostan and Masons Island	P.L. 72-146	47 Stat. 163
11 February 1933	An Act to change the name of "Roosevelt Island" to "Theodore Roosevelt Island"	P.L. 72-332	47 Stat. 799
13 September 1960	Amendment to Act of 21 May 1932, that the Secretary of the Interior shall erect a memorial on Theodore Roosevelt Island	P.L. 86-764	74 Stat. 904
21 August 1935	An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes	P.L. 74-292	49 Stat. 666
1 July 1947	A Joint Resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars	P.L. 80-157	61 Stat. 242
7 July 1952	A Joint Resolution to amend the Act of 1 July 1947, inserting "Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation" and striking "Marine Corps League, Inc."	P.L. 82-462	66 Stat. 441
16 June 1953	A Joint Resolution to amend the Act of 1 July 1947, inserting the words "or immediate vicinity" after "District of Columbia"	P.L. 83-66	67 Stat. 64
24 August 1935	A Joint Resolution to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Fourth Division, American Expeditionary Forces	P.L. 74-55	49 Stat. 647
23 August 1954	An Act authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the people of the Netherlands	P.L. 83-628	68 Stat. 769
29 June 1955	An Act designating the Custis-Lee Mansion as a Memorial to Robert E. Lee	P.L. 84-107	69 Stat. 190

30 June 1972	Amendment to the Act of 29 June 1955, restoring the Custis-Lee Mansion to its original historical name, followed by the explanatory memorial phrase, Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial	P.L. 92-333	86 Stat. 401
11 June 1959	An Act to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes. Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation, Dyke Marsh Act	P.L. 86-41	72 Stat. 71
21 September 1959	A Joint Resolution authorizing the National Geographic Society to erect a memorial on public grounds in the State of Virginia to honor Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd	P.L. 86-290	73 Stat. 569
2 October 1964	A Joint Resolution authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs	P.L. 88-612	78 Stat. 992
9 October 1965	An Act relating to the establishment of concession policy in the areas administered by National Park Service and other purposes	P.L. 89-249	79 Stat. 969
10 October 1965	An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for the administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes	P.L. 89-255	79 Stat. 981
18 September 1972	An Act proposing the erection of a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of the Seabees of the United States Navy	P.L. 92-422	86 Stat. 678
28 December 1973	An Act to establish the Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac	P.L. 93-211	87 Stat. 909

20 December 1975	An Act to amend the Joint Resolution approved 28 December 1973, restricting Federal expenditures up to \$1,000,000 and conditions of access	P.L. 94-162	80 Stat. 870
7 March 1974	An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers; in particular, to implement, by the Corps of Engineers, the restoration of the historical and ecological values of Dyke Marsh on the Potomac River	P.L. 93-251	88 Stat. 12
26 October 1974	An Act to provide for the Clara Barton National Historic Site	P.L. 93-486	88 Stat. 1461
6 February 1976	An Act authorizing the One Hundred and First Airborne Division Association to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs	P.L. 94-211	90 Stat. 151
30 October 1986	An Act amending P.L. 95-599, extending contract authority until expended \$2,500,000 for improvements to George Washington Memorial Parkway	P.L. 95-591	100 Stat. 3341-250
6 November 1986	A Joint Resolution authorizing the establishment of a memorial to honor the American Armored Forces	P.L. 99-620	100 Stat. 3493
6 November 1986	Authorizes the Women in Military Services for America Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor women who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces, using non-Federal funds.	P.L. 99-610	100 Stat. 3477

14 November 1986	An Act to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes. Also known as the "Commemorative Works Act"	P.L. 99-652	100 Stat. 3650
------------------	---	-------------	----------------

28 November 1989	An Act to redesignate a certain portion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway as the "Clara Barton Parkway"	P.L. 101-177	103 Stat. 1296
16 October 1989	House of Representatives Report (101-285) on redesignating a portion of George Washington Memorial Parkway as the "Clara Barton Parkway"		

23 September 1996	An Act to authorize land conveyance for fiscal year 1997 lands to the Army at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. This Act requires Secretary of Interior to transfer certain Section 29 lands to the Secretary of the Army currently at the Robert E Lee Memorial Preservation Zone. Only lands will be transferred that the Secretary of the Interior does not determine must be retained because of historical significance or required for the maintenance of nearby lands or facilities	P.L. 104-201	110 Stat. 2791
-------------------	--	--------------	----------------

1 November 2000	To authorize the exchange of land between the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of Central Intelligence at the George Washington Memorial Parkway in McLean, Virginia, and for other purposes.	P.L. 106-412	114 Stat. 1795
-----------------	---	--------------	----------------

28 December 2001	Alternate site for United States Air Force Memorial, preservation of open space on Arlington Ridge tract, and related land transfer at Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia (Section 29)	P.L. 107-107	115 Stat. 1332
------------------	---	--------------	----------------

AGREEMENTS

20 June 1929	Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Alexandria and the United States of America for use of Washington Street in connection with the memorial highway, to be constructed
24 February 1947	Memorandum of Agreement between the National Park Service and the Civil Aeronautics Administration relating to the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway
3 April 1940	An agreement between the National Capital Park and the Planning Commission, County Board of Arlington County, Virginia, and the Governor of Virginia, concerning the assistance in acquisition of property for the George Washington Memorial Parkway
27 December 1946	An Agreement between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, County Board of Arlington County, Virginia, and the Governor of Virginia concerning further assistance in acquiring property for the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and stipulations theretofore.
9 March 1955	An Agreement by and between the National Capital Planning Commission, Board of County Supervisors of the County of Fairfax, Virginia, and the Governor of Virginia concerning assistance in acquiring land for the George Washington Memorial Parkway
22 October 1956	Supplemental Agreement No. 1 by and between the National Capital Planning Commission, Board of County Supervisors of the County of Fairfax, Virginia, and the Governor of Virginia concerning the further assistance in acquiring land northwest of State Route 123.
11 August 1959	Supplemental Agreement No. 2 included approximately 15 acres known as Fort Marcy
4 August 1959	Supplemental Agreement No. 3
31 July 1962	Supplemental Agreement No. 4
28 March 1958	A House of Representatives Report from the Committee on Roads on the proposed memorial highway from Washington City to Mount Vernon via the Arlington Memorial Bridge, 70th Congress, Report No. 1065

- 4 November 1968 Request from the Director, National Park Service, to the Secretary of the Interior, through the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, for naming of Parklands on Columbia Island as Lady Bird Johnson Park
-
- 10 April 1986 Agreement Between Mount Vernon Chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the United States of America, Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region, George Washington Memorial Parkway for the preservation, repair, maintenance and interpretation of the historic lighthouse at Jones Point, Alexandria, Virginia
-
- 1 October 1986 A Special Use Permit granting the City of Alexandria, for a period of 25 years, permission to develop, manage, and maintain Jones Point Park upon parkland of U.S. Reservation 404V, Section 1, in Alexandria, Virginia
-
- 23 May 1991 A Cooperative Agreement between the NPS, George Washington Memorial Parkway and Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, to uphold the sovereign rights of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and to protect the special lands and waters of Dyke Marsh. This agreement concerns the use and maintenance of eight floating blind sites along the Potomac River, adjacent to Dyke Marsh. Term of agreement is three years, or until 23 May 1994
-
- 6 June 1981 An Agreement between the Friends of Turkey Run Farm, Inc. and George Washington Memorial Parkway whereby the Friends of Turkey Run Farm shall have use of Turkey Run Farm Park for the purpose of conducting a living interpretive demonstration educational program related to an 18th-century low-income Northern Virginia family farm. Term of agreement is through 30 September 2011. With Amendments Nos. 1 and 2
-
- 17 February 1986 An Agreement to Exchange Easements by and between COOK INLET REGION, INC. (CIRI), an Alaska Corporation and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. CIRI received at auction on 22 August 1984, property known as the "Old Ford Plant." Easements include continuous public access along the shoreline, height of buildings, and CIRI's agreement to improve and maintain in perpetuity the public access area and bicycle trail for public use
-

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| 18 May 1987 | A Memorandum of Agreement between the National Park Service and Glen Echo Park Foundation, Inc., intending to support the Service's implementation of the 1984 Management and Facilities Program at Glen Echo Park |
| 4 January 1993 | A Cooperative Agreement between the Glen Echo Park Foundation, Inc., and the National Park Service, National Capital Region, George Washington Memorial Parkway to allow the Foundation to complete the program planning (i.e. conduct the Feasibility Study) on the implementation of the Vision Statement for Glen Echo Park |
| 5 October 1994 | A Memorandum of Agreement between the National Park Service and the Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in the United States, Inc., to raise funds and/or services as a donation for the material and services to repair and/or rehabilitate the Netherlands Carillon |
| 31 January 1994 | A Cooperative Agreement between the National Park Service and Arlington County, Virginia, for the improvement of traffic flow at the intersection of Spout Run Parkway and Lorcom Lane in the County of Arlington |
| 2 February 1996 | An Agreement between the National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, Potomac Overlook Regional Park regarding development and maintenance of the developed viewing area referred to as the "Overlook," which is located on the National Park Service Land, at Potomac Overlook Park, 2845 N. Marcey Road, Arlington, Virginia |
| 7 October 1996 | An Agreement between the George Washington Memorial Parkway and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division over riparian hunting rights in the Potomac River as being made available for the recreational purpose of hunting |