MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD
FREDERICK, MARYLAND
AN ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY

December 2019

Resource Stewardship and Science
Division of Cultural Resources, National Capital Region
Monocacy National Battlefield
Frederick, Maryland
An Administrative History

Paula S. Reed & Associates, Inc.
Hagerstown, Maryland

In Partnership with the Organization of American Historians

US Department of the Interior • National Park Service • National Capital Region • Resource Stewardship and Science • Washington, DC
2019
As the Nation’s principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering sound use of our land and water resources; protecting our fish, wildlife, and biological diversity; preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places; and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people by encouraging stewardship and citizen participation in their care. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under US administration.

US Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Resource Stewardship and Science
Washington, DC

Publication Credits: Graphics from sources other than federal repositories may not be reproduced without the permission of the owners noted in the captions. Other information in this publication may be copied and used with the condition that full credit be given to the authors and publisher. Appropriate citations and bibliographic credits should be made for each use.

Cover photo: Photo of 14th New Jersey Monument in Monocacy National Battlefield, Paula S. Reed and Assoc., 2019.
# Table of Contents

**List of Figures**  
VII

**Acknowledgments**  
IX

**Preface**  
XI

**List of Abbreviations and/or Acronyms**  
XIII

**Introduction**  
1

**Chapter 1: Monocacy National Battlefield Landscape and Property Histories**  
5

- The Monocacy National Battlefield Landscape  
5
- Monocacy Battlefield’s Pre-Civil War History and Development  
6
- Fords and Ferries  
7
- James Marshall’s Influence, Land Speculation, and Development  
11
- Development in the New Republic and the 1800s  
16
- Notice to Bridge builders and Turnpike Road-makers  
17
- Enslaved Workers at Monocacy  
34
- Conclusion  
44

**Chapter 2: The Civil War and Commemoration**  
45

- Maryland – On the Border  
46
- Lee Invades the North Again: Summer 1863  
49
- Jubal Early’s Northern Invasion of 1864  
51
- The Monocacy Battle, July 9, 1864  
57
- On to Washington  
60
- Memorials, Monuments, and Commemoration  
64
- Establishing Monocacy National Military Park  
66
- Conclusion  
72

**Chapter 3: Establishing Monocacy National Battlefield**  
73

- National Park Service Founding Principles and the Mission 66 Vision  
74
- Establishing Monocacy National Military Park  
76
- The Black Hole: No Activity on Battlefield Development and US 240 Constructed  
88
- Conclusion  
94
CHAPTER 4: MONOCACY BATTLEFIELD BOUNDARIES AND LAND ACQUISITION

National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmark Designation for “Monocacy Battlefield,” 1973

Suitability/Feasibility Study, Proposed Monocacy National Battlefield, May 1976

Public Law 94–578, Passed October 21, 1976, Establishes Battlefield Boundary

Boundary Increase, November 10, 1978, Public Law 95–625

First General Management Plan, 1979

Public Hearing, July 9, 1979

Land Acquisition

Land Protection Plan/Environmental Assessment, 1983

Land Acquisition Funding, Public Law 102–202, 1991

The Process of Land Acquisition


Acquiring the Monuments

National Historic Landmark Update and Boundary Revision, 2012–2016

Life Estates on Monocacy Properties

Renting of Battlefield Agricultural Land

Scenic Easements

Right-of-Ways/Roads, Railroads, and Utilities

External Issues Facing Monocacy National Battlefield

Conclusion

CHAPTER 5: MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD ADMINISTRATION

Coordinating Superintendents and Staff: Evolving Roles

Opening of a New National Park

Site Managers at Monocacy

Building a Park: Susan Trail, Monocacy’s First Superintendent


Turnover of Superintendents

Planning

General Management Plan, 2008

Interpreters and Volunteers
| Cultural Resource Activities          | 149 |
| Natural Resource Activities         | 150 |
| Maintenance                          | 151 |
| Law Enforcement                      | 152 |
| Rangers                              | 152 |
| Development of Relationships with Partner Organizations | 152 |
| Conclusion                           | 161 |

**CHAPTER 6: RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND PUBLIC USE**

| Management Plan Evolution            | 163 |
| Suitability/Feasibility Study, 1976  | 163 |
| Assessment of the Alternatives – General Management Plan, 1979 | 164 |
| Land Protection Plan, 1983           | 165 |
| Statement of Management, 1986        | 165 |
| Foundation Document, 2015            | 167 |
| Natural Resources                    | 168 |
| Natural Resource Condition Assessment, 2011 | 168 |
| Flooding                             | 170 |
| Effects of Visitor Use               | 170 |
| Cultural Resources                   | 171 |
| Preservation and Rehabilitation of Standing Structures | 172 |
| Gambrill Mill/Bush Creek Area        | 172 |
| Worthington House                    | 173 |
| Lewis Farm                           | 174 |
| Best Farm                            | 175 |
| Thomas Farm                          | 176 |
| Baker Farm                           | 178 |
| Development of Trails                | 178 |
| Archeology                           | 180 |
| Interpretation and the Visitor Experience | 181 |
| Conclusion                           | 185 |
# List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copy of Special Order 191 (NPS)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1864 Hotchkiss Monocacy battle map (Library of Congress)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1935 Graham map (National Archives)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1932 W. Jarboe Grove map (National Archives)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1937 aerial view of the Monocacy Battlefield farms (NPS)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Map showing points A, D, and B</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Porter, Langley, &amp; Little Report, 1940, MNB Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Site B blueprint (courtesy of Theresa Michel)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Site D blueprint (courtesy of Theresa Michel)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Proposed Entrance Road Plat #8060</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Frederick Co. Land Records, Maryland State Archives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1951 Maryland highway map showing the completed section of Rt. 240 and planned Rt. 15 Frederick by-pass</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1963 newspaper photo of C. Lease Bussard (MNB Library)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>National Register nomination boundary map showing SW section (NPS)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>National Register nomination boundary map showing NE section (NPS)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Proposed boundary Alternative A (ANB vertical files)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Proposed boundary Alternative B (ANB vertical files)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Proposed boundary Alternative C (ANB vertical files)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>February 1976, “Boundary Map, Monocacy National Battlefield” (ANB vertical files)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 18: February 1976, “Boundary Map, Monocacy National Battlefield” (Federal Register) 104

Figure 19: November 1977 News-Post photo of commission meeting (MNB Library) 135

Figure 20: Commission tour, November 1977 (Frederick News-Post, MNB Library) 136

Figure 21: 1991 Monocacy National Battlefield Opening Program (MNB Library) 139

Figure 22: Mill/visitor center interior flooding, 1996 (NPS) 171

Figure 23: View of Worthington Farm trail (PRA 2016) 173

Figure 24: View of Gambrill Mill area (PRA 2016) 174

Figure 25: View of Worthington Farm (PRA 2016) 174

Figure 26: View of Lewis Farm (PRA 2016) 174

Figure 27: View of Best Farm (PRA 2016) 175

Figure 28: NW view of Thomas Farm (PRA 2016) 177

Figure 29: View of archeological work on slave houses (NPS) 180

Figure 30: View of visitor center (PRA 2016) 192

Figure 31: View of Fourteenth NJ monument rededication (NPS) 193

Figure 32: View of restored Thomas stone house (PRA 2016) 194
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Researching and producing this administrative history for Monocacy National Battlefield depended on help from many people along the way. First and foremost we would like to acknowledge the time commitment and thorough review of various drafts of this report by National Park Service staff at the National Capital Regional Office and at Monocacy National Battlefield. In particular we thank Dean Herrin, PhD, chief historian, National Capital Region and Andrew Banasik, chief of resource management, Monocacy National Battlefield, who guided and coordinated the development of this administrative history. We also thank Nissa Fink, chief of resource education and visitor services with Monocacy, for providing information on visitation at the park.

We thank Susan Trail, superintendent at Antietam National Battlefield, and Stephanie Gray, Antietam National Battlefield collections curator, for their help in guiding us to Monocacy Battlefield records housed at Antietam National Battlefield.

Part of the scope of work for this administrative history was to provide recorded interviews with selected persons who were important to the growth and development of the park. We interviewed eleven individuals who generously gave their time and shared their experiences relating to Monocacy National Battlefield. Thank you to our interviewees, Beverly Byron, Cathy Beeler, Earle Geisbert, Gail Stephens, John Howard, John Parsons, Keith Wiles, Rick Slade, Susan Trail, Susan Moore, and Theresa Michel.

And finally we wish to thank the late Aidan J. Smith, OAH public history manager, who managed this project until his untimely death in April of 2018.
Preface

In February of 2016, Paula S. Reed and Associates, Inc. contracted with the Organization of American Historians to prepare an administrative history for Monocacy National Battlefield, at Frederick, Maryland. Monocacy National Battlefield preserves and interprets the Civil War Battle of Monocacy that occurred on July 9, 1864. Yet the battlefield also has a very rich history of settlement and development of plantations and transportation systems along the Monocacy River from the early 1700s forward. While the National Park Service’s primary role is to interpret the Civil War battle, the earlier history is important in its own right and provides essential context to the Civil War history in west central Maryland.

The fundamental goal of the National Park Service’s administrative history program is to obtain an accurate, thorough, and well-written account of the origin and evolution of each unit of the National Park System. A park administrative history explains how the park was conceived and established, and how it has been administered up to the present. It focuses on the history of the park as a park, to include the development of various park programs and activities.¹

The primary audience for park administrative histories is current and future park managers and staff. The more familiar managers and staff are with the problems their predecessors faced and their responses, the better prepared they will be to make thoughtful, informed decisions about ongoing or recurring issues. Administrative histories provide valuable context and inform superintendents about why and how their predecessors made certain decisions. They help superintendents understand past controversies and prepare for future ones and are a critical tool for park managers who seek greater understanding of why and how certain practices and policies evolved.²

The following report is organized into seven chapters with appendices and a bibliography. It begins with the historical context and history of the establishment of the battlefield, followed by the National Park Service’s growing role in establishing, nurturing, and managing the battlefield.

² Ibid.
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Introduction

Monocacy National Battlefield, the site of the Civil War “Battle that Saved Washington” on July 9, 1864, was authorized by Congress on June 21, 1934. No framework, however, was set in place for the acquisition or maintenance of the property. Most of the battlefield remained in private ownership and was actively farmed. In 1973 the approximately 1,500-acre battlefield was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Three years later, Congress authorized preservation of the battlefield and provided for the purchase, donation, or condemnation of land within its boundaries. Since the 1980s, Monocacy has acquired the Best, Thomas, Worthington, Baker, and Lewis farms as well as the Gambrill Mill property. The owners of Thomas and Baker farms were provided with a life estate. The National Park Service has been working to record and preserve the historic landscape, as well as its natural and manufactured components, to enrich the interpretation of the battle and its impact on the inclusive properties. Land is currently rented to farmers in a mutually beneficial relationship that allows them to grow crops, and which allows the battlefield to retain the agricultural aesthetic that it possessed at the time of the battle.

The preparation of the Monocacy National Battlefield Administrative History involved research among primary and secondary sources resulting in a report with a detailed understanding of how the park was conceived, formed, and managed since its creation. The administrative history was developed in accordance with the guidelines outlined in National Park Service Administrative History: A Guide (2004).

NPS administrative histories are one of several baseline studies that the NPS requires for each park unit under one of its policy directives — Director's Order 28, Cultural Resource Management Guidelines. Administrative histories document the establishment and administration of individual parks to provide documentary context for their management. Administrative histories inform park and regional managers about the decision-making of their predecessors in the NPS, and about how NPS decisions have reflected and reflect broader social, economic, cultural, and political trends and interests. Administrative histories are a critical element if the NPS is to record and preserve its own history. Further park level policies and management decisions cannot be formulated properly without reference to past experience. By learning more about challenges their predecessors faced, managers at all levels can be better informed.
about contemporary issues and bring greater awareness to their policy and program decisions.

This study documents the establishment and management of Monocacy National Battlefield and places it within the larger contexts of park management, public use, and natural and cultural resource preservation inside and outside the National Park System. It serves as an ongoing guide to park management about the history of park issues over time, how these have been addressed, and how they have changed depending on the context of the time.

This administrative history for Monocacy battlefield begins with an introductory chapter that summarizes the battlefield’s landscape and its pre-Civil War history and development. This first chapter also contains a section on enslaved workers who lived and toiled on what was to become Monocacy National Battlefield.

Chapter 2 looks at the Civil War and Commemoration at Monocacy and concludes with the establishment of Monocacy National Military Park in June of 1934. It summarizes the Battle of Monocacy, which occurred on July 9, 1864, and also covers efforts to place monuments and memorials to commemorate regiments that participated in the battle.

Chapter 3 provides the story of the establishment of Monocacy National Battlefield, beginning as Monocacy National Military Park, and the decades that followed in the mid-1900s when the park, rather than developing, languished in quiet neglect.

Chapter 4 begins with the National Register and National Historic Landmark nomination that was done in 1973, in response to a proposed highway that would have bisected the battlefield east to west. It continues with the various pieces of legislation that established boundaries for the battlefield and efforts at land acquisition through purchase or scenic easement, and production of documents such as the General Management Plan to guide development of the park into the future.

The focus of Chapter 5 is on Monocacy National Battlefield’s administration, beginning with coordinating superintendents in the early years of the park, the opening of the park to visitors in July 1991, the appointment of site managers, and finally independence of the park with its own superintendent. Monocacy is still a young park, with just its third superintendent currently in place. Also part of the park’s administration are interpretation, maintenance, law enforcement, and care and protection of cultural and natural resources.
Chapter 6 continues with resource stewardship for both natural and cultural resources and efforts to preserve them. Conservation efforts for the park’s resources include preservation and rehabilitation of buildings and landscape protections for both natural and cultural features. Extensive research into historical and natural features and archeological investigations informed stewardship of the park’s resources.

The concluding Chapter 7 covers day-to-day operation of the park, staffing, site managers and the three superintendents, interpretation, and special events.

The narrative chronicles the history of the National Park Service’s involvement with Monocacy National Battlefield and the people who played important roles in the park’s development. The administrative history covers major decisions and actions in creating and managing the park as well as how the park has grown and progressed since it was initially authorized by Congress in 1934.
CHAPTER 1:
MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD LANDSCAPE AND PROPERTY HISTORIES

The Monocacy National Battlefield properties form a significant cultural resource reflecting three centuries of occupation of a cohesive historic landscape. The peopling of the Monocacy area is particularly important. The place drew investors and families from the Tidewater region of Maryland, French refugees, Scots, and a sizable number of enslaved African Americans whose owners brought them to lands near the banks of the Monocacy. These groups blended and interacted on the five farms that make up Monocacy National Battlefield. Onto this rural, but sophisticated landscape was overlaid the drama of the Civil War, which was played out at Monocacy over three successive summers in 1862, 1863, and climaxing with the Battle that Saved Washington in 1864. Protection accorded to the area, which Union Troops occupied from 1861–1865, underscores the importance of the Monocacy rail crossing and junction in the Civil War. The military presence protected the railroad bridge and thus the rail route, plus routes into Frederick, an important Union supply base during the war. On June 21, 1934, Congress approved an act to “establish a national battlefield at the battlefield of Monocacy,” officially recognizing the significance of Monocacy’s role in the Civil War. In addition, efforts to memorialize and commemorate the battle resulted in placement of monuments on the landscape during the early 1900s, the most recent commemoration occurring in 1964. These memorials have become part of Monocacy’s cultural and commemorative landscape.

THE MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD LANDSCAPE
Monocacy National Battlefield contains 1,647 acres of farmland and woods straddling the Monocacy River and Maryland Route 355, just southeast of Frederick in Frederick County, Maryland. Flat river bottomland and steep bluffs dominate the landscape, along with old fencerows and road networks, some of which date back to the mid-1700s. Much of the land is farmed, used primarily for hay and grain production, and for pasture. Bush Creek passes through the Battlefield near its northern edge, east of the river, and paralleling this creek is the CSX Rail Line (formerly the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad), which figured so prominently in the July 9, 1864 battle. Just west of the river, there are railroad forks, with the main branch heading west toward Harpers Ferry, and a spur extending north into Frederick. Since the coming of the railroad in the 1830s this place
was known as Frederick Junction or Monocacy Junction. On the segment of the Monocacy River that flows through the battlefield are two fording places that were known as early as the 1730s. One was located near the mouth of Ballenger Creek and the other, which later was used as a ferry crossing, is approximately 365 feet downstream from the present Maryland Route 355 bridge. Confederate forces used the ford at Ballenger Creek during the Battle of Monocacy. The other ford, known as the “Middle Ford,” is recorded in Frederick County Court records and on land plats, and the trace of the old road leading to the crossing is still evident on the landscape. There was ferry service at this ford from at least 1748 until 1828, when the first Washington [Georgetown] Turnpike Bridge was constructed. The battlefield landscape is largely pastoral. There are some non-historic elements, mostly houses dating from the mid- and later 1900s (not owned by the National Park Service). Maryland Route 355 (locally called Urbana Pike) has long been part of the Monocacy landscape, first as the Georgetown Road and later the Washington or Georgetown Pike, and in the 1930s called Route 240. The route’s presence and development is an integral part of the area’s history. Interstate 270, added to the landscape in 1950 as a dualized replacement for Route 240, abruptly bisects the battlefield, running southeast to northwest, forming both a visual and physical barrier to the continuity of the landscape. There are five monuments placed as memorials to participants in the Battle of Monocacy. On the borders of the battlefield there is significant development, commercial and residential sprawl extending from Frederick on the northwest, from the Buckeystown Pike on the southwest and from Urbana on the southeast. On the northwest a shopping mall and an office park extend to the very boundary of the battlefield.

**MONOCACY BATTLEFIELD’S PRE-CIVIL WAR HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT**

The story of the Monocacy Battlefield properties is part of a much larger cultural history that framed the events of the Civil War, climaxing with the Battle of Monocacy on July 9, 1864. Monocacy National Battlefield preserves not only an important piece of Civil War history but also a significant slice of Maryland’s developmental history. Unique physical expressions of that heritage appeared as early as 1724 with John Radford’s initial land survey of Henry, where Henry Ballenger began the process of agricultural and industrial development in the Frederick County region.

The area now encompassed by Monocacy National Battlefield has roots, which extend deep into Frederick County’s and America’s history. The

---

3 There is some disagreement about the exact location of the Ballenger Creek ford. Some sources, including eye witness Glen Worthington, say it was below the mouth, while others say it was upstream from the confluence.
five farms of the battlefield area are among a group initially held by well-to-do Englishmen migrating into the area from the tidewater section of the colony. These families form colorful threads in the rich cultural tapestry that characterizes Frederick County’s heritage. Also woven into this historic fabric was a significant minority of Germans who interacted with the English and settled the county concurrently with them; a few French refugees escaping from the terror of the Revolution in 1789 and a slave revolt against Saint-Domingue’s (Haiti’s) sugar and coffee planters in 1791; and African Americans brought into the county as enslaved labor. Members of these diverse groups blended, yet remained distinct, as they combined to create Frederick County’s and Monocacy’s cultural identity. The area that became Monocacy Battlefield is distinct in that it was almost entirely settled by the planter and merchant culture, except for some leaseholdings on speculator Daniel Dulany’s Locust Level.

FORDS AND FERRIES

The earliest settlers of the Monocacy region and the western lands beyond faced the difficult task of developing transportation routes, not only for travel to settlement sites, but also for the conveyance of agricultural and consumer products to and from markets located far to the east and south. While planters and communities in the tidewater region of Maryland depended largely on navigable water for bulk transportation, those in the western settlements found water travel an unreliable option. In 1739, “Inhabitants about Monoccacy [sic] and above the mountains on Potomack River on the Back part of Virginia” petitioned for a road to Annapolis “for more Easy Carrige of their Grain Provisions and other Commoditys.”

Baltimore-Town, officially platted in 1745, overtook Annapolis as the preferred port for many western Maryland grain farmers. Also in 1745, Daniel Dulany platted Frederick Town. Frederick’s main east-west street (Patrick Street) aligned with the road to Baltimore. The largely Germanic farming population around Frederick concentrated their production in wheat and rye more typical of Pennsylvania farms. The large “plantations” to the south of Frederick, primarily settled by English, Scottish, and Scotch-Irish families, continued to produce the Maryland cash crop, tobacco, for

6 *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 44, 214; Act of Assembly to lay out Baltimore-Town with 60 lots, combining the Baltimore settlement and Jones Town. Baltimore-Town was to be centered on the “land whereon Edward Fell keeps Store,” presumably what would become Fells Point.
export. Their preferred transportation routes led southward along the lower Potomac River drainage toward tobacco warehouses at Bladensburg, Piscataway, Port Tobacco, Alexandria, and “the Rolling-House which George Gordon built” near the mouth of Rock Creek.\footnote{Archives of Maryland, Vol. 44, 607 and 609. George Gordon’s tobacco warehouse was designated an official tobacco inspection house in 1747 by the Maryland Assembly. Other tobacco inspection warehouses within reach of the Monocacy plantations were established at Bladensburg and at Piscataway.} Frederick’s “Market Street” running north-south was, in part, aimed at these destinations, first along the old “Monocacy road” on the west side of the Monocacy River, and soon along a more direct route on the east of the river.\footnote{Market Street also led north toward Lancaster, PA, and the “Great Road to Philadelphia.” The road south on the west side of Monocacy River was commonly called “the road to the mouth of Monocacy,” now better known as the Buckeystown Pike. The more direct route on the east side of the river, later called the Georgetown road or Pike, led to Bladensburg and Georgetown.}

As the population of the region surrounding Frederick Town grew, agitation intensified to form a new county. In 1748, Frederick County was carved from the western reaches of Prince Georges County with the southern boundary beginning at the mouth of Rock Creek on the Potomac River. George Gordon’s warehouse, on Rock Creek and near the landing on the Potomac, was the only tobacco inspection warehouse located in Frederick County. Frederick Town was designated the county seat and regional market center.

Transportation of agricultural products through and out of Frederick County, far from the navigable creeks and rivers surrounding the Chesapeake Bay, determined many road routes. In a land quickly concentrating on grain production rather than tobacco, secondary roads to and from flour and gristmills began to spider web across the countryside. When the new Frederick County Court convened in March 1748 (1749 in the Julian calendar then in use), not only did the justices hear complaints and convict criminals, the court also designated the main county roads and assigned overseers to maintain them. Among the roads described were several sections of a road on the east side of Monocacy River leading from George Gordon’s warehouse at Rock Creek to Frederick Town, including “the new road to the middle ford.”\footnote{Frederick Co. Court Judgment Records, March Court 1748, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD; also transcribed in J. Thomas Scharf, History of Western Maryland, 436–37.} This “new road” divided from the old Monocacy road just south of Frederick Town, at a point now known as “Evergreen Point,” and continued southeasterly to the middle ford.
The court described the adjoining segment of the old Monocacy road as, “From Henry Ballinger’s to Hussey’s ford” (an old ford located north of Frederick). In the same 1748 March court proceedings, Henry Ballenger entered into a contract with the county court, “to keep a ferry over the Middle Ford on Monocacy.”

The road to Bladensburg and George Gordon’s warehouse crossed the Monocacy below the mouth of Bush Creek on land called “Henry” and “Ballengers Endeavour,” occupied by Henry Ballenger since 1728. In addition to his ferry operation, Ballenger ran a grist or flourmill on Ballenger Creek on the western end of Henry where he probably lived as well. Like many who later contracted to “keep the ferry,” Ballenger probably hired someone else to live nearby and actually run the ferry operation.

In 1751, Henry Ballenger sold all of his land to Richard Richardson, a Baltimore County “Planter” and fellow Quaker. An increasing number of roads radiating from Frederick Town reflected the growing population. The 1753 November Court described four of the road sections leading from Frederick as being overseen by Patrick Doran: “From Frederick Town to Richardson’s & to the new ford & from Town to Peter Apples & from Town to Dulanys Mill.”

The transportation route across “the new ford” (Middle Ford) was becoming increasingly important since the passage of the 1751 Act of Assembly, “for laying out and erecting a Town on Potowmack River, above the mouth of Rock Creek in Frederick County.” The town of 80 lots, later called Georgetown, adjoined the George Gordon tobacco inspection warehouse and was partially on his land.

10 Frederick Co. Judgment Records, March Court 1748, Maryland State Archives. Note: There is some question if “middle ford,” as described in the March Court records, is the one near the mouth of Monocacy, shown on the Tracey and Dern map (p. 51) as cited in pre-1745 records. Later records suggest that as population and road development accelerated through the 1740s following the establishment of Frederick Town, a new designation of “middle ford” was given to the ford over Monocacy just south of Frederick Town, perhaps because it was closer to the “middle” of the Monocacy in Frederick County. References to this crossing being called “Middle Ford” or “Middle Ferry” occur with more frequency in later records but may have begun at about the time that Frederick County was formed.

11 Frederick Co. (FR) Deed Book (DB), B/ 389.

12 FR Co. Judgement Records, November Court 1753, Maryland State Archives.

13 Archives of Maryland, Vol. 46, 630.
Richard Richardson, like Henry Ballenger before him, owned the land encompassing the Middle Ford or Ferry on the road to Georgetown. However, Richardson apparently never showed interest in overseeing the operation of the ferry. In 1754, the Frederick County Court appointed “Thomas Beatty and William Griffith, Gentlemen, to agree for keeping a ferry at the Middle Ford on Monocacy.”14 Beatty and Griffith, being “Gentlemen,” probably contracted the ferry operation to a “yeoman,” possibly a man named Daniel Kennedy. In the same court session, Daniel Kennedy was awarded a license, “to keep a house of Entertainment in the County of Frederick in the late Dwelling House of Richard Richardson,”15 and in 1755, Kennedy’s license was renewed for “an Ordinary or Publick House of Entertainment at the place where he now lives.”16

That same year, in 1755, war with the French and their Indian allies simmered along the western edges of the British colonies. British General Edward Braddock landed at Alexandria, Virginia, prior to his advance to Frederick where he provisioned for his march to Fort Cumberland and eventually Fort Duquesne. The road into Maryland from Alexandria turned north toward Bladensburg where it joined the “main road leading to Bladensborough and George Town” from Frederick Town.17 It was probably at this Monocacy crossing where Daniel Kennedy helped the war effort in 1755, apparently at his own expense: “The petition of Daniel Kennedy, of Frederick County, praying his Account for transporting of General Braddock’s Soldiers and Wagons, etc. over Manockasy Ferry, to be allowed by a Public Charge of this Province, was read and rejected.”18

Several years later, Kennedy contracted with the Frederick County Court in 1759 for his own license to “keep the ferry where he now lives ‘till November Court next.”19 By 1760, the roads, fords, and ferries
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14 FR Co. Court, Nov. 1754, as transcribed by Millard Milburn Rice, *This Was the Life* (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1984), 152.
15 FR Judgment Records, Nov. 1754, Maryland State Archives. There are several options for interpretation of “the late Dwelling House of Richard Richardson”: 1) that “late” means “most recently owned by” dwelling house, possibly the old Ballenger house probably located on the west side of the road to the Mouth of Monocacy (Buckeystown Pike where Arcadia mansion now stands); 2) that “late” means “former” dwelling house of Richardson, either that he recently vacated his new property or that he lived somewhere else along the Monocacy prior to moving onto the Ballenger tracts (least likely since he was a “Baltimore County Planter” on the 1751 deed).
16 FR Judgment Records, March 1755, Maryland State Archives.
17 FR Co. Court, Aug. 1755, in Rice, *This Was the Life*, 165.
18 Archives of Maryland, Vol. 52, 342.
19 FR Court, Judgment Records, Nov. 1759, Maryland State Archives.
along the Monocacy River in Frederick County were at least well established, if not well maintained. Although the French and Indian War continued to stifle significant growth in the area, ambitious men knew the development potential and formulated plans to exploit and tame the wilderness. Merchants like Scotland-born James Marshall looked for products to export (wood especially) and sought out customers for imported merchandise. In 1758, James Marshall of Prince Georges County purchased 700 acres of Wett Work, an apparently undeveloped 1,400-acre tract, from the heirs of John Abington, one of the region’s early land speculators. Located along the east bank of the Monocacy adjoining the Middle Ferry, the woodland also encompassed a section of the Georgetown road.

In 1765, James Marshall expanded his holdings, purchasing land on the west side of the river and surveying to form Arcadia. With Wett Work and Arcadia Marshall owned the land and river encompassing the Monocacy ferry on the Georgetown Road. The crossing became known as “Marshall’s Ferry.” Ferry licenses issued by the county court in 1772 and 1773 indicate that Marshall did not oversee “Marshall’s Ferry.” The court appointed Capt. Thomas Price and Mr. Chris Edelin in 1772, “to [trist? (i.e., meet with)] with some person to keep the Ferry over Monocacy at Mr. Marshalls.” In 1773, Robert Peter and David Lynn posted £50 each as security for Daniel Shultz, “for keeping ferry over Monocacy.” The court additionally ordered, “that the sum [Lined?] for this Ferry be entered on the Levy payable to Mr. James Marshall.” Although not directly involved in the ferry operation, the order made it clear that Marshall owned the land and river over which the ferry passed.

**JAMES MARSHALL’S INFLUENCE, LAND SPECULATION, AND DEVELOPMENT**

James Marshall once owned the majority of the land that makes up the cultural landscape of the Monocacy Battlefield. Marshall’s Wett Work, on the east side of the Monocacy River, was divided after his death in 1803 into the Gambrill Mill property and the Thomas (Araby), Worthington (Clifton), and Baker Farms. The other large tract on the west side of
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20 FRDB, F/ 197 and 904 Release; also 1759 from Wade, FRDB, F/ 654, and 1760 from Deakins, FRDB, F/ 1070.
21 FR Co. Court Minutes, Nov. Term 1772, Maryland State Archives.
22 FR Co. Court Judgment Records, Nov. Term 1773, Maryland Archives. A David Linn was the securitor for Daniel Kennedy’s tavern license back in 1755 and Robert Peter, like James Marshall, was an agent for John Glassford & Company (FRDB, T/ 166).
the river, which he called Arcadia, later formed the nucleus of the Hermitage or Best Farm.23

As a young merchant from Scotland, Marshall relocated to America in 1747 to make his mark in the lucrative tobacco and commodities trade triangle with Britain, the American colonies, and the West Indies. He served as “factor” or “agent” for the Glasgow merchant firm of John Glassford & Company. The Glassford Company, among the three major Scottish exporters of Maryland tobacco to Britain, provided imported consumer goods to Maryland stores through much of the 1700s until the American Revolution.

James Marshall influenced the development of the river crossing and the land he owned and sold, which created Monocacy Battlefield’s landscape. It is a rich, multi-layered history that highlights the rise in importance of Frederick County as a center for agriculture and trade as well as the region’s cultural diversity. As the land was sold or divided following Marshall’s death, the agricultural development of the neighborhood intensified and the various farms took on the appearance that they largely retain today. The historic development of the road, railroad, river, and Marshall’s and later owners’ land had a profound impact on this Monocacy neighborhood’s central role throughout the American Civil War, culminating in the July 1864 Monocacy battle, and the eventual formation of the Monocacy National Battlefield with the National Park Service. During the late 1800s, the decline in large-scale grain agriculture and the rise in dairy production left the area only slightly changed with the loss of the mill and the addition of several dairy barns.

Before James Marshall began purchasing the tracts to establish his estate in Frederick County in 1758, the land followed a regular process for speculation and development that took hold of the backcountry in the early 1700s. Frederick County land, then part of Prince Georges County, saw its earliest speculators and settlers in the 1720s, coinciding with the migration of Pennsylvania German farmers to Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley. While land speculators like Benjamin Tasker, Thomas Cresap, and Daniel Dulany snapped up huge tracts of land for later subdivision, a determined core of farmers, primarily of German descent, began to work the land.

Despite the improvements in place on his Frederick County land, Marshall’s residence, and commercial and personal ties remained in Prince Georges County throughout the 1760s. James Marshall first

23 Only the Lewis Farm sits outside of the boundaries of James Marshall’s land from the 1700s.
identified himself in business dealings and land records as a Frederick County resident in 1770. Although referring to himself in documents interchangeably as “Planter” or “Gent,” depending on the transactions taking place, Marshall also apparently maintained his ties to the Glasgow merchants. In 1771, he returned to Scotland and stayed with his cousin Claud Marshall for seven months. The 1771 county court’s road descriptions reflected Marshall’s presence in the area as well as his use of the land, describing two sections of the Georgetown Road out of Frederick: #56 as, “the great road leading to Marshalls Quarter,” and #19 “from Marshalls Ferry on Monocacy to lower Bennetts Creek.”

The explicit descriptions of Marshall’s Georgetown Road properties by 1771 indicate that James Marshall had moved his household to either Arcadia or Wett Work, one being his manor and the other his “Quarter.” It is possible that during his absence in Scotland he refurbished the Richardson manor house on Ballenger Creek (by 1775 described in some road records as “James Marshalls Branch”).

Perhaps the most visible demonstration that he was in America and Frederick County to stay, in 1779 Marshall entered into a contract with Edward Crabb for “rent of the middle ferry on Monocasy and plantation thereto adjoining.” Marshall’s 1779 contract with Crabb for the ferry operation suggested his continued investment in and development of his riverside property through the 1770s. The plantation adjoining the ferry was technically Arcadia, or more specifically, the part of Arcadia made up of Henry and Ballengers Endeavour that reached across the river to the eastern bank along the Georgetown Road.

In February 1785, James Marshall entered into a bond agreement for £100 with Thomas Basford. The contract was a ten-month lease agreement, for which “Thomas Basford hath rented of the said James Marshall the middle
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24 FRDB, N/473; James Marshall, “of Frederick County,” sold 295 acres, part of Arcadia (the part within Resurvey on Mill Lott and Ballengers Endeavour) to Charles Beatty for £330.
26 FR Co. Court Minutes, Nov. 1771, Maryland State Archives.
27 Note: “A quarter was a plantation separate from the one where the owner lived, and typically was managed by an overseer and contained housing for enslaved workers. The term quarter appeared in tax lists and indicated that the land was not the principal residence of the owner.” (Maryland Archives, “Understanding Maryland Records, Quarter,” found online at www.mdarchives.state.md.us).
ferry on Monocassy [sic] with the dwelling house & plantation adjoining,”
a similar arrangement to the Crabb lease of 1779. Following Basford,
Robert Hammitt (Hammit, Hammet) leased the ferry and apparently
operated a tavern on the east bank of Monocacy as well. Hammitt
continued to operate Marshall’s Ferry, possibly as late as 1794 when the
Dennis Griffith Map of Maryland showed a tavern stand on the east side
of the crossing under the name “Hammett.” The National Park Service
conducted an archeological investigation of the tavern/ferry house site
in the 2004, 2006, and 2008 field seasons. The excavations yielded a large
number of artifacts and provided the footprint of the tavern building.30

Marshall built a new manor house, constructed on Wett Work, around
1780, and his influence around the middle Monocacy neighborhood south
of Frederick increased.31 In addition to developing relationships with the
local gentry, Marshall frequently delved into the more mundane needs of
his ferry, his land, and the monetary needs of his less fortunate neighbors,
although not always in their favor.32 Loans of cash, recorded in the form of
mortgages, at times resulted in the conveyance of the mortgaged property to
Marshall. His purchases, sales, contracts, and friendships helped to shape the
surrounding neighborhood for the century to come.

Beginning in 1784 James Marshall became an independent agent for
neighboring landowner Daniel Dulany “to improve his Estate here [in
Frederick] & other good services,” including the facilitation of land sales,
contracts, and evictions among his duties.33 In 1794, he served as agent
for Dulany in arranging the sale of 457 acres of Locust Level, located
immediately north of Marshall’s Arcadia between the Georgetown and

29 FR Co. Court Papers, Bond, Feb. 1785, Maryland State Archives.
30 Joy Beasley, ed., Archeological Overview, Assessment, Identification and
Evaluation Study of the Thomas Farm (National Park Service, National
Capital region, 2010), 123 ff.
31 Williams, History, 322; Williams states that Marshall built the brick house on
Araby “about 1780.”
32 FR Court Papers, Aug. 1786 and 1787, Maryland State Archives. Two cases
involving two neighbors, one against John Richardson “to recover damages
for a smooth gun … converted by the Defendant to his own use,” and one
against Wm. Hall Jr. to collect a bond “passed for Benj. Beckwiths Debt for a
Horse he bot [sic].”
33 James Marshall to Daniel Dulany, May 3, 1791, Dulany Papers, Special
Collections, Maryland Historical Society (MdHS), Baltimore, MD.
Buckeystown roads. Victoire Vincendiere and her family, refugees from the slave revolt in the French West Indian colony of St. Domingue, purchased the property. Marshall then sold part of his Arcadia to the Vincendieres a few years later for £10 per acre, and there is evidence that he prepared that parcel for their occupation by 1794, and perhaps as early as 1793. The French refugees named the combined acreage that they purchased L’Hermitage.

Although no documentation has been found to confirm a prior relationship between Marshall and the Vincendieres, their common association within the international trade network that had been around since long before the American and French revolutions, may have facilitated their acquaintance. The Vincendieres and a cousin, Payen Boisneuf, who accompanied them, had been coffee and sugar planters in St. Domingue, and would have had associations with merchants, importers, and exporters like James Marshall.

Marshall’s arrangement with Dulany, serving as his agent, proved to be a disappointment. Dulany reportedly promised “due consideration” in payment for services performed by Marshall from 1793, but upon his death in 1797 the family refused to recognize the debt from the estate. Marshall felt swindled and expressed his frustration in a letter to Dulany’s widow stating, “so that taking a view of the family in a group I may truly say that I have found nothing but mean pitiful deceit and ingratitude at least from the most considerable part of that family.”

34 Marshall to Boisneuf, Dec. 12, 1794, Dulany Papers, Special Collections, MdHS. James Marshall, acting as agent for Daniel Dulany, contracted initially with Payen Boisneuf but by December 16th, the contract was finalized and signed by Victoire Vincendiere for 457 acres of Locust Level for £4,113. According to the contract, Boisneuf paid half of the purchase price (£2,579) as a deposit on the 13th of December to Dulany in Baltimore, on behalf of Victoire Vincendiere and with her money. The deed for the land was conveyed on the 24th of March 1795 when Victoire Vincendiere paid the remaining amount in full to Dulany (FRDB, WR 13/ 397).

35 Francis Sergeant Childs, French Refugee Life in the United States 1790–1800 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940), 51. Payen Boisneuf worked to arrange shipments of goods to and from St. Dominque prior to the slave revolt; he also served as a deputy of the National Assembly of France (Marriage Contract, 1790, Dugas-Kerblay Papers, The South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, SC)

36 James Marshall to Mrs. D. Dulany, Dec. 10, 1799, Dulany Papers, Special Collections, MdHS.
James Marshall completed the gentrification of his middle Monocacy neighborhood in 1801 with his sale to prominent Annapolis and Frederick lawyer Arthur Shaaff of 350 acres, part of *Arcadia* “clear of the River Monocacy.” The conveyance also specified reserving the ferry parcel for Marshall, with metes and bounds given for the reserved acreage (approximately 5 acres) identical to those noted in the deed to Victoire Vincendiere in 1798. The Marshall to Shaaff deed additionally included 100 acres of *Wett Work* and the seventeen and one-half-acre parcel of *Locust Level* that Marshall purchased from Daniel Dulany in 1791. The total purchase price was $15,000, indicating there were substantial improvements on the property.

When James Marshall died in the spring of 1803, he left behind a large estate of both real and personal property. The division of his estate among his children, in addition to his prior conveyances to Shaaff and Vincendiere, set the stage for the development of Monocacy in the years leading up to the Civil War.

**DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW REPUBLIC AND THE 1800S**

Despite the economic and political changes leading up to and throughout the American Revolution, travel and commerce continued in the Monocacy region. By 1774, the Maryland General Assembly defined the Georgetown Road as one of the “Principal market roads” of Frederick County, and appropriated $1,200 in the form of a loan for improvements to the road.

In the first decade of the 1800s, plans for construction of the National Road to the territory encompassed by the Louisiana Purchase spurred a rash of like-minded private road improvements. Local banks and public stock sales financed the turnpike road companies. Through the first half of the 1800s, a web of turnpikes, many of them improvements on already established public roads, spread across Maryland. In 1805, the Washington Turnpike Company was established, a corporation to improve the road between Frederick and Georgetown (and Washington, DC), beginning with a five-mile stretch between Georgetown and Rockville (Montgomery County Court House). On the heels of the road improvements came the Chesapeake & Ohio (C&O) Canal and the Baltimore & Ohio (B&O) Railroad in the 1830s. Each of these advancements in transportation, as they reached the western counties of Maryland, improved the ability of local farmers and mill operators to transport their products to markets.
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37 FRDB, WR 21/162.
38 FRWB, GM 3/577.
39 Archives of Maryland, Vol. 64, 394.
40 Turnpike Records, 1819–1845, Maryland State Archives.
more cost-effectively. The first half of the 1800s was the age of prosperity for Frederick City and its surrounding farmland.

An 1828 newspaper advertisement for construction of what must have been the final segment in the Washington Turnpike, provided a detailed description of the bridge that was to replace the old rope ferry that had operated since 1748:

**NOTICE TO BRIDGE BUILDERS AND TURNPIKE ROAD-MAKERS**

A Bridge across the river Monocacy, and for making between Three and four miles of Turnpike, on the road leading from Frederick to Georgetown. The Bridge to be about 300 feet in length, with stone abutments and pier 30 feet in height.\(^{41}\)

Other requirements included two 13-foot lanes and the bridge to be “covered with white pine or cedar shingles and weatherboarded.” Lewis Wernwag constructed the bridge and John McAleer oversaw construction of the turnpike and toll house, and according to Washington Turnpike Company president Nathan Lufborough, the new bridge and turnpike road was to intersect the old road by 1829.\(^ {42}\) Later Frederick County maps show the location of the toll house on the west side of the Georgetown Pike, just south of the point (now Evergreen Point) where the road divided from the Buckeystown Pike.\(^ {43}\) The new bridge moved the road more than 300 feet up river (northeast) of the old ferry landing. With the closing of the old roadbed leading to and from the ferry, nature and the plow obscured its trace on the west (Hermitage) side of the river. On the east side of the Monocacy, the abandoned “sunken” road trace was rediscovered and used as cover by Union troops during the 1864 Battle of Monocacy.\(^ {44}\)

**The Best Farm (Hermitage):** The Best Farm has been known as the Hermitage or South Hermitage, Resurvey on Locust Level, and originally as Locust Level. The farm also includes part of Arcadia. Locust Level was

\(^{41}\) Frederick Town Herald, May 24, 1828.

\(^{42}\) “Letter from Nathan Lufborough, President of the Washington Turnpike Co.,” 20th Congress, 2nd Session, 1829, MdHS, PAM 1793, as cited in “Central Maryland Transportation History Context,” Catoctin Center for Regional Studies, Frederick, MD, 2003.

\(^{43}\) 1858 Isaac Bond Map and 1873 Titus & Co. Atlas Map (Frederick District).

\(^{44}\) Glenn Worthington, *Fighting for Time* (Shippensburg, PA: White Mane Publishing Co., 1985, originally published, 1932), 125, 135, and 137–39. The metes and bounds description in a 1835 deed for the *Hermitage* referred to the “stone planted on the north side of said river [Monocacy], and on the west side of the old road leading from Frederick City to the City of Washington in the District of Columbia, then running across the said old road now shut up.” (FRDB, JS 49/146).
a land grant patented to Daniel Dulany in 1740. When Dulany originally acquired rights to the land, it contained 3,180 acres. In 1756, Dulany added more land and had the piece resurveyed into the Resurvey on Locust Level, with an increased total of 3,902 acres. Dulany was a speculator who acquired a large amount of land in Frederick County, which he subdivided and sold or leased. George Beckwith Sr. on June 10, 1761, leased from Daniel Dulany, esq., 100 acres of Locust Level, “for and during the natural lives of him the said George Beckwith and of Basil and Benjamin,” sons, and for the life of the longest lived of them. This was a typical colonial period lease in Maryland. The rent was £2, 10 shillings, annually, and the tenants “further shall keep in good tenantable repair the house already erected on the said devised premises, and to erect or build others of equal goodness.”

Daniel Dulany used preprinted standardized lease forms specifying the terms including a requirement for the planting and maintenance of 100 apple trees. The leases also specified a dwelling of a defined minimum size with a stone or brick chimney and a barn. The Beckwith lease describes acreage along the “Road from Frederick Town to the Mouth of Monocacy,” today’s Buckeystown Pike. This land would have been adjacent to or on land that eventually became the Hermitage.

On March 24, 1795, Daniel Dulany, Barrister at Law, Esquire, of Baltimore County sold to Mademoiselle Victoire Pauline Marie Gabrielle Delavincendiere (also spelled De La Vincendiere or just Vincendiere) part of Locust Level, containing 457 acres exactly, property that had been under contract of sale since December 16, 1794. For this land, Vincendiere paid £4,113, current money of Maryland. A few years later on April 27, 1798, Vincendiere purchased an additional tract of adjoining land, of 291 acres, part of the Resurvey on Locust Level, and part of Arcadia. This she bought from James Marshall for £2,910. Marshall acquired at least part of this land from Dulany in 1791. This second piece of land was located to the south of the first purchase, since Marshall owned adjoining land, which was part of Arcadia and Wett Work. These Marshall holdings bordered the southeast edge of Resurvey on Locust Level. The total acreage that Vincendiere assembled was 748 acres. However, the Vincendieres had been in residence on the property that Victoire bought from Marshall since at least 1794. The will of a fellow French refugee was written on the Hermitage property in December of 1794, and refers specifically to a chamber in one of the present dwellings, and also refers to the Hermitage

45 FRDB, K/64-65.
46 MS#1562[a], Dulany Legal Papers, MdHS.
47 FRDB, WR 13/397.
48 FRDB, WR 10/124.
49 Dr. Arthur Tracey, maps of Monocacy area land grants.
as the home of the Vincendieres. It was under Victoire Vincendiere’s ownership that the Hermitage, now known as the Best Farm, essentially took on its present appearance.

At the time she made the first purchase, Victoire Vincendiere, who was born in St. Domingue in 1776, according to census records, was only nineteen years old. Yet she owned and managed a substantial plantation with one of the largest enslaved populations in Frederick County. The 1800 Census for Frederick County lists Vincendiere as the head of a household of eighteen members (who apparently included a variety of other refugees), and with 90 enslaved laborers. The 1810 census lists her with seven household members and 90 enslaved persons, and the 1820 census shows her with 11 people in her household and 48 enslaved. The 1820 census also records “4 other free” which would mean free African Americans, and “2 not naturalized,” probably referring to two French citizens staying with the Vincendiere family.

In 1827, on June 14th, Vincendiere sold L’Hermitage to John Brien for $24,025. Brien, who already owned Arcadia, was involved with the iron industry in Frederick and Washington counties with the Johnson and McPherson families. Colonel John McPherson, John Brien’s father-in-law, owned the adjoining Araby property, which he assembled from Wett Work lands purchased from the estate of James Marshall.

John Brien died in 1829, and his estate was placed in equity court to settle his debts. John McPherson was appointed trustee to “sell and dispose of the real estate of John Brien, late of said county deceased, for the payment of his debts, all of which fully appear from the proceedings in [Court of Equity case] No. 1399 on the Equity Docket of Frederick County Court.” On January 29, 1835, McPherson sold the Hermitage to John H. McElfresh for $26,367. The property was the same that Vincendiere acquired, containing 748 acres.

The Hermitage property remained in the hands of McElfresh until his death in 1841. McElfresh had the property resurveyed into the Resurvey on the Hermitage in 1835 and acquired some additional land to make the total 761½ acres. In the 1835 Frederick County Tax Assessment, John H. McElfresh was assessed for 748 acres improved with a roughcast (stuccoed) house and stone barn. The property was valued at $4,987. Under McElfresh, rental of the farm continued. By 1836 the Hermitage was
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50 FR Survey Book THO 1, 510–12.
tenanted “on shares” by Thomas B. Murray, on which he grew 84 acres of wheat in four fields and five acres of rye.  

By the time that David Best began his lease on the Hermitage, it had been divided into two farms, North and South Hermitage. Best was possibly on the North Hermitage farm at least as early as 1843 according to a “mortgage” record in which Best secured a loan of $1,189 from Theresia McElfresh (widow of John McElfresh). David Best used his share of the crops “now growing on that part of the Hermittage [sic] farm in my occupancy” to secure his loan repayment. The arrangement continued on the South Hermitage farm when Ariana McElfresh (daughter of John McElfresh) and her husband Charles E. Trail in 1852 inherited the South Hermitage following a further division of the McElfresh lands. Ariana and C. E. Trail, already in possession of the North Hermitage, received the South Hermitage as well. David Best moved from the North Hermitage to the South Hermitage, most likely in 1852, after the Trails acquired the property. Agricultural Census records from 1850 and 1860 show that Best was farming an increased amount of land, reflecting the move to the larger South Hermitage farm.

John T. Best, son of David, took over the South Hermitage farm operation in 1863, although his father David apparently still lived on the property. The 1870 census listed David Best, in a separate household next to his son John, with his wife and their unmarried daughter Elizabeth. In 1880, John Best was still renting “for shares” on the 425-acre South Hermitage farm. According to Williams’s History of Frederick County, “For over forty years, he [John T. Best] carried on a flourishing dairy business, which was a source of much revenue to him.” In 1888, he moved from the Trail farm to his own nearby property.

The Wiles family’s lease of the South Hermitage, beginning in 1924 with Courtney Wiles, brought a renewed commitment to dairy farming and some of the most significant physical changes on the farm. In the 1930s government sanitation regulations required that dairy cattle be housed

51 FRDB, HS 4/306. The wheat and rye was to be harvested and Murray’s share to be used as payment for his debt in the amount of $233 to McElfresh.
52 FRDB, HS 18/474.
53 FRDB, ES 1/530. In a deposition by John T. Best, son of David Best, he indicated that they occupied the South Hermitage beginning in 1852 (C. E. Trail Quartermaster Claim, #R-153, RG 92, NARA, Washington, DC).
54 1850 and 1860 Agricultural Census schedules, Maryland State Archives.
55 Deposition by John T. Best, son of David Best, C. E. Trail Quartermaster Claim, #R-153, RG 92, NARA.
separately from other farm livestock. In response Wiles constructed a state-of-the-art concrete block dairy barn, just north of a frame bank barn rebuilt after a fire in 1878. The Wiles family operated the farm until 1999. The Trail heirs conveyed to the National Park Service the “Charles B. Trail Farm,” 273.69 acres of the South Hermitage farm in 1993.

The Thomas Farm (Araby) and Gambrill (Araby) Mills: Known as the C. K. Thomas Farm during the Battle of Monocacy, Araby was a tract of 1,111½ acres, assembled by John McPherson, resurveyed by John McPherson Jr. and renamed “Araby” in 1832. It is mostly made up of land grants called “Wett Work” and “Altogether.” Most of today’s Araby farm is on the original land grant, “Wett Work.” Araby existed only until 1844.

James Marshall made his will in 1799, and it was proved in 1803. Marshall was actively acquiring lands of Wett Work in 1759 and 1760. In 1800, however, census records listed him in the Frederick Town District, in a household that included four members and 16 enslaved persons. He maintained contacts with family in Glasgow and returned to Scotland for at least seven months in 1771. He left provisions for these people in his will.

James Marshall’s will reveals that he wanted his property to be sold, and he provided for the subdivision of his land if necessary. When Marshall died in 1803, his three children, William, Chloe, and Eleanor (Harding), divided his lands among themselves. When Chloe died in 1807, William acquired 410 acres with the manor house and the ferry operation, the northern part of Marshall’s Wett Work. That 410 acres was the same that William Marshall conveyed to Col. John McPherson in 1812, and which became the heart of Araby. Eleanor’s 500 acres were located to the southwest of the 410 acres that became Araby.

At the same time, Thomas Johnson had land called “Altogether” created from a group of earlier surveys to him and to others in a “Patent of Confirmation” in 1805. Altogether contained 4,289½ acres and was located to the east and north of Wett Work. Then, Johnson began selling off portions of the assembled tracts. Some of these eventually became part of Araby.

The final piece of Araby came in 1819, when John L. Harding (husband of Eleanor Marshall), sold to John McPherson Jr., part of Altogether, 119 acres, for $3,808. This was part of a 200-acre parcel of Altogether, which Harding acquired from Henry Bantz on May 19, 1810. Bantz had acquired 600 acres of Altogether from Thomas Johnson earlier in 1810.
Properties that John McPherson and his son John purchased were eventually resurveyed to form Araby in 1831. Colonel John McPherson, the elder, died on October 21, 1829. The property that was to become Araby was devised by will to John McPherson Jr., the son, except for portions he already owned. McPherson (the younger) then commissioned a resurvey of the various tracts, creating Araby with 1,111½ acres. John McPherson the younger established the mill at Araby in 1830, about the time of the construction of the B & O Railroad. He may have had plans for some industry on the property earlier, since he bought and carefully recorded the water rights associated with a distillery that John L. Harding (son-in-law of James Marshall) formerly operated. The Araby mill was designed to be a merchant mill and probably was created with the new rail service in mind for a profitable operation of buying local grain and selling processed flour in Baltimore.

By 1844 John McPherson and his wife Fanny were deeply in debt. In February of 1844 in a deed of trust, John and Fanny McPherson conveyed to William J. Ross, attorney and trustee, their real estate and personal property to sell for the payment of debts. This transaction set into motion the break-up of Araby only 13 years after it was created.

The “Mansion House Farm” with the brick house that James Marshall built was sold in two parcels to Worthington R. Johnson on April 23, 1844, for $15,302. These same two parcels were sold on August 4, 1847, to Isaac Baugher for $14,841.51. The Araby Mills property containing 66 acres was sold separately to Elias Crutchley in 1844.

In 1852, Isaac Baugher’s heirs sold the 226-acre Araby mansion farm to Griffin Taylor. Taylor had previously purchased adjoining acreage to the south from William Ross in 1847. Griffin Taylor died in 1855, and his property was sold at public sale. Among other properties, his real estate included the Araby Farm, and adjoining Clifton Farm to the south.

Taylor’s trustees, Godfrey Koontz and Michael Kreps, handled the public sale of his real estate. In April of 1856, the property transferred to John F. Wheatley and T. Alfred Ball of Georgetown. At this point the Araby mansion farm property contained slightly more than 254 acres, and Wheatley and Ball purchased it at public sale for $19,606.12½. Griffin Taylor was living in the house at the time of his death, apparently having moved there from Clifton. In the 1850 census records, Griffin Taylor
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was listed in the Buckeystown District as a farmer with property valued at $55,000 (a substantial amount) and a wife, nine children, and one mulatto laborer. (In the 1850 slave census, Griffin Taylor is listed in the Buckeystown District with 18 enslaved laborers.)

Wheatley and Ball were partners and shortly after purchasing Araby and the adjoining Clifton, they formed a business relationship with James H. Gambrill, owner of the Araby Mill, to operate a distillery, which they built at Gambrill’s Araby Mills. The firm was known as “Wheatley and Gambrill”; Ball farmed Clifton and Araby to raise the necessary grain (rye or barley), Gambrill ground it into malt, and Wheatley ran the distillery. The timing was not right to begin this seemingly cost-efficient operation, however. An economic recession occurred in 1857, which continued until the onset of the Civil War in 1861. The distillery failed in 1860. On the 24th of August 1860, John F. Wheatley and his wife, Catherine, and Turner A. Ball, and his wife, Elizabeth, sold Araby to Christian Keefer Thomas for $17,823.75. Stability came to Araby with C. K. Thomas’s purchase, as the family owned it for the next 50 years.

According to Scharf’s *History of Western Maryland*, Col. C. K. Thomas was a native of Frederick County but had moved to Baltimore where he was a merchant. In 1860, he returned to Frederick County and purchased Araby. He was hardly settled there when the Civil War intruded. In 1863, during the Gettysburg Campaign, General Winfield Scott Hancock made Araby his headquarters for three days. In 1864, during the Battle of Monocacy, the house suffered damage. Eight shells penetrated the house, with most damage being on the west side. Union sharpshooters were stationed in the house, and interior damage included destruction of the dining room wall, which was “beaten down.” One month after the battle, eight Union generals held a council of war in one of the upper rooms of the house. These included Generals Grant, Hunter, Ricketts, Crook, and Sheridan.

Upon C. K. Thomas’s death, Araby was sold to Samuel S. Thomas and Alice Thomas Anderson, for $15,277.50 in May 1894. The acreage was nearly the same that C. K. Thomas acquired back in 1860, 257 acres, two rods, and 20 square perches. When Alice Thomas Anderson who lived in Washington, DC, died, Araby conveyed on September 7, 1910, to Eugene Sponseller of Frederick City for $20,317.15. Eugene Sponseller and his
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wife Amanda only had Araby for a year, selling it on September 6, 1911, to William G. Baker.\textsuperscript{62}

Sometime between 1932 and 1949, William Baker Jr. moved to Baltimore County, where he died. In June 1949, his executors sold the Araby farm, containing 257 acres to C. Edward Hilgenberg for $32,000.\textsuperscript{63} In August 1954, C. Edward and Anne J. Hilgenberg conveyed the property to Robert E. and Josephine R. Clapp. At this point, the acreage conveyed was 240, being most of the traditional Araby farm but with a few adjustments, including right-of-way to the State Roads Commission for the path of Maryland Route 240, essentially following the route of today’s I-270.\textsuperscript{64} The National Park Service acquired Araby in 2002 from the Clapp family.

\textbf{The Gambrill House, “Edgewood”:} Despite the hard times experienced by the Wheatley and Gambrill partnership in the 1850s, James Gambrill continued to develop the Araby Mills into a successful business over the next several decades. The physical expression of his success, his palatial Second Empire residence, which he called “Edgewood,” was built in 1872. Described in detail in a 1991 HABS report, the house was “one of the largest single-family residences ever built in Frederick County” and is “one of its very few full-scale Empire style houses.”\textsuperscript{65} Gambrill’s richly furnished house, with 17 rooms, servant’s quarters, and a ballroom, was a center of gracious entertainment.\textsuperscript{66}

In 1844, the Gambrill property included the three-story stone merchant flour mill; a sawmill on a stone foundation, 50 by 15 feet; a two-story stone chopping and plaster mill, 50 by 20 feet; a 1½ story stone miller’s house with an attached stone kitchen (Pendleton, \textit{HABS Report, Gambrill House}, 1991). Gambrill purchased the mills in 1855. Unfortunately by 1897 the milling operation at Araby Mills had failed, and Gambrill was forced to sell.\textsuperscript{67} In the early 1900s, about 1925, Ai and Fannie Smith converted the mill to a house by removing the upper story and changing the roof from gabled to hipped. The original miller’s house may have been removed about the same time.
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In 1872, James H. Gambrill built his new mansion house on high ground overlooking the mill. Constructed in the Second Empire style, the house, Edgewood, is a large brick L-shaped building with a mansard roof and tower. After a financial failure, Gambrill sold the property on December 6, 1897, to his daughter, Minnie Leigh Mercer, and her husband, Carroll Mercer. By 1901, the Mercers had divorced, and the property was sold to Alexander R. Magruder, a wealthy naval officer. The Magruders changed the name of the house to “Boscobel.” In 1922, the Magruders, now divorced and remarried, sold the house and mill to Ai B. Smith and his wife Fannie. The property remained in the Smith family until 1961 when heirs of Fannie Smith sold it to A. Earl and Jean J. Vivino. In 1967, the Vivinos undertook a major remodeling campaign to convert the Gambrill House into a private medical treatment facility with accommodations for patients. Earl Vivino sold the tract to the Federal Government in 1981 for inclusion into Monocacy National Battlefield. Edgewood/Boscobel was individually listed in the National Register in 1984. There was also a crop barn, stable, and a servant’s quarter behind the Gambrill house. These buildings were all removed.

The Lewis Farm (McPherson Hill Farm): The “Lewis Farm” is located along the east side of Baker Valley Road opposite Araby and north of I-270 at the eastern edge of the Monocacy Battlefield. The property is a diamond-shaped piece with Baker Valley Road forming one side of the tract and the Old Georgetown Road forming another. It was once part of John McPherson’s “Hill Farm,” which he acquired from John L. Harding, in 1819. The Harding purchase contained 119 acres of Altogether and New Bremen. The 1819 purchase eventually became part of Araby in 1832. There are actually two historic farmsteads within this Hill Farm property: the “Lewis Farm” belonging to the National Park Service and another located just to the north. The particular property on the Monocacy Battlefield lands is that known as Tract 101–26. It contains 60.97 acres. The National Park Service acquired it in 1989 from Betty B. Geisbert et al. This same conveyance also included the adjoining Baker Farm on the opposite side of Baker Valley Road.

Thomas Johnson created Altogether to consolidate his holdings in 1805. New Bremen was a land grant surveyed in 1786 for John Amelung and patented the following year. New Bremen contained 1,822 acres, and it was on this property, off Park Mills Road, that the Amelung Glass Works
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was established. The Hill Farm would have been at the very western edge of this piece.

John L. Harding acquired 200 acres of Altogether in 1810 and operated a distillery on the property, piping water from a spring to the distillery. In 1819, when Harding sold 119 acres of his portion of Altogether to McPherson, he relinquished the rights to the water from the spring to his distillery. The distillery was not on the 119 acre parcel that Harding sold, but was adjacent to it.

The Hill Farm was eventually sold when Araby was broken up. In a deed made April 24, 1849, William J. Ross, trustee, John McPherson, and Fannie R. McPherson conveyed the property then containing 104 acres, 1 rod, and 14 perches to Henry Layman. The property is described as all that part of the “Hill Farm, being part of Araby, next to the Mansion Farm part of Araby, bounded by the road to Georgetown and a county road from the Georgetown Road to Buckeystown” (Baker Valley Road) and bounded by the “Still House Lot.”

Henry Layman owned the Hill Farm until his death in February 1856. His will left to his wife Lydia “my plantation whereon I now live” containing 110 acres more or less, for her life and after her decease to be sold and the proceeds divided. (Lydia may be the Lydia Layman who was listed in census records as a domestic for C. K. Thomas). Henry Layman is shown on this property in the 1853 Isaac Bond Map of Frederick County. By 1863 Henry Layman’s wife had died, and the heirs sold the property to C. K. Thomas for $4,434.75 on December 28, 1863.

Unfortunately, no records have been found to show how the property passed from C. K. Thomas and who owned it next. It is shown with the name “H. Lewis” on the 1873 Frederick County Atlas map. Later records show, however, that Charles E. Trail eventually owned the Hill Farm.

Apparently, Charles E. Trail acquired the farm in bits and pieces during the late 1800s. Among the transactions to Trail was one from Jacob Lewis who was serving as executor for a property containing 50 acres. It had come to Elizabeth Lewis from Hobart and Rebecca Lewis in November 1878. This could be the connection that explains the “H. Lewis” label
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on the 1873 Atlas map on this property, and why it is now referred to as the Lewis Farm.

Upon Charles E. Trail’s death, his land holdings passed to his heirs and eventually sold. The farm is described as the one which C.E. Trail devised in trust for the use and benefit of his son, Arthur Trail, for his life, and at Arthur’s death, the farm was to be sold and the proceeds were to be divided among C. E. Trail’s residuary legatees. When the farm sold, the tenants living there, Frank and Clinton Whitmore, purchased it. Charles C. Geisbert acquired the property on April 30, 1945, from Pearl I. Whitmore, widow, and Charlotte M. Whitmore, unmarried. The property was described as the Whitmore Farm containing 216 acres and 22 square perches of land. The National Park Service acquired the farm in 1989.

Wallace’s Headquarters Area (Railside Properties): On the east side of the Monocacy River along the B&O Railroad is a cluster of properties that were once part of the community known as Frederick Junction, Monocacy Junction, or Araby. These were the names given to a siding and junction area near the railroad bridge across the Monocacy River. The actual junction or split in the railroad is located west of the river, but the small community that developed in the vicinity was on the east side. It was from here that goods produced at Araby Mills and distillery shipped out by rail. General Lew Wallace also maintained headquarters here during the Battle of Monocacy. On high ground north of the railroad, the Union Army established defensive positions during the battle and throughout the war to protect the rail crossing. A public road once ran through the settlement, north to south, linking roads to the north at Crum’s Ford across the Monocacy and ultimately the National Pike with the Georgetown Pike. This road provided access to the railroad from Araby Mills and distillery as well as access to the National Road and served farmers living all along its route.

According to Scharf’s History of Western Maryland, the vicinity known as Frederick Junction included a post office and a community of railroad workers and tradesmen in the 1880s. Although it is not clear just when this railside community developed, the B&O Railroad has a definite construction period and figures importantly in the development of the Monocacy area. By 1831, condemnation proceedings were underway for lands in the railroad’s path, both for the main line and for the spur into Frederick, indicating that construction was planned for both routes.
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simultaneously. Key landowners in the Monocacy battlefield area when the railroad was developed were Col. John McPherson, John Brien McPherson, and Horatio McPherson, who among them owned Araby, Hermitage, and Arcadia. In fact, as the right-of-way proceedings were underway in the late summer and fall of 1831, John McPherson was having Araby surveyed and patented, and he had established the Araby Mills along the proposed route of the new railroad in 1830. Brien had purchased Hermitage from Victoire Vincendiere in 1827. The McPhersons and Briens (who were related) probably acquired these properties to take advantage of opportunities that would come with the railroad.

The portion of this junction area on the east side of the river was part of the Araby tract. When Araby was broken apart in the 1840s, the railside area became part of the Araby Mills property. In 1897, James Gambrill, owner of the Araby Mills since 1855, was forced to sell the property because his business had failed. The advertisement of sale of the Gambrill Mill property includes a description of the railside properties at that time: “There is on this property [Araby Mills tract] a private switch and brick warehouse along the main stem of the B&O R.R. Also a stone and weatherboard dwelling house two stories high, in good condition. The trustees reserve off of this property a small lot containing about 1¼ acres of land sold by James H. Gambrill to one William M. Moler with the right to convey the same.” There was also a private siding for the mill and to accommodate the warehouse. The warehouse was actually an adaptive reuse of the unsuccessful distillery that had been built by the partnership consisting of Gambrill, Wheatley, and Ball. However, it is possible, even likely, that some buildings may have been at the rail siding as early as the 1830s, when John McPherson built the Araby mill, knowing full well that the railroad was coming.

The railside properties are on three separate parcels as acquired by the National Park Service: 101–01, 101–02, and 101–29. The first two are on the south side of the railroad tracks and the third is on the north side, including part of the old road trace and the Civil War fortifications. Parcels 101–01 and 101–02 adjoin each other and were part of a larger nine acre and 20 perches tract that James Gambrill conveyed to the partnership consisting of himself, John F. Wheatley, and T. A. Ball, on August 12, 1857. The distillery was on the parcel that came to be the National Park Service acquisition 101–02. The nine-acre distillery lot was part of the larger Araby Mill property, containing 65 acres, which James H. Gambrill purchased from
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George M. and Margaret Delaplaine on March 31, 1855 for $10,000.\textsuperscript{78} The 65 acres included part of Araby and part of the Resurvey on the Hermitage. The Delaplaines acquired the property in 1847 from William Ross, the attorney/trustee handling the sale of John McPherson’s estate.\textsuperscript{79}

Parcel 101–02 comes from a different part of the nine-acre tract that Benjamin Brown purchased from Wheatley, Ball, and Gambrill. This piece went through numerous transactions and includes the site of the buildings pictured in Williams’s History.

Most sources agree that General Lew Wallace had headquarters in a frame house on the south side of the railroad, just east of the bridge. That area would be encompassed by parcel 101–02, which at the time of the battle was owned by Eleanora Lyeth although it was mortgaged to the former owner, Benjamin Brown. According to research assembled by Monocacy Battlefield personnel, Captain John McF. Lyeth was in the Union service in the First Maryland Regiment, and he owned the house where Wallace established his headquarters. The railroad properties need further archeological study to establish their age and the extent of resources standing at the time of the battle.

The third parcel making up the railside properties at Monocacy is the 6.38-acre piece on the north side of the railroad. This is identified on National Park Service maps as parcel 101–29. It is bounded on the west by the Monocacy River and on the south by the B&O Railroad. This is part of a 45-acre tract from Araby. When Araby was subdivided and sold in the 1840s, John Markell purchased this piece, described as “lot No. 15,” on July 1, 1844.\textsuperscript{80} The Markell family assembled several farms along the north side of the railroad totaling 859 acres. The property descended through the Markell family until 1944, when John Usher Markell sold Markell Farm #3 to William F. Atkinson, et al. Farm #3 contained a little more than 355 acres, including the old 45-acre piece from Araby. There was also a reservation of a right-of-way for ingress and egress to the farm on an 8-acre tract of woodland. This reserved right-of-way may be the path of the old road to Frederick Junction.

Depressions in the ground near and along the old road trace to the junction are manufactured trenches, and a rectangular hole dug nearby has the appearance of having been part of a powder magazine. These fortifications probably predate the Battle of Monocacy, since the railroad junction was
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an important place on a major Union supply and transportation route. The B&O was guarded (with mixed success) throughout the war.

During the late 1800s, Frederick Junction was a viable community. However, by the turn of the century the situation gradually began to change. In 1897, James H. Gambrill was forced to sell the mill and his other property to pay debts. With the mill business diminishing, the warehouse activity stopped and the action at the Araby siding slowed. None of the cluster of buildings that formed the little community at the railroad tracks remains; only foundations and rubble mark what was once there. The road, which once gave access to the rail siding, ceased to be used and became overgrown, although still discernable. The Civil War fortification remnants lie protected by undisturbed woodland.

**The Baker Farm:** The Baker Farm has had a much more stable history of ownership than Araby, and the Araby (Gambrill) Mill. Only three families have owned the property for its entire history. For the early history of this farm, the story of the assemblage of Wett Work and James Marshall’s resurvey is told above in the discussion of Araby.

According to the August 28, 1806 deed from Chloe Marshall to Eleanor Marshall Harding, wife of John Lackland Harding, for the sum of £5, Chloe relinquished 500 acres, the southern part of Marshall’s Wett Work.\(^{81}\) The low price indicates that this was an in-family transaction to distribute the property under the terms of James Marshall’s will.

The 500 acres was in the vicinity of other property that John L. Harding owned to the east (later the McPherson Hill Farm), and upon which he operated a distillery. The Hardings retained the land until September 28, 1841, when trustees William Ross, Madison Nelson, and James M. Harding sold 512 acres to Griffin Taylor at $35 per acre or $17,920.\(^{82}\) This is the same Griffin Taylor who purchased portions of Araby in 1847 and 1852. Taylor kept the whole property for only a month, selling 380 acres of it to Daniel and Edward Baker on October 25, 1841, and retaining 132 acres which became part of Taylor’s Clifton farm.\(^{83}\) Taylor purchased the 512 acres as the result of an equity court decree declared July 25, 1839, in a case where Griffin Taylor was the complainant and James M. Harding et al. the defendants. Probably, James M. Harding was the son of John L. Harding.
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and Eleanor Marshall Harding and was named after his grandfather, James Marshall. The equity court proceeding may have had to do with the settlement of the estate of John L. Harding.

The 1800 census lists John Harding in the Buckeystown District with nine people in his household and one enslaved person. In the 1810 census (which did not provide district names), a J. Harding is listed as head of a household with nine people and one enslaved person. The tax assessment for Frederick County in 1825 included John L. Harding in District 1 (Buckeystown) with 500 acres, part of Wett Work (the land from Eleanor), 81 acres of Altogether (the remainder of 200 acres Harding had purchased from Henry Bantz in 1810 and subsequently sold 119 acres to John McPherson in 1819), and five acres of New Bremen. In the 1830 census, Harding was listed in Frederick Town with a household of 10 members and five enslaved persons. In the 1835 tax assessment, John L. Harding, still in District 1, is taxed for 616 acres, part of Wett Work, Altogether, and New Bremen. In this same assessment, a Sarah Harding is recorded with 93 acres of Wett Work and a stone house. Sarah Harding was the wife of James M. Harding, who is presumed to have been the son of John L. and Eleanor Marshall Harding.

Neither the 1808 Varlé map nor the 1856 Isaac Bond show any Harding property or Harding’s distillery. The house that is now the centerpiece of the Baker Farm is a replacement dwelling built about 1914 when the Geisbert family acquired the farm. Therefore, the present dwelling does not offer any clues to what might have been standing when the Hardings owned the property.

The 380 acres of the 500 that Harding conveyed remained in the hands of Daniel and Edward Baker until January 6, 1849, when the two brothers divided the property. In this division, Daniel received 214 acres that came to be known as the “Baker Farm” and Edward got 150 acres adjoining to the southwest. The farm remained in the hands of Daniel Baker until his death. On October 12, 1903, William D. Baker, acting as administrator for the estate of Daniel Baker of F., sold the Baker Farm to David A. Baker for $7,063.
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On March 30, 1914, David Baker sold the Baker Farm to Charles G. Geisbert. The acreage was the same as previously recorded. The property remained in the Geisbert family until acquired by the National Park Service in 1989. The Geisbergs continue to farm the land and occupy the house and farm buildings.

The Worthington Farm (Clifton): The Worthington Farm, known as Clifton, is located immediately west of Araby, west of I-270, and northwest of the Baker Farm. Containing approximately 300 acres, the farm was assembled by Griffin Taylor from portions of adjoining tracts in the 1840s. A curve in the Monocacy River forms the northern and western boundaries of the property, and the east boundary is the crest of Brooks Hill. A long, thin neck of land extends to the northeast from the main body of the Clifton land, along the river to the Georgetown Pike. This constituted the original access corridor to the property. On the west side of the Monocacy, opposite this farm, Ballenger Creek enters the river. Just above this juncture is the old colonial period fording place, which gave access to Ballenger’s mill and a small settlement near the mouth of the creek. This ford was a main Confederate crossing place during the Monocacy battle. Known at the time of the battle as the Worthington Ford, it was the route used by Confederate forces to cross the river to clash with Ricketts’s Division of the US Army’s Sixth Corps.

In 1835, Griffin Taylor purchased Arcadia, containing about 400 acres, from John McPherson, who was acting as trustee for the estate of John Brien. Presumably Taylor moved into the manor house on Arcadia (located on the west side of the river), which had previously been Brien’s residence. James Marshall made the original grant for Arcadia in 1793, for 881 acres. Eventually, Taylor sold 287 of his 400 acres of Arcadia to Michael Keefer in 1851. He kept the 121 acres that were on the east side of the Monocacy.

Griffin Taylor was a transplant from Berkeley County, Virginia (now West Virginia), arriving in Frederick County, Maryland around 1834. In that year Taylor transported 16 enslaved laborers into Maryland, which he was required to record at the county courthouse, “and at the same time also made oath, that it is bonefide his intention to become a citizen of the State.” In January 1835, Taylor imported eight more enslaved persons and was in the process of finalizing the purchase of land on the west side of
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Monocacy River, *Arcadia*. Over the next 15 years Taylor added substantially to his land holdings with several purchases of Araby tracts, including the Mansion House Farm and the 512-acre parcel that had been Eleanor Marshall Harding’s inheritance.  

In 1852 he began construction of the complex of buildings which he named Clifton. It seems that Taylor’s intent was to create a separate landholding and residential seat, east of the Monocacy and adjoining Araby. Taylor eventually acquired the Araby Mansion Farm in 1852 and moved his residence there. Thus, if Taylor lived at Clifton at all, it was only for a very short time.

Griffin Taylor died in 1855, at the age of 51. His trustees, Godfrey Koontz and Michael Keefer, advertised the two farms, Araby and Clifton, for sale in 1856. The buyers were John F. and Catherine Wheatley of Baltimore and Turner A. and Elizabeth Ball of the District of Columbia. In the sale advertisement published in the Frederick Examiner, Clifton is described as adjoining Araby, containing 300 acres: “280 acres are in a high state of cultivation, the residue in Timber, and is acknowledged to be one of the most productive Farms in Frederick County. There is running water in every field. The improvements consist of a new [emphasis added] TWO-STORY BRICK HOUSE AND KITCHEN, a good Frame barn and Corn Crib, sufficiently large to house 400 barrels of corn; with a large number of FRUIT TREES.”

When the distillery venture failed, Wheatley and Ball sold Clifton to John T. Worthington. Apparently T. A. Ball continued to live at Clifton until 1862, when the farm was sold. Worthington was yet another wealthy landowner of Frederick County. In the 1850 Agricultural Census, John T. Worthington was recorded with 6,770 acres of improved land, and 2,490 acres unimproved, all in the New Market District (that would be east of the Georgetown Pike and east of the Monocacy River). The value of the real property was $124,080. In addition, he had livestock valued at $13,895. His farm implements were valued at $3,810. These figures, when compared with other Monocacy producers discussed above, show that John T. Worthington by far outproduced his neighbors.

The 1880 general census lists John T. Worthington, aged 54, occupation farmer, with Mary, 48, keeping house; Glenn H., 22, working on farm,
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Clark, 16, working on farm. In addition the household included Miranda Snowden, 55-year-old African American servant; John H. Posey, a 14-year-old African American farm laborer (the Posey family lived nearby, and had their own separate listing in the census); and James King, a 15-year old African American farm laborer.

The various tenant farmers in the Monocacy area during this period, like most of those who owned their farmland, described their farming operation as “General Farming.” This term implied a trend away from concentrating production on a primary cash crop such as wheat toward a more varied production including orchard products, more livestock, and increased production of corn. Although all of these products had always been present on mid-Maryland farms to some degree, and the term “general” has always applied, there was now greater emphasis on a variety of products geared toward urban markets. Throughout this period of more generalized farming, increased numbers of dedicated buildings appeared on farmsteads: poultry houses, hog barns, hay barns, wagon sheds, corncribs, silos, and milk houses, all reflecting specific uses.

ENSLAVED WORKERS AT MONOCACY
The property owners associated with the Monocacy farms were owners of enslaved laborers from the 1700s through the Civil War.

Victoire Vincendiere was a member of a French-colonial planter family from St. Domingue who came to Frederick County in 1793 at the age of 17 as a refugee, along with her mother, cousin, Payen Boisneuf, and brother and sisters. Vincendiere purchased and developed a plantation, L’Hermitage, on the west side of the Monocacy River, known on the Monocacy Battlefield as the Best Farm. Maryland law did not allow importation of enslaved laborers, but it made an exception for French refugees, to allow them to bring in up to five personal servants per family through an “Act for relief of certain Foreigners who have settled within this state, further supplementary to the Act for Naturalization; passed the 22nd of December 1792.”93 The head of the household was allowed five enslaved laborers under Maryland’s law, single men were allowed three. However, planter refugees seem to have ignored or circumvented the law and brought large numbers of enslaved laborers into the state, as the Maryland Gazette recorded ships “loaded with Negroes” entering the port of Baltimore from St. Domingue.94

94 Maryland Gazette, July 11, 1793.
According to Maryland “Declarations of Negroes,” which listed the names of enslaved persons brought into Maryland, on November 5, 1793, Etienne Paul Marie de la Vincendiere (Victoire’s older brother) had sent from Saint-Domingue three slaves, Marianne, about 40, Cecele, her daughter, 18, and Souris, 15. Magnan de la Vincendiere, Victoire’s mother, as head of household, had five slaves sent to Maryland: Janvier, 24, François, surnamed Arajon, 20, Jean, surnamed Sans-nom, 16, Veronique, 16, and Maurice, a mulatto, 15. Payen Boisneuf (cousin of Magnan de la Vincendiere) had three slaves sent: Pierre Louis, about 35 years old, Lambert, about five years old, and Fillile, about eight years old. Victoire, as a single young woman, was allowed to declare one slave, Saint Louis, about 14 years old. The declaration was made in Frederick Town on December 24, 1793. Some of these enslaved persons are mentioned in other records pertaining to the Vincendieres. Veronique and Janvier listed as the property of Magnan de la Vincendiere in the Maryland slave declaration were sent to Charleston, South Carolina, to serve her husband, Etienne de la Vincendiere, and are named in his 1802 will.

The Vincendieres had been planters near Saint-Marc in western Saint-Domingue. Etienne Bellumeau de la Vincendiere’s coffee plantation, known by the name Boucan Roche, [at?] the Grands Cahos (10–12 leagues from St. Marc) had 225 enslaved laborers, two brand new mills to hull coffee beans, and storehouses with brand new large windows, according to notes left by Etienne de la Vincendiere. “We have always heard that when he left St. Marc in January 1793 he had more than 500,000 weight of coffee, already in storage or on the plants, which were burned and plundered.”

His wife’s family, through her mother, Marie-Françoise Sterlin De Magnan, had a plantation on the Plaine de l’Artibonite that produced indigo, and Payen Boisneuf had a plantation in the vicinity of St. Marc that produced sugar. All of these plantations were in the western section of St. Domingue.

When the slave rebellion erupted in the French colony of St. Domingue in the 1790s, these families along with thousands of other refugees fled.
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96 Inventory of coffee plantation for indemnity claim, Dugas-Kerblay papers, 14 MSS, 1793–1830, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.
97 État Détailé Des Liquidations, Paris, 1834, Special Collections, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, LA.
The enslaved population, which by the late 1700s greatly outnumbered the planters and tradesmen, revolted beginning in 1791, and by 1804 successfully established the republic of Haiti. The revolt spawned brutal violence inflicted on both sides. While homeless French refugees found asylum in numerous havens throughout the Atlantic and Gulf coasts after 1791, some of the Vincendiere family came to Maryland in 1793. Baltimore was a major harbor for the French fleeing both the revolution in France and the St. Domingue slave uprising. Frederick County, about 40 miles west of Baltimore, was the most populous jurisdiction in the state at the time, according to 1790 census records, and also among the most prosperous. However, Victoire Vincendiere and her mother Magnan likely fled first to Charleston, South Carolina, and migrated from there to Baltimore and Frederick, Maryland in late 1793. Captain Watson’s ship, Carolina, that carried Victoire to Maryland, was based out of Charleston and made frequent trips to Baltimore. Merchant-planter and neighbor James Marshall likely already knew the family through business dealings and helped with their resettlement in Maryland.

The connection between Frederick and Baltimore, Maryland, and St. Domingue may have originated from the trade of Maryland and Pennsylvania flour to St. Domingue and other islands in the West Indies. Through the late 1700s and early 1800s, wheat continued in great demand throughout the Caribbean, and “Baltimore became known as the ‘granary of the West Indies.’ Vessels traveling between Baltimore and the West Indies were able to make the voyage a day faster than ships sailing from other eastern grain ports. Baltimore wheat withstood quick spoilage. For decades, merchants and traders in the Caribbean regarded ‘Baltimore flour’ as among the best in the world.”

Victoire continued to own 90 enslaved laborers for more than a decade, according to the 1810 census records. In the years after their arrival in 1793, a number of legal actions involving the enslaved workers at both the county and state levels occurred. On December 9, 1796, the Frederick County Court recorded a “Judgement of the Court in State of Maryland vs.

Payen Boisneuf” for especially cruelly and unmercifully beating of his slave, Negro Shadrack. The trial verdict found Boisneuf guilty. On the same day as the State of Maryland vs. Payen Boisneuf, he was also found guilty for not providing sufficient meat and clothing for his slaves.

In March of 1797, Pierre Lewis [Louis] who was one of the enslaved individuals Payen Boisneuf declared in his Certificate of Negroes brought from St. Domingue in 1793, sued Boisneuf and Victoire Vincendiere for his freedom. Also in 1797, in the March Court Minutes, State of Maryland vs. Payen Boisneuf, Boisneuf was to answer eight indictments for ill-treating his slaves. In another case, the State of Maryland took action against Victoire Vincendiere and Payen Boisneuf for ill-treating her slave, Jenny. In the document, Victoire’s name had been crossed out. The March Court Minutes also recorded an action against Boisneuf for beating his slave Shadrack (this is the same case listed in the county dockets above). There were nine witnesses for the state. James Marshall served as interpreter for the French speakers and was also one of the witnesses for the defense. In that case Boisneuf was found guilty. In yet another case brought by the State of Maryland, in March 1797, against Boisneuf, he was charged and found guilty for “not sufficiently clothing and feeding his Negroes.” This also is a relisting from the case in the county dockets.

Enslaved individuals also ran away from the Vincendiere plantation. On November 25, 1795, the Frederick Newspaper, Rights of Man, ran an advertisement for “M. Vincendiere, near the Middle Ferry, reward for a black man named Phil about 40, 6’tall, sold last Whitsuntide [Pentecost] at Baltimore to Mr. Coxnave, merchant by Mr. Walker of that County.”

In March 1798, in Frederick County court, Rebecca Dulany (widow of Daniel Dulany) sued Payen Boisneuf and Victoire Vincendiere involving access or trespass by enslaved laborers. The case was continued to allow for arbitration. James Marshall was listed as “spba”[?]. The trial in the case of Pierre Lewis’s [Louis] lawsuit for his freedom took place on March 31, 1798. The jury’s verdict was that the petitioner was entitled to freedom. The case, however, was continued with an appeal for arbitration.

---
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James Marshall again was listed as “spba.” It appears that Pierre Louis eventually gained his freedom. According to Jacob Engelbrecht’s diary on July 29, 1824, “Thurs. Died, Negro Peter Loui, ‘French Loui,’ age 65.” Engelbrecht noted that he was a native of St. Domingue and came to this country when the insurrection of the blacks took place on that island in 1793.

Possibly the several lawsuits stemmed in part from general anti-French sentiment among native-born Americans at the time. The animosity stemmed from the XYZ Affair in 1797 and the resulting Quasi War with France, a political and diplomatic confrontation between the United States and France that occurred in 1798 and 1800. French foreign minister Talleyrand attempted to bribe American commissioners who were in France to negotiate a settlement with France over the seizure of American ships. Americans, particularly Federalists, were outraged at the meddling. The Alien and Sedition Acts followed in 1798, allowing expulsion of “aliens” (specifically French immigrants) for conspiracy and restricted public activities of the American Democratic-Republicans who were sympathetic to the French Revolution.

Gradually, after 1810, Vincendiere began selling off her enslaved laborers. By the 1820 census, Vincendiere is listed as head of household with three men and two women age 26–45, one man and two women 16–26, two boys and one girl under 10, 24 male slaves and 28 female equaling 52 enslaved. Two people were not naturalized, French citizens.

In a June 19, 1822 bill of sale, Victoire Vincendiere sold a 15-year-old enslaved girl Indianna, 4 feet, 11½ inches tall, dark complexion, no scars to Edward Smith of Tennessee. In November of the same year, Vincendiere sold three enslaved laborers, John, Ramond, and Black Emmos to Richard Woolskill of Baltimore. On March 8, 1824, according to a Bill of Sale, she sold to Frederick L. E. Dugas (her nephew), of Augusta, Georgia, Daniel, about 40, for $500. The big sale occurred in 1825 when on June 13, a Bill of Sale records that Victoire Vincendiere of Frederick Town sold to Nicholas Wilson of the Parish of Iberville in Louisiana 17 slaves for life: Louisa, 14; Kitty, 12; Sucky, 10; Ben, 8; Fillile, 35 (Fillile was one of the enslaved persons that Boisneuf brought from St. Domingue as an eight year old in 1793); Mary, 6; Jane, 9; Nicholas, 3; John, 1; Magdalene, 14;
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Polly, 42; Manuel, 50 (willed to Vincendiere by Pierre Laberon in 1794); Molly, 45; Marsoline, 1; Anthony, 15; Priscilla, 9; and Felix, 15. The price paid was $2,925.\textsuperscript{112} In 1825 Victoire and her sister Adelaide moved from the Hermitage to Frederick.

In 1830, Vincendiere had only six enslaved laborers and two free African Americans in her household. By this time, however, she was living in Frederick Town, not on the plantation. Also, like other slave owners in the Monocacy area, she had gradually begun the process of manumission of her enslaved workers.

On the Hermitage from 1795 through at least 1810, the enslaved population stood at around 90. The amount of housing required for those enslaved people made a substantial visual and physical impact on the landscape. According to contemporary accounts and archeological evidence, the slave housing followed the pattern of French Caribbean plantations, situated in front of the main house rather than behind. Archeological investigations revealed foundations for six buildings which were presumably quarters, located between the secondary house and the Georgetown Road. Before 1827, the Georgetown Road ran much closer to the buildings than it does today.

The National Park Service has been instrumental in documenting this very unusual and important story of the only known French refugee plantation in Maryland, along with the story of the occupants both enslaved and free. The National Park Service has undertaken several research and archeological projects with the Hermitage to illuminate the story. This research of the Vincendieres and Payen Boisneuf and their plantation has produced sometimes conflicting interpretations of their history.\textsuperscript{113}

Other owners of enslaved laborers in the Monocacy area included Worthington Johnson (Araby) with 16 enslaved laborers in 1830, although he was listed with only three in 1820. In 1840, Johnson had 13 enslaved workers. John McPherson (Araby) was listed with 13 enslaved in 1820. In 1840, Griffin Taylor at Clifton had 17 enslaved laborers, while neighbor Daniel Baker (the “Baker Farm” and “Lewis Farm”) had a household with one slave and three “free colored” people. David Best (Best Farm) had seven enslaved persons in 1850. However, by 1850, the number of enslaved

\textsuperscript{112} FRDB, JS22/518.  
workers had dropped significantly among the Monocacy owners, most with only one African American or mulatto farmhand or domestic servant. For example, the 1850 census listed Griffin Taylor with real property valued at $55,000, a wife, nine children, and one mulatto laborer, while ten years earlier he had 17 enslaved workers.

What these figures indicate is that in the Monocacy area some owners had a large number (over 15) of enslaved laborers, while many had only a few. Many households also had free African Americans among their inhabitants, which may mean that some members of African American families were free while other members were enslaved. When there were manumissions, children of the manumitted person remained enslaved. According to *The Negro in Maryland*, by Jeffrey R. Brackett, a Maryland law enacted in 1809 stated that:

> Persons who should manumit slaves, after January of the following year, to be free after some specified time or on performance of certain conditions, might determine the condition of any issue which might be born meantime. Such issue if there was no provision to the contrary, would be slaves. When this bill was considered in the House, an attempt was made to change it so that such issue in all cases serve the owners of the mother 25 years for males and 20 for females, and should then be free; but this was defeated by a large majority.  

Frederick County’s agricultural activity required labor. Slavery continued legally in Maryland until 1864, but the number of enslaved laborers decreased substantially. According to census records, many of the property owners in the Monocacy area had African Americans living in or near their households. For example, the census listing for James H. Gambrill, proprietor of Gambrill Mill, in 1870, along with his wife and six children, listed in the household Henry Adams, 26, an African American farm laborer; Louisa Adams, 32, an African American domestic servant (who could read, the document noted); and Clara King, 12, an African American domestic servant. Most likely, these African Americans were a family. Also listed were two young white men who worked in the mill. The likely pattern, which seems to be supported by census data, is that in the mid-1800s, Frederick County residents who owned enslaved workers reduced their numbers through sale or manumission to just a few per household. Those enslaved were possibly related to one another by blood or marriage, since census records frequently indicated both free and enslaved African Americans as part of a white household. By November 1864, any remaining enslaved persons were freed according to Maryland law. Census records suggest that

---

some former enslaved laborers remained with their former owners, working as farm hands and domestics. If Frederick County freedmen followed the same practice as freed slaves farther to the south, they stayed on the farm of their former owners but moved their dwellings to more private locations away from the “big house.” Some may also have moved to established communities of free African Americans, such as those dotted throughout southern Frederick County including Hope Hill, Sunnyside, Pleasant View, and Mt. Ephraim, or to established communities in Frederick city.

Perhaps because of the seasonal nature of grain agriculture, there was an active trade of enslaved laborers among the Monocacy neighbors during 1850s and 1860s. Lease agreements for enslaved workers were generally for a set term of service, providing for the manumission of the enslaved person at the end of the term.\textsuperscript{115} With these gradual manumissions, a fairly large free African American labor force replaced the enslaved farm labor of the region.

In 1860, David Best arranged several slave sales that appear to have netted him significant cash. In August 1860 he sold to John Sinn for $200 his negro man named John N. Combash,\textsuperscript{116} age 22, to serve until 1866.\textsuperscript{117} Then in September, after purchasing a 20-year-old woman named Ann Eliza Combash from Joseph Thomas for $250, Best then sold Ann Eliza to John Sinn, “to serve until the first day of February [1868],” and Elias W. Combash, born in 1842, to serve until 1872.\textsuperscript{118} Sinn paid $660 for the two enslaved workers’ combined 20 years of service as well as the service of any children Ann Eliza might have during her term. Both Elias and Ann Eliza, and probably John N. as well, were born slaves like Ann Eliza’s future children would be, described as the “children of negro Dinah who was manumitted and set-free by Cornelius Staler” in 1832.\textsuperscript{119} In 1842 Best secured a loan from Theresia McElfresh with his enslaved woman, Diana [Dinah] and her three children Charity, age eight, Nelson [John N.?], age

\textsuperscript{115} See for example, FRDB, BGF 7/486; BGF 5/668; BGF 5/614; ES 1/562; ES 1/295; ES 7/424.

\textsuperscript{116} Soon after Sinn bought Combash, he sold him to Moses Hinde of Baltimore. Earlier in 1860, an advertisement in a Frederick newspaper announced that the firm of “Wilson & Hinde” from Baltimore wanted to purchase slaves. Moses Hinde may be the Hinde of Wilson & Hinde, but the ad also stated that John T. Sinn was the Frederick agent for Wilson & Hinde. In 1863, Combash joined the USCT - 1st Infantry, Co. F - enlisting on Mason’s Island (Theodore Roosevelt Island) in the District of Columbia.

\textsuperscript{117} FRDB, BGF 6/56.

\textsuperscript{118} FRDB, BGF 6/143 and 144.

\textsuperscript{119} Diana’s [Dinah] status is unclear. She is described as having been freed in 1832, but as enslaved in 1842. Diana was manumitted in 1832, but her future children were to be enslaved. (FRDB, BGF 6/142 and 143)
six, and Eliza Ann, age four. In 1846, he again mortgaged Charity, 10; Nelson, 9; Eliza Ann, 7; and included this time Elias Washington, 3. The Combash children, born into slavery on the Best Farm, had been mortgaged twice, and Ann Eliza (Eliza Ann) was sold and re-purchased before being sold again, all within the first twenty years of their lives. None of the three sold to John Sinn in 1860 served out their full terms, their freedom coming in 1864, as the direct result of the Civil War.

In the 1870 population census, C. Keefer Thomas was listed as a farmer, aged 52, with property valued at $27,100. In the household was Evelina (his wife), aged 49, keeping house; Samuel, aged 24, farmer; and Mary aged 13. There was also Lydia Layman, housekeeper, aged 28 (she was white). There was, however, listed in the household an African American family and three African American and one mulatto farm laborers. The African American family was that of Hanson Giddings, aged 30, farm laborer; Caroline, aged 36, domestic; Mary, aged 10 and John, aged 9. Separately listed farm laborers included David, aged 25, Isaac, aged 18, Vernon, aged 16, and Henry, a 20-year-old mulatto, who was the only one who could read or write. Were the Giddings family formerly enslaved workers belonging to C. K. Thomas? Thomas arrived in Frederick County too late in 1860 to be listed in that year’s census.

In the 1866 Frederick County Tax Assessment, Daniel Baker of F. was listed with improved real estate valued at $70 per acre for a total of $15,750 for 225 acres. Slave census records for 1850 listed Daniel Baker with one enslaved person, a 51-year-old male. In the 1860 slave census he was listed with two enslaved workers, 40- and 18-year-old females.

Although Daniel Baker of F. had only a few enslaved laborers, he was active in buying and selling, as shown by the following land records. On May 16, 1856, Baker purchased from Jacob Lewis the services of an enslaved woman Savilla for a set term of 12 years, after which she was to be manumitted. Simultaneously, Baker signed an agreement with Henry Williams, “free negro,” who also happened to be Savilla’s husband. Williams pledged to sell himself into servitude for six years to Baker if he would agree to reduce Savilla’s time to six years. This Daniel Baker agreed to, but less than a year later, he sold Savilla to a Samuel Hoke, and along with her, the services of Henry Williams as stipulated in their prior agreement. However, in the bill of sale between Baker and Hoke for Savilla, her term of service was still given as 12 years, less the year she
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had already served with Baker. An immediately following agreement in the Frederick County Land Records, pertaining to the services of Henry, however, referenced the terms and conditions of the agreement reached between Henry and Daniel Baker. Perhaps Savilla did not trust either Daniel Baker or Samuel Hoke, because, on the same day of the bill of sale for her to Samuel Hoke, she secured a written manumission document from her former owner, Jacob Lewis. This stated that she would be freed May 16, 1868. No mention was made of Henry Williams’s agreement with Daniel Baker.

Daniel Baker of F. purchased other enslaved persons as well. On March 5, 1860, he bought from William T. Ervin of Frederick County, for $525 his “negro slave ‘Martha’ who is a dark mulatto for the term of twenty-three years from the twenty eighth day of February Eighteen hundred and sixty and no longer. The said negro girl ‘Martha’ being a slave for life, and now about twelve years of age.” The bill of sale continued with the manumission of Martha upon expiration of the agreement on February 28, 1883.\(^\text{123}\) On May 15, 1862, Baker paid $250 for Negro slave William Henry, late the property of Joseph Crist, for a term ending on the 23rd of December 1875. William Henry was to be manumitted upon that date.\(^\text{124}\)

These dealings point out the ambiguity with which enslaved workers were treated in Maryland during the mid-1800s. While slavery in Maryland was diminishing, enslaved persons were being converted from “slaves for life” to bring enslaved for a finite term of years. However, from these records, it seems that no one anticipated the end of slavery. Terms of service stretched into the 1870s and 1880s and beyond, even as the Civil War was underway.

Unfortunately, we do not know what happened to Savilla and her husband Henry Williams, except that the Civil War did intervene and regardless of the written terms and agreements and whether they were followed or not, the Williamses would have been freed in 1864. Another interesting question is where were these manumitted persons living during this period. The most likely scenario is that they were residing in modest wooden houses at the edges of the big farms, close-by for convenience, but far enough away to demonstrate their independence.

In the 1880 population census, the families of Monocacy continued to list African American servants within their households, but the names of the individuals were different, suggesting some fluidity in relationships among blacks and whites in Frederick County. The census-taker’s notations beside

\(^{123}\) FRDB, BGF 5/568.
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names of some African American servants indicated that their families lived nearby. This condition supports the premise that former enslaved families separated themselves physically from their former owners by moving to the edge of or just off the plantation or farm. The pattern described in the census records continued in 1900, 1910, and 1920, although the later records were less detailed and specific.

**CONCLUSION**

Since the National Park Service acquired the Monocacy Battlefield properties, it has taken on the role of curator and protector of the cultural landscape, buildings, structures, and the associated history. This responsibility requires an understanding of the people and events that created the battlefield landscape that visitors see today. The role of the Battle of Monocacy is an important one, and indeed, these properties would probably not be preserved if it were not for the establishment of the Monocacy National Battlefield. However, the particular pre-Civil War history associated with the battlefield properties is also very significant and, in fact, unique in Maryland and the larger region. The development of the history of the Monocacy properties has been well researched, including the earliest settlements in the area and the involvement of a Scottish merchant and representative of an important import-export company. Likely through him, there was a connection with wealthy planters from St. Domingue who came as refugees from the French Revolution and slave revolt to establish the only known French Caribbean-influenced plantation in Maryland. The story places the Monocacy National Battlefield in a crucible of events leading to and including the American Civil War, and the subsequent efforts to protect the cultural landscape thereafter. The National Park Service at Monocacy National Battlefield has sought out the early history of the place through a *Cultural Resource Study*, Cultural Landscape Reports, multiple archeological investigations, and Historic Structures Reports. These efforts allowed the early history of the battlefield properties to be preserved and interpreted. Chapter 2 focuses on the Civil War and Commemoration as a prelude to the establishment of Monocacy National Battlefield.
In 1859, the simmering disagreement between the states over slavery came to a boil at the confluence of the Shenandoah and Potomac rivers in Virginia. John Brown, known for his violent antislavery activities in Kansas, believed he could free the slaves by creating an “army of liberation.” Brown chose Harpers Ferry, Virginia, to begin his war, where he planned to seize the weapons stored at the US Arsenal there. In what one Frederick resident referred to as the “Great excitement,” on Sunday evening, October 16, 1859, John Brown and his men entered Harpers Ferry.\(^{125}\) Within hours they were met by a small contingent of US Marines led by Col. Robert E. Lee. Brown was captured and several of his men killed when the Marines stormed the engine house where they had barricaded themselves with their hostages. By mid-day on Monday the incursion was over.\(^{126}\) News of John Brown’s failed raid on Harpers Ferry shocked the nation, both North and South. Brown was hanged for his attack on a federal installation, saying at his end: “I … am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land will never be purged away but with blood.”\(^{127}\)

The presidential election of 1860 further divided the country as Republicans nominated Abraham Lincoln and the Constitutional Union Party nominated John Bell. The Democratic Party split into northern and southern factions, the National Democratic Party with Senator Stephen Douglas as the nominee and the Constitutional Democratic Party nominating John C. Breckenridge. With the election of Abraham Lincoln in November 1860, the die was cast. While Lincoln’s supporters celebrated in Springfield, Illinois, observed Civil War historian Bruce Catton, “Charleston was as jubilant and as excited as Springfield . . . Here too there was a feeling of release from tension. . . . There would be a new nation,
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125  David H. Wallace, transcriber, *Frederick Maryland in Peace and War 1856–1864, The Diary of Catherine Susannah Thomas Markell [Markell Diary]* (Frederick, MD: The Historical Society of Frederick County, Inc., 2006), 68.

126  Report: The Select Committee of the Senate Appointed to Inquire into the Late Invasion and Seizure of the Public Property at Harpers Ferry, June 15, 1860 (GPO), Ruth Scarborough Library, Shepherd University, Shepherdstown, WV.

it would be born in South Carolina, and it would begin to take shape at once."128 John Brown’s prophesy of blood would soon come true.

On December 20, 1860, the South Carolina state legislature voted to secede from the United States. They were soon joined by the states of North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas. In May Virginia ratified secession from the Union by popular vote, joining the other southern states to form the Confederate States of America (CSA). A significant corps of former US Army officers, including Col. Robert E. Lee of Virginia, forsook their oaths and followed their home states into the Confederacy. The remaining, mostly northern states stayed in the Union, determined to restore the United States. Four border states, Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, all slave-states located below the Mason-Dixon Line, also remained within the Union though somewhat tenuously. Thus began the American Civil War, the war between North and South. With Jefferson Davis as president, the Confederacy moved their capital from Montgomery, Alabama to Richmond, Virginia, just one hundred miles south of the Union capital in Washington, DC.

MARYLAND – ON THE BORDER
Throughout the first year of the Civil War, Maryland’s commitment to the Union was fragile, with a divided legislature and many families divided – fathers, sons, and brothers joined the fight in one or the other opposing army. Still, the majority of Marylanders professed their loyalty to the Union, though perhaps sympathetic to the southern cause. And with the US capital city of Washington located within the state’s borders, federal forces aimed to keep the state within the Union. Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee’s Maryland Campaign in the late summer of 1862 sought to test the waters of rebellion in Maryland, and perhaps ease the strain of near constant occupation and fighting in Virginia.

The Maryland Campaign began on the 4th of September in 1862, as the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia composed of approximately 50,000 men waded across the Potomac River into Frederick County, Maryland.129 The army was plagued by a lack of supplies, most critically food and shoes, which resulted in large-scale straggling and some wholesale desertions. Yet, among those marching into Maryland, the soldiers’ spirits were high. They had scored a series of victories and had great hopes for their invasion of the North.

The Confederates made camp near Frederick, along the Monocacy River near the junction of the Buckeystown and Georgetown Pikes. Their encampment was located on the Hermitage, the childhood home of former Maryland governor, Enoch Lewis Lowe, son of Adelaide Vincendiere Lowe. Lowe, a Democrat, served as governor from 1851 to 1854, but fled to Richmond at the start of the war. By 1862 the Hermitage property belonged to Charles E. Trail, though it came to be known as the Best Farm for its tenant farmer at the time, David Best.

On September 9, while still in camp on the Best Farm, General Lee issued his “Special Order 191,” the operational orders for the Maryland Campaign. In a bold and risky plan, he divided his army. Lee sent Maj. Gen. James Longstreet’s command north to Hagerstown, to await further developments and possibly prepare for an invasion into Pennsylvania. Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson led a contingent to capture the garrisons at Martinsburg and Harpers Ferry. The rest were positioned to guard the three passes over South Mountain at Turner’s, Fox’s, and Crampton’s Gaps. Seven copies of Special Order 191 were prepared to be delivered to Lee’s commanders.\footnote{Wilber Jones Jr., “Who Lost the Lost Orders: Stonewall Jackson, His Courier, and Special Orders No. 191,” \textit{Civil War Regiments: A Journal of the American Civil War}, Vol. 5, No. 3 (1997), 3. The number of copies written was seven, plus the extra one written later for D. H. Hill that was lost.}

Although General Lee’s plan to divide his already undersized army while in enemy territory was a tremendous gamble, he knew that Union Gen. George B. McClellan would be slow to move and overly cautious. If the plan was followed, the Harpers Ferry garrisons would be captured and the army would be back together by September 12 or 13. Unfortunately for General Lee, when the Confederates vacated their campsite on Best’s farm on September 10, one of the copies of his Special Order 191 was lost.\footnote{“Special Order No. 191,” \textit{Monocacy National Battlefield}, accessed Oct. 24, 2012, \url{www.nps.gov/mono/historyculture/so191.htm}.}

On the evening of September 13, Union troops moving west in pursuit of the Confederate column occupied the same camp on and around the Best Farm. There several of the men of Company F, Twenty-Seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry found an envelope with two cigars, and the lost order. The information was quickly passed to General McClellan who saw the opportunity to take advantage of Lee’s vulnerability and capture the divided southern army. McClellan put his forces in motion the following morning, September 14. (\textbf{Figure 1})
The result of the loss of Special Order 191 was the Battle of South Mountain, a delaying action to protect the scattered Confederate forces until the army could reassemble, followed by the Battle of Antietam at Sharpsburg. The Battle of Antietam, because of its magnitude and its ghastliness, overshadows the other events of the Maryland Campaign. The September 15 Battle of South Mountain proved to be a dramatic and costly effort which held Union forces at bay until the Harpers Ferry capture could be completed. On the morning of the 16th, Confederates hastily reassembled at Sharpsburg. This movement put them closer to the rest of the army as they returned from Harpers Ferry. Lee made the decision to form a battle line west of the Antietam Creek near Sharpsburg, on a ridgeline between the creek and the Potomac River.

General Lee had the advantage of choosing the ground, but again he was at risk because his back was to the Potomac River and a retreat, if necessary,
could be made at only one nearby ford. His army was also severely depleted by stragglers and deserters.\(^{132}\) On Tuesday, September 16, Lee’s scattered army began to gather between the Antietam Creek and the Potomac River in and around Sharpsburg. Under Lee’s direction, they assembled a battle line, their force of around 45,000 men stretched painfully thin, extending some four miles in length north and south of Sharpsburg. Arrayed against him was McClellan’s federal force of 65,000, with an additional division kept in reserve east of the Antietam Creek.

The Battle of Antietam, or Battle of Sharpsburg as it is known in the South, began early on the morning of September 17, 1862. By the end of the day, more than 23,000 combatants lay dead, wounded, or missing, making it the bloodiest single day in US history. The exhausted Confederates remained in place through the following day, September 18, and began withdrawing into Virginia that night and the following morning. Again Robert E. Lee took a great risk, for if McClellan had renewed the attack on September 18, surely the Confederates would have been beaten, or at least dealt a crippling blow. However, the Union force did not attack and thus, the Battle of Antietam drew to a close with no clear victory and at the cost of tens of thousands of lives.

President Lincoln seized the opportunity afforded by Lee’s withdrawal to announce his plan to free the slaves in the rebelling states the following January. Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation changed the nature of the war from one to preserve the Union to one in which the South’s economic and social structure was at stake as well. The emancipation issue made it much more difficult for the European powers, particularly England that had abolished slavery a generation earlier, to recognize the Confederacy.

**LEE INVADES THE NORTH AGAIN: SUMMER 1863**

The following summer, in June of 1863, General Lee again led the Army of Northern Virginia into northern territory. Once again, his objectives were similar. Politically, he sought to take advantage of the growing peace movement in the North by bringing war to its doorstep. Again, Lee hoped that victory in the North would create demands for a compromised negotiated peace and separation. Strategically, Lee believed a decisive Confederate victory on northern soil would again encourage England and France to recognize the Confederacy and put pressure on the North to end the war. And finally, as it was in the Maryland Campaign of 1862,
Lee’s underlying objective for a northern invasion was to replenish supplies for his army.

General Lee’s military goal then was to reach Harrisburg, capture the city, and cut off rail traffic to Philadelphia and New York. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia entered Pennsylvania by way of the Cumberland Valley. While the Confederates were moving along the valley west of South Mountain, Union General Joseph Hooker was replaced with Maj. Gen. George G. Meade, who kept the Union troops on the east side of the mountains protecting the capital city of Washington. They followed the Confederate advance on a parallel course, moving in a northerly direction through Frederick and Westminster in Maryland. The two armies collided at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, where major roads coming from all directions converged. The three-day battle ended with a Confederate retreat, again crossing the Potomac River to the relative safety of Virginia soil.133

As the Federals passed through Frederick County on their way to Gettysburg, they paused in the vicinity of Frederick and encamped along the Monocacy River in the same location on Best Farm that they had used less than a year earlier. Nearby, C. K. Thomas’s farm called Araby became the headquarters for Union Maj. Gen. Winfield S. Hancock for three days. Repeated use of the farms south of Frederick as an encampment site by both armies was likely because of the proximity to main highways, the railroad, and the river.

Certainly, the B&O Railroad was concerned about the threat of all of this military activity to their tracks, bridge, and equipment in the Monocacy vicinity. An important supply line, protection of the railroad had been essential to the Union war effort since the beginning of the conflict. The Confederates had early targeted the B&O Railroad, destroying the bridge at Harpers Ferry in June 1861. Temporary replacements were destroyed regularly throughout the war. On March 16 of 1863, US Maj. Gen. Henry W. Halleck wrote to Maj. Gen. Robert Schenck, in apparent frustration, “I must again call your attention to the importance of constructing blockhouses for the defense of our railroad bridges.”134 Two

133 The retreat across the river into Berkeley County (primarily) occurred on July 13–14, 1863. Just a month earlier, on June 20, 1863, the State of West Virginia was created from the northwestern counties of Virginia, including very reluctantly (for the purpose of protecting the B&O Railroad) the Eastern Panhandle counties of Jefferson, Berkeley, and Morgan. These counties would have been considered very friendly to the Confederates.

134 OR, Series 1, Vol. 25, Part 2, 139.
blockhouses were finally constructed at Monocacy Junction, one on each side of the river.\textsuperscript{135}

**JUBAL EARLY’S NORTHERN INVASION OF 1864**

On March 1, 1864, President Lincoln appointed Ulysses S. Grant as lieutenant general in charge of the strategy and movement of all the armies of the United States, including the Army of the Potomac, then still under the command of General Meade. Grant focused the Union’s efforts relentlessly on multiple areas in Virginia, and he sent Maj. Gen. William T. Sherman on his ruthless march through Georgia to the Atlantic coast.\textsuperscript{136} As a part of this campaign, Grant began activity in the Shenandoah Valley with his Department of West Virginia under Maj. Gen. Franz Sigel. Attempting to stretch Lee’s dwindling Army of Northern Virginia further, General Grant moved Sigel into the Upper Valley. However, following his defeat in the battle at New Market, Sigel was replaced by Maj. Gen. David Hunter. General Sigel returned to the Lower Valley to continue his mission of protecting the railroad, supply, and communications centers of Winchester, Harpers Ferry, and Martinsburg.\textsuperscript{137}

Hunter’s campaign in the Shenandoah Valley began successfully, moving quickly south toward Lynchburg, destroying southern rail lines along the way. Early in June, General Lee was forced to detach troops to face Hunter. Lee sent Maj. Gen. John C. Breckenridge’s division, who had previously defeated General Sigel, and also the Second Corps commanded by Lt. Gen. Jubal A. Early. On word that Early had arrived to save Lynchburg, Hunter quickly retreated west, ending the campaign in June and leaving the valley open as far north as Winchester.\textsuperscript{138}

In the meantime, Grant’s Union forces laid siege to the city of Petersburg and were beginning to threaten Richmond, the capital of the Confederate States. General Lee, a master of devising impossible plans that repeatedly saved his army and the Confederacy, mulled over a new plan with President Jefferson Davis in a letter dated June 26, 1864. By 1864, the ranks of the Confederate army had grown thin, both in physical condition and in numbers. Lee’s plan, he hoped, would avoid a confrontation with Grant’s


\textsuperscript{137} For a good review of the Shenandoah Valley campaign, see Brett W. Spaulding, *Last Chance for Victory* (Brett W. Spaulding, 2010).

army, while at the same time supply his army under siege, add to his shrinking ranks, and draw Union troops away from Petersburg.139

Lee proposed sending Maryland troops under the command of Marylander Col. Bradley T. Johnson to release the Confederate prisoners held in the Union prison at Point Lookout, located on the Potomac River in southern Maryland. Once freed and armed they could, with assistance noted Lee, “capture Washington” or at least “march around it and cross the upper Potomac where fordable.” “Provisions &c.,” wrote Lee “would have to be collected in the country through which they pass.” General Lee concluded,

The sooner that it is put into execution the better. . . . At this time, as far as I can learn, all the troops in the control of the United States are being sent to Grant, and little or no opposition could be made by those at Washington.140

Assistance would come from Early and Breckenridge, then moving into and through the huge hole left in the Shenandoah Valley by Hunter.

Apparently General Lee was already convinced of the value of his plan, sending orders to General Early on June 12, 14 days prior to his letter to President Davis. Lee ordered Early to begin moving through the Lower Valley to the Potomac River crossing at Leesburg or Harpers Ferry, and to “threaten Washington City” if possible.141 According to Early, Lee also instructed him “to destroy the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal,” though Early recalled that retreating Union troops had already burned “the railroad and pontoon bridges across the Potomac” as they crossed from Harpers Ferry to the Maryland Heights.142 Early’s men finished the job as they pursued the Union troops across the Potomac River between July 5 and July 8.143 John Garrett, president of the B&O Railroad, who rightly feared for the safety of his railroad, paid a visit to Union Maj. Gen. Lew Wallace, in command of the Eighth Corps or Middle Department headquartered in Baltimore. Garret informed Wallace of the Confederate movements and requested a force of 1,000 men be sent to Harpers Ferry, far outside of Wallace’s Middle Department jurisdiction.144

140 Ibid.
142 Ibid., 495.
143 Ibid., 494–95. Here “trains” refer to supply wagons.
144 Spaulding, Last Chance for Victory, 50.
The jurisdiction of Wallace’s Middle Department in fact only stretched as far as the western boundary of Baltimore County. From there west, including the Monocacy River at Frederick, was part of General Hunter’s department. However, Hunter had withdrawn deep into West Virginia when Jubal Early’s Confederates appeared, which left the lower Shenandoah Valley, the B&O Railroad, and the approach to Washington unprotected. Civil War historian B. Franklin Cooling notes, “It was perhaps the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company more than anyone else that recognized the peril and took steps to inform government officials and cajole them into action.”

It seems that Jubal Early’s invasion of Maryland in 1864 was not initially taken particularly seriously by the War Office in Washington, or by General Grant. By July 4 the Confederates had cut telegraph lines, limiting communications to Washington. Confederate raiding parties north of the Potomac River were not uncommon and the magnitude of Early’s movement apparently was not known, or not appreciated. Still, there was fear and concern in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, as residents recalled the horror of the Gettysburg Campaign, still fresh in their memory from July 1863. General Halleck in Washington did send reinforcements to help General Sigel who had been isolated on Maryland Heights. But by the time Federal troops arrived on the scene, Early’s Confederates had already bypassed Harpers Ferry and were bearing down on Frederick. Instead of gathering information about the size and strength

---

145 B. Franklin Cooling, *Jubal Early’s Raid on Washington: 1864* (Baltimore, MD: The Nautical & Aviation Publishing Co. of America, 1989), 53. Cooling notes: “A serious question may be raised about Wallace’s judgment. Wallace, for whatever reasons (whether to aid Garrett, a desire for combat, or a plan to retrieve lost glories and his reputation through a victory), may well have consciously exceeded his authority and pushed some 30 actual miles beyond his official departmental jurisdiction. According to reorganization orders published in March and June, Wallace’s boundary came nowhere near the Monocacy. General Order 97, Adjutant General’s Office, March 12, 1864, established the Middle Department as ‘…the eastern shore of Maryland, and Cecil, Harford, Baltimore, and Anne Arundel counties in Maryland.’ General Order 214, Adjutant General’s Office, June 21, 1864, prescribed the Department of the Potomac “to consist of that part of the State of Maryland west of Baltimore and Anne Arundel counties, east of the Monocacy, and north of a line from the mouth of the Monocacy to Annapolis Junction’ See Raphael P. Thian (John M. Carroll, editor), *Notes Illustrating the Military Geography of the United State, 1813–1880* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1979) 91, 104.”

of the enemy force, the Federals merely re-positioned at Harpers Ferry.\footnote{Ibid.} With General Hunter withdrawn and the Harpers Ferry garrison staying put, only Lew Wallace with his promise to protect the B&O bridge at Monocacy Junction stood between the Confederates and their planned destination of Washington, DC.

From his command at Baltimore, General Wallace was only able to gather about 2,200 men for the defensive effort, and many of them were inexperienced. Besides Wallace’s men, the only other military presence was a detachment of the Eighth Illinois Cavalry, sent by General Halleck to patrol the Potomac River between Washington, DC and Point of Rocks, Maryland. Taking a night train to the Monocacy Junction, Wallace and an aide arrived on the morning of July 5, looked over the terrain and planned a strategy. With his limited manpower, Wallace could not cover all the crossing places of the Monocacy River. He focused on the railroad bridge, as he had promised Garrett; the wooden highway bridge just to the southwest, which carried the road to Washington; and the National or Baltimore Pike stone bridge about two miles to the north in the event that Early’s destination was Baltimore rather than Washington.

The Confederate force, rumored to be as many as 30,000 men, alarmed Wallace. His chances of being the victor against a larger, battle-hardened Confederate force were remote and he knew it. Wallace’s hope was to delay the Confederates long enough for reinforcements to be sent, or for a proper defense of Washington to be assembled. Encouragement came in the form of news from Garrett that veteran reinforcements sent from Petersburg to Baltimore by steamship would arrive at Monocacy Junction via the B&O Railroad by July 8.\footnote{OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 1, “Reports of Gen. Robert E. Lee, C. S. Army, Commanding Army of Northern Virginia, of Early’s Operations July 23–July 26,” 346.} This played into Gen. Robert E. Lee’s hope that Early’s threat to Washington would force Grant to send reinforcements, thus drawing Union troops away from Petersburg and Richmond.\footnote{Marc Leepson, Desperate Engagement (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2007), 81.}

Wallace prepared his line of defense on the east side of the Monocacy River. “Here,” wrote Wallace on July 8, 1864, “as the situation appeared to me, the fate of Washington was to be determined.”\footnote{Wallace, as cited in Leepson, Desperate Engagement, 85.} The high ground along the east bank of the river afforded protection and a good, commanding view of the landscape to the north and west. Wallace
initially located his headquarters in “a small dwelling house just across the railroad,” recalled Judge Glenn Worthington in his account of the battle, *Fighting for Time*.\(^{151}\)

General Wallace’s strategy was simple: to defend the river crossings south and east from Frederick, from Hughes Ford to the stone bridge on the Baltimore Pike, Crum’s Ford, and the railroad and Georgetown Pike crossings. On the north side of the B&O Railroad tracks a long narrow ridge loomed above the Markell Farm, the Monocacy Junction community, and the east bank of the Monocacy River. Along the west face of the ridge was a long defensive trench dug by the men of the Fourteenth New Jersey during their 1862–63 deployment at the railroad bridge. This Wallace would put to use defending the road and railroad bridges. From there the Monocacy River curved around the hilly landscape upon which the Thomas and Worthington houses were perched, and the heavily wooded Brooks Hill, behind which Daniel Baker’s farm was nestled in a valley. Just below the Worthington farmhouse the river turned south near the Buckeystown Pike, where a ford used only by local farmers crossed at the mouth of Ballenger Creek. With his troops already stretched thin, this ford, thought Wallace, would have to be only lightly guarded.\(^{152}\) (Figure 2)

The reinforcements, in the form of Brig. Gen. James Ricketts’s division of the Sixth Corps, began arriving the morning of July 8. The men of General Ricketts’s division provided much-needed additional bodies, but more importantly they added combat experience to Wallace’s defensive line. He now had at his disposal approximately 6,000 men, including his own men from the Eighth Army Corps. In the early hours of July 9, General Wallace set up his line of defense:

The right, forming an extended line from the railroad, was given General Tyler, who, by direction, had left Colonel Brown at the stone bridge on the Baltimore pike with his command, and the company of mounted infantry. Upon the holding of that bridge depended the security of my right flank, and the line of retreat to Baltimore. Three companies of Colonel Gilpin’s regiment were posted to defend Crum’s Ford – midway the stone bridge and railroad. Landstreet and Gilpin were held in reserve at the railroad. The battery was divided – Ricketts and Tyler each received three guns. On the left, as it was likely to be the main point of attack, I directed General Ricketts to form his command in two lines across the Washington [Georgetown] pike, so as to hold the rising ground south of it and the wooden bridge across the river. Still farther to the left, Colonel

\(^{151}\) Worthington, *Fighting for Time*, 65.

\(^{152}\) Cooling, *Monocacy*, 110.
Clendenin took post to watch that flank and guard the lower fords with such detachments as he could spare. On the western bank of the river, Captain Brown’s detachment of the First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade was deployed as skirmishers, in a line three quarters of a mile to the front. A 24-pounder howitzer was left in a rude earthwork near the block-house by the railroad, where it could be used to defend the two bridges and cover the retirement and crossing of the skirmishers.153

As the defenders of the Monocacy crossings took their places, Jubal Early’s Confederate force, in reality numbering about 15,000 men, entered Frederick City. Early demanded what he called an “assessment” of $200,000 from the City of Frederick, which after extended negotiations

---

the local banks paid.\textsuperscript{154} Several hours passed while Union defenders and residents of the Frederick area waited tensely. In anticipation of the coming battle the Worthington and Thomas families took shelter in their cellars, recalled Glenn Worthington, who witnessed the battle as a child through the farmhouse cellar window.\textsuperscript{155}

**The Monocacy Battle, July 9, 1864**

The battle began tentatively between 6:00 and 8:00 a.m. as Confederate troops approached the lightly defended stone bridge on the Baltimore Pike and escalated sharply a few hours later with the attack on the railroad and Georgetown Pike crossings to the south. Five hours later, surprisingly little Union ground had as yet been lost. As Wallace later related in his memoir, he was “fighting for time” in order to slow Early’s advance on Washington, and their position at noon gave him reason to feel encouraged. Wallace believed if he could hold through the afternoon, at the very least Early would have to wait until the following morning to move again, giving Grant time to send reinforcements to Washington.\textsuperscript{156}

General Wallace was still expecting the arrival of Ricketts’s Third Brigade, earlier reported by Garrett to be expected about 1:00 p.m. Their arrival was delayed however, at Monrovia to the south, where much of the B&O Railroad equipment at Monocacy Junction had been taken prior to the battle. The last rail car, which had been parked on the east side of the river near Wallace’s headquarters to transport the injured from the battle, was removed in a panic by B&O station agent Francis Mantz sometime before 1:00 p.m.\textsuperscript{157} Mantz reported that the wooden covered bridge on the Georgetown Pike (Washington Road) was on fire, in fact set ablaze under orders from Wallace.

General Early still held a large reserve of men at the south end of Frederick, near the intersection of the Georgetown and Buckeystown turnpikes known as Evergreen Point. General Breckenridge’s Corps, two divisions, rested near the Mt. Olivet Cemetery, observing the action in front of them. The morning’s skirmishing revealed the ford at the Worthington Farm to be the best course for attack. At 2:30 in the afternoon, according to Maj. Gen. John B. Gordon’s report, Breckenridge ordered Gordon’s division to move in that direction, a four-mile march.


\textsuperscript{155} Worthington, *Fighting for Time*, 101–2.


It was the battle-hardened troops of Ricketts’s Division of the Sixth Corps, men from New York, New Jersey, Vermont, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, freshly deployed across this part of the Union line that faced the Confederate onslaught. Their lines encompassed the Thomas farmstead, where just four days earlier the Thomas family had been celebrating the 4th of July. The advantage of the Union ground was lost in the chaos of a Confederate flanking surge from the left. Without hope of fresh reinforcements, Ricketts’s two brigades remarkably stood their ground for more than an hour against the swarm of Gordon’s men, compounded by the pounding of artillery:

Finding it impossible to hold my position under such a fire, I fell back a few rods and formed along a cut in the Washington turnpike. Still exposed to the fire of the artillery, and having received orders to fall back when I could hold my position no longer, and seeing the enemy coming down upon us in overwhelming numbers, with imminent danger of having my command annihilated, the balance of the line having given way and the line on my right having been withdrawn, I gave the order to fall back.

As the Union defense eroded, Confederates overwhelmed their positions, including the field hospital at Gambrill Mill.

By five o’clock, the organized defense had collapsed, and the Union forces were retreating across the countryside and back roads to the Baltimore Pike. While Alexander’s Battery apparently followed an orderly retreat, for most of the Union troops structure fell apart as Gordon’s infantry closed in and the last regiments received the order to retreat.

The men who were able to get away following the railroad re-grouped with Wallace at Monrovia. Continuing the retreat east along the Baltimore Turnpike through New Market (Maryland) and on to Ellicott’s Mills (today’s Ellicott City), Wallace sent several messages, first to B&O Railroad president John Garrett:

I did as I promised. Held the bridge to the last. They overwhelmed me with numbers. My troops fought splendidly. Losses fearful. Send

me cars enough to Ellicott’s Mills to take up my retreating columns. Don’t fail me.\textsuperscript{161}

Then to General Halleck in Washington he wrote:

\begin{quote}
I fought the enemy at Frederick [Monocacy] Junction from 9 a.m. till 5 p.m., when they overwhelmed me with numbers. I am retreating with a foot-sore, battered, and half-demoralized column. Forces of the enemy at least 20,000. They do not seem to be pursuing. You will have to use every exertion to save Baltimore and Washington.\textsuperscript{162}
\end{quote}

Indeed, as Wallace had hoped, the Confederates chose not to pursue his retreating troops toward Baltimore and instead they simply made camp on the battlefield.

More significantly, the planned Confederate march to Washington was delayed by a full day; a day during which General Halleck telegraphed General Grant requesting troops be sent to Washington rather than Virginia. Grant’s reply: “If you think it necessary, order the Nineteenth Corps as it arrives at Fortress Monroe to Washington . . . if the rebel force now north can be captured or destroyed I would willingly postpone aggressive operations to destroy them, and could send in addition to the Nineteenth Corps, the balance of the Sixth Corps.”\textsuperscript{163} That evening, Halleck sent a message to the Commanding Officer at Fort Monroe: “Troops arriving from New Orleans will be sent immediately forward to Washington.”\textsuperscript{164}

Back on the battlefield at Monocacy, George K. Johnson, surgeon and Medical Inspector of the US Army, reported the grim results of the battle:

The Federal dead left on and near the field at Monocacy on the 9th instant, were buried under my supervision on the 10th and 11th instant.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{161} OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 2, message from Maj. Gen. Lew Wallace to J. W. Garrett (received 8:33 p.m.), relayed by Garrett to Sec. of War Stanton, 139.
\item \textsuperscript{163} OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 2, Correspondence etc., Halleck to Grant, July 9, 1864 (1 p.m.) and Grant to Halleck, July 9, 1864 (received 7:30 p.m.), 133.
\item \textsuperscript{164} OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 2, Correspondence etc., Halleck to Fort Monroe, July 9, 1864 (11:30 p.m.), 137.
\end{itemize}
There were buried on the field, 117; and in the neighborhood, 4; making a total of 121.\footnote{OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 1, “Reports of Surg. George K. Johnson, Medical Inspector, U.S. Army,” July 14, 1864, 203.}

The number of Union wounded taken to the army hospital in Frederick was listed as 204 men. Johnson estimated 150 to 275 Confederate dead. Concerning the wounded he noted,

The Confederates left 405 of their wounded in the hospital of Frederick. In addition to these a number of cases, not fewer, I think, than 30, were left in various country houses, making the total number now in our hands at Frederick 435. Most of these were serious cases and could not be carried away.\footnote{Ibid., 204.}

Total casualties in fact exceeded Johnson’s estimates, with 1,300 Union men killed, wounded, or missing and about 900 Confederates.\footnote{OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 1, “Composition and losses of the Union forces in battle of the Monocacy,” 201–2.}

**ON TO WASHINGTON**

On July 10, the Confederates resumed their march to Washington, but their energy was spent. Throughout the day on the 11\textsuperscript{th}, Early rested his troops near the Washington defensive installation known as Fort Stevens. Small groups of skirmishers spent the day reconnoitering the strength of the fort and its forces, described by topographical engineer Capt. Jed Hotchkiss as “of a very formidable character and fully manned.”\footnote{OR, Series 1, Vol. 43, Part 1, “Report of Capt. Jed. Hotchkiss, Topographical Engineer, C. S. Army, of operations of the Second Corps, Army of Northern Virginia and Army of Valley District, May 3–November 14, 1864,” 1021.} Apparently unknown to the Confederates, the fort had only a small garrison of 78 Ohio National Guardsmen, 72 men of the Thirteenth Michigan Battery, and 52 convalescents.\footnote{OR, Series 1, Vol. 37, Part 1, “Report of Lt. Col. John N. Frazee, 150\textsuperscript{th} Ohio Infantry [National Guard], of the Defense of Washington,” July 16, 1864, 246. Lt. Col. Frazee was in command at Fort Stevens at the time.} Initial reinforcements to the Washington defenses, approximately 7,800 men under the command of Maj. Gen. Alexander McCook, came in the form of Veteran Reserves, Quartermaster’s men,
and Volunteer regiments stationed in the area. On the 12th, Early’s jaded forces skirmished at Fort Stevens with fresh Union reinforcements from the Sixth Corps. They had traveled from Louisiana to Petersburg, where Grant quickly, though grudgingly, sent them on to Washington. General Early recalled the situation at Fort Stevens:

I determined to make an assault on the enemy’s works at daylight next morning. But during the night a dispatch was received from General Bradley T. Johnson from near Baltimore, that two corps had arrived from General Grant’s army. . . . I had, therefore, reluctantly to give up all hopes of capturing Washington, after I had arrived in sight of the dome of the Capitol, and given the Federal authorities a terrible fright.

That night Early withdrew his men. The Confederates re-crossed into Virginia at White’s Ford and Conrad’s Ferry, taking with them 2,000 head of cattle, 1,000 horses, and supplies as well as prisoners and close to $225,000 in cash.

Historically there were differing opinions as to whether Lee and Early ever actually intended to attack Washington’s defenses. In his 1884 essay for Battles and Leaders, “Early’s March to Washington in 1864,” Jubal Early said his orders from Lee were “to threaten Washington city.” He qualified this statement in a letter to the editors, included as a footnote to the essay, stating:

General Lee did not expect me to be able to enter Washington. His orders were merely to threaten the city, and when I suggested to him the idea of capturing it he said it would be impossible.

Early also addressed the implication by “some Northern papers” that he dawdled in his march to Washington, “that, between Saturday and Monday, I could have entered the city,” and so probably never intended to capture the capital. To this suggestion Early answered that “on Saturday I was fighting at Monocacy,” that his army had marched up the Shenandoah
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172 Leepson, Desperate Engagement, 211–24.
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Valley hungry and some barefoot, and were exhausted following the Monocacy battle. By the time they were ready again for battle, the Washington defenses had been reinforced:

My small force had been thrown up to the very walls of the Federal capital, north of a river which could not be forded at any point within forty miles, and with a heavy force [Hunter’s] and the South Mountain in my rear . . . a glance at the map . . . will cause the intelligent reader to wonder, not why I failed to take Washington, but why I had the audacity to approach it as I did, with the small force under my command.176

General Early may have believed that had the opportunity presented itself, that he would indeed have captured Washington, though it appears that General Lee did not believe it would be possible. In the end, the Union capital was not captured, but Lee’s plan to draw Federal troops away from the siege at Petersburg and from threatening the Confederate capital at Richmond was successful.

Even with the withdrawal of Early’s forces from Washington, at that time there was no Union recognition of the Monocacy battle’s significance in saving the capital of the United States. General Wallace was in fact initially demoted, then reinstated and returned to duty for the remainder of the war.177 Wallace was offered no special commendation from General Grant, or recognition of the sacrifice that his command made. However, years later in the 1880s, Ulysses S. Grant did acknowledge the Monocacy battle and the important role that General Wallace played:

the situation of Washington was precarious and Wallace moved with commendable promptitude to meet the enemy at the Monocacy. He could hardly have expected to defeat him badly, but he hoped to cripple and delay him until Washington could be put into a state of preparation for his reception. . . . They met the enemy and, as might be expected, were defeated; but they succeeded in stopping him for the day on which the battle took place. The next morning Early started on his march to the capital of the Nation, arriving before it on the 11th. . . . If Early had been but one day earlier he might have entered the capital before the arrival of reinforcements I had sent. Whether the delay caused by the battle amounted to a day or not, General Wallace contributed on this occasion, by the defeat of the troops under him a greater benefit to the cause

176 Ibid.
177 Leepson, Desperate Engagement, 221.
than often falls the lot of a commander of an equal force to render by means of a victory.\textsuperscript{178}

For his part, Wallace felt that his mission had largely failed. In his battle report, written the next day, Wallace asserted that he “had gone into battle with three simple objectives: first, to keep open the railroad link with Harpers Ferry; second, to cover the roads to Washington and Baltimore; third, to make Early disclose the size of his force. ‘I failed in all but the last.’”\textsuperscript{179}

When Wallace wrote his report on July 10, the fate of Washington was as yet unknown. Neither Early nor Grant’s reinforcements had reached the city yet. Weeks later, Wallace reassessed, believing that his men had fought to save Washington and were successful in the long run. He proposed a monument to be dedicated to the Union dead from the battle inscribed to read, “These men died to save the National Capital and they did save it.”\textsuperscript{180}

The significance of the Monocacy battle endures whether the capture of Washington was intended or not. At the same time that Lee’s plan may have saved the Confederacy, the plan also appears to have helped save President Lincoln from defeat in the 1864 election. Early’s invasion into northern territory, the third major Confederate invasion in as many years, and the imminent threat to the US capital was viewed by Lincoln’s opponents as perhaps the final blow to a failing administration. Copperheads, also known as “Peace Democrats,” sensed an opportunity to influence the upcoming election, defeat Lincoln, and end the unpopular war.\textsuperscript{181} But the capital city was not taken and Lincoln defeated the Democratic candidate Gen. George McClellan by a wide margin of the popular vote. In the opinion of Civil War historian Gary Gallagher, “it can be said with confidence that Wallace’s troops spared the Lincoln government a potential disaster, and for that reason the battle of the Monocacy must be considered one of the more significant actions of the Civil War.”\textsuperscript{182} Lincoln and Grant construed the 1864 election as a mandate to continue the war to its necessary conclusion: the defeat of the rebellion and reunification of the United States.\textsuperscript{183} Indeed, by April 1865, the war was over.

\textsuperscript{178} Cooling, “Monocacy,” quoting Ulysses S. Grant’s Memoirs, 60.
\textsuperscript{181} Leepson, \textit{Desperate Engagement}, 222, citing James McPherson.
\textsuperscript{182} As cited in Leepson, \textit{Desperate Engagement}, 222.
MEMORIALS, MONUMENTS, AND COMMEMORATION

As one historian has said, “The Civil War remains perhaps the most compelling episode in American history, but especially during the latter decades of the 19th century it was an overwhelmingly dominant historical presence that deeply impacted the lives and thoughts of millions of Americans.”

Even as the American Civil War waged on, efforts at memorialization began as the numbers of the fallen mounted and a sense of the need to honor their sacrifice grew. In July of 1862, a Congressional Act included a provision empowering the president “to purchase cemetery grounds and cause them to be securely enclosed, to be used as a national cemetery for the soldiers who shall die in the service of the country.” President Lincoln designated 12 such cemeteries in 1862 at the height of the war. In 1863, immediately following the battle at Gettysburg, private citizens formed the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA) to oversee the purchase of land for a cemetery in which to bury the Union dead. Located on ground “where Northern troops had scored a crucial victory,” NPS historian Richard Sellars notes, the site selection, surely heightened the symbolism and the sense of consecration and hallowedness that Lincoln reflected upon in articulating the Union cause and the meaning of the war, and in validating the “altogether fitting and proper” purpose of battlefield cemeteries.

The GBMA additionally purchased sections of the battlefield where significant Union activity occurred, including Culp’s Hill and Little Round Top, for the purpose of preserving the hallowed ground. The Gettysburg efforts were indicative of the commemorative battlefield preservation activities that followed the war later in the 1800s.

Similarly, in March of 1864, the Maryland legislature passed “an act to purchase and enclose a part of the battlefield at Antietam for the purposes

of a State and National Cemetery.”¹⁸⁸ Union dead from the battles at Antietam, South Mountain, and Monocacy were reinterred in the cemetery, which was dedicated on September 17, 1867. But it was not until 1880, at the start of an intense period of monument memorialization on Civil War battlefields, that “The Private Soldier” or “Old Simon” monument was placed at the center of what became known as Antietam National Cemetery. The 44½-foot monument was dedicated to the memory of all the fallen soldiers, with the inscription “Not for themselves, but for their country.”¹⁸⁹

General Wallace, in his official report following the July 1864 Monocacy battle, proposed erecting just such a monument over a mass grave of the Union dead at Monocacy.¹⁹⁰ The men, however, were buried at Antietam National Cemetery, and the monument was never constructed. But the idea was not forgotten. In 1889, a group of Union veterans of the Monocacy battle formed the Monocacy Monument Association, headed by Frederick W. Wild, a private in Alexander’s Battery during the battle. The association’s mission was “to recognize the importance of the battle of Monocacy, and to erect a monument on the field to commemorate the event.”¹⁹¹ The group planned a reunion of Union participants at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the battle that year, at which “a letter was read from Gen. Lew Wallace, expressing regrets at his inability to participate in the reunion and stating that $5,000 had been secured for and was at the disposal of the Monocacy Monument Association.”¹⁹² Despite this promise of a substantial sum of money, again no monument was forthcoming. In 1904, at the 40th reunion, the surviving battle veterans led by General Wallace himself proposed “to erect a monument on the historic battlefield.”¹⁹³ This time their fundraising efforts fell short, and the monument was never built.

The idea of battlefield monuments, often memorializing the death of officers, but more commonly marking significant locations of military units on the field of battle, began with the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial


¹⁹² Ibid.

Association in 1864. However the concept was not put into practice until the 1880s with the coming of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Civil War years and continued into the early 1900s. Unlike the one monument planned for Monocacy, monuments dedicated to specific units began to appear in great numbers, often paid for by veteran’s groups, private donations, or by state appropriations. Carefully researched cast iron markers and tablets described the line of battle, the time of day, and the outcome of the engagement. Inverted cannons typically marked the site of the death of a general. The battlefields at Gettysburg, Chickamauga, Chattanooga, and Vicksburg all have more than a thousand monuments, markers, and tablets, while Shiloh has over 600, and Antietam more than 400. At Monocacy, by 1915, there were three monuments dedicated to the Union regiments of New Jersey (1907), Pennsylvania (1908), and Vermont (1915). A fourth monument, erected in 1914, was dedicated to the Confederate men who fought at Monocacy, funded by the Frederick chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy.

**ESTABLISHING MONOCACY NATIONAL MILITARY PARK**

In his 1992 NPS bulletin, *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America’s Historic Battlefields*, historian Patrick Andrus observed that, “The movement to construct monuments dedicated to individual units in the 1880s gave many battlefields their current park-like appearance.” Indeed, the need to preserve that “park-like appearance” of the hallowed ground now dotted with monuments sparked the move to designate battlefields as national military parks. In 1890, Congress authorized the battlefields at Chickamauga and Chattanooga in Georgia as the first national military park. In this action, Congress approved for the first time acquisition of property through purchase or through condemnation by the power of eminent domain. Thus began a new concept, that of preserving whole battlefields as historic landscapes, rather than the earlier practice of just placing monuments at specific sites.

At Gettysburg, the purchase of battlefield lands by the citizen-led GBMA, which began almost immediately following the battle, accelerated in the 1880s with renewed interest from veterans groups. In 1895 the GBMA transferred their preserved battlefield lands to the federal government, and
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the pattern of large-scale property acquisitions continued.\textsuperscript{199} Antietam, however, followed a different path to preservation. Authorized by Congress in 1890, at the same time as the hugely expensive Chickamauga and Chattanooga reservation, Congress sought to reduce the expense at Antietam. The original plan for the preservation of 800 acres of the Antietam battlefield, authorized in the 1890 act, eventually was whittled down to 17 acres. Beginning in 1893, members of the Antietam Board, General Heth and Colonel Stearns, made the recommendation for roads through the battlefield saying,

On some of the fields, notably, those in the vicinity of the Dunkard church, East Woods, and the Bloody Lane, a large number of tablets will be located. In justice to the farmers owning these fields, we think roadways should be constructed to enable visitors to this battlefield to view and inspect these tablets without trampling upon and injuring growing crops, gardens, orchards, etc.\textsuperscript{200}

This radical plan for battlefield preservation, now referred to as the Antietam Plan, left the farm fields on which the battle took place in the continued ownership of the farmers.

Through the decades following the Civil War, the Monocacy landscape, like Antietam, remained largely agricultural and relatively unchanged. Like many smaller battlefields, Monocacy was recognized by locals and veterans of the battle, but not nationally known. Efforts to expand that public awareness began with local histories. Thomas Scharf’s \textit{History of Western Maryland} (1882) and Williams’s \textit{History of Frederick County} (1911) both described the battle in detail. In 1927, Judge Glenn Worthington, whose family lived on the Worthington Farm at the time of the battle, published his eyewitness account of the fight in \textit{The Battle of Monocacy; Being an Account of the Important Engagement at Monocacy River, Near Frederick, M.D., on July 9, 1864, Together with Excerpts from Official Reports}.\textsuperscript{201} Despite Representative Keifer’s 1908 introduction of H.R. 21132 “to authorize the purchase of land on which was fought the battle of Monocacy,” the land...
encompassing the battlefield remained in private ownership and there was no official recognition of the site.  

Judge Worthington was a prominent force in the push to nationally recognize and preserve the Monocacy battlefield. In 1926, the old Georgetown or Washington Pike was designated US Route 240. The road, which had two sharp curves just east of the river since its realignment in 1828, was straightened, bypassing the curves, which then became part of Araby Church Road.  

This realignment impacted three of the four standing memorials, noted E. D. Pope, editor of the Confederate Veteran magazine, in February 1928:

since the relocation of the Georgetown road these monuments are no longer accessible, at least, they are very much neglected and some of them almost hidden from view by bushes and briars growing up around them.

Pope’s message came in response to an article about the Monocacy battle, written by Judge Worthington and printed in the January 1928 issue of the monthly magazine. Pope observed that,

many of the leading citizens of Frederick are interested in having the old battle field area made into a memorial park, feeling that a battle of such importance, for it delayed the Confederate advance on Washington, deserves recognition from the government for having saved the city from possible capture.

I. G. Bradwell of Alabama, a Confederate veteran from Gordon’s Brigade, who shared his memories of the battle in successive issues in 1928, agreed: “Yes, let Congress set aside this ground as a national memorial.” Though he noted it would “commemorate the valor of our Southern heroes … who might have taken the President as a prisoner back to Dixieland.”


203 It appears that a Pratt Truss bridge spanned the Monocacy River until it collapsed in June 1930 and was replaced by the Parker Truss bridge now standing. See Report of the State Roads Commission of Maryland for the years 1927, 1928, 1929, and 1930 (Baltimore, MD, 1930), 69
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In January 1928, the Frederick group met to draw up a preservation proposal for Congress. The Washington Post reported on January 25, 1928, that the Frederick Chamber of Commerce had formed a committee called the Monocacy Battlefield Association, headed by Col. D. John Markey, who presented the proposal for a $50,000 appropriation to Maryland Rep. Zihlman. A Bill to establish a national military park at the battle field of Monocacy, Maryland, was introduced by Zihlman at the first session of the 70th Congress. It was referred to the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs and a hearing was held on April 13, 1928. The stated purpose of the bill was “to preserve … the breastworks, earthworks, walls, or other defenses or shelters used by the armies therein,” to be achieved by the acquisition of “title to the lands deemed necessary by the Secretary of War.” The bill cited the 1888 congressional authorization for condemnation of lands as the avenue for US government acquisition of required land for the proposed park. Under questioning, Col. Markey stated that the federal government was in fact not being asked to “purchase the battlefield.” Following the example of the Antietam Plan, Markey noted that the “$50,000 is to be used in the construction of roads and paths, in putting the old blockhouse back in shape, development of a park along the river and erecting proper markers, and relief maps.” As the committee mulled over the amount of acreage that might in fact be necessary, Ohio Rep. John C. Speaks observed:

I think its character and importance is such that the Government ought to take it over and establish it as an institution to be maintained in accordance with the ideas of the people relating to historic places.

To which Judge Worthington answered: “I have hoped for it all my life.”

The House of Representatives approved the plan and passed the full appropriation. The Senate, however, did not agree and on March 1, 1929, Congress passed a bill authorizing just $5,000, “to (1) acquire not to exceed one acre of land, free of cost to the United States, at the above-named battle field, (2) fence the parcel of land so acquired, (3) build an approach
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to such parcel of land, and (4) erect a suitable marker on such parcel of land.”

It was later explained to Judge Worthington by Army War College historian Col. H. L. Landers, that “Monocacy Battlefield was rated by the Army War College in a secondary classification, and that all engagements of this rating, according to the policy of the War Department, are marked in a manner provided for the Monocacy field.”

More than two years after the 1929 appropriation, the Monocacy Battlefield Association still had not expended the money to erect the monument directed by Congress. Throughout that time they stated their intention to ask Congress for the full appropriation, but they were advised in December 1930 that “the present time was not auspicious for a move for more money,” as the United States economy was slipping into the Great Depression. In early August 1931 the association was informed by Capt. John A. Gillman, the “U.S. constructing quartermaster at Washington,” that if they did not use the money, they would likely lose it. Instead the group decided to pursue the additional appropriation for the creation of the military park.

Monocacy Battlefield was in fact one of 50 Civil War battlefields identified in the Army War College study as Class IIb. Completed in 1926, the study rated battlefields according to their national significance (based on previous congressional actions) and made recommendations toward their preservation and monumentation. Class I battlefields were considered “Battles worthy of commemoration by the establishment of national military parks,” and Class II were “of sufficient importance to warrant the designation of their sites as national monuments,” while Class IIa battlefields were “of such great military and historic interest as to warrant

212 “An Act To provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland,” Seventieth Congress, Session II, Chapter 447, 1444.


locating and indicating the battle lines of the forces engaged by a series of markers or tablets,” and finally, Class IIb battlefields rated “sufficient historic interest to be worthy of some form of monument, tablet, or marker to indicate the location of the battlefield.”

Initially, the Great Depression stymied large-scale efforts to preserve battlefields. In 1930, Col. Landers estimated that the comprehensive program of battlefield preservation considered by Congress in 1926 would cost the federal government up to $20 million. For the time being, “special acts for special battlefields,” like the 1929 appropriation for a monument at Monocacy, would have to suffice. In the meantime, Judge Worthington continued his campaign to raise public interest in the battlefield, publishing his second eyewitness account of the battle entitled Fighting for Time, in 1932. In his “Preliminary Statement” Worthington wrote: “If the National Government is to notice this battlefield at all, surely it will do so in a way worthy of this great nation and appropriate to the vital importance of the sanguinary struggle that took place there at so critical a moment.”

Official recognition of the Monocacy battlefield finally came on June 21, 1934, when Congress approved the establishment of Monocacy National Military Park and authorized the long sought-after $50,000 to begin the process. The bill additionally allowed for the condemnation and purchase of land “deemed necessary,” directed it to be administered by a National Park Service superintendent, provided for the creation (and maintenance) of interpretive tablets and roads to access important sites within the battlefield, and allowed for the erection of new monuments. Judge Glenn Worthington passed away less than two months later at the age of 76. He had witnessed the Monocacy battle when he was just six years old and for much of his life worked to raise public awareness of the national significance of the engagement. Worthington died believing he had achieved his goal.

---


In fact, though the 1934 legislation creating Monocacy National Military Park was written into the official record, President Franklin D. Roosevelt threatened to veto the bill unless Maryland Senator Millard E. Tydings and Representative David J. Lewis, who sponsored the legislation, signed a letter promising that none of the money would be used to purchase land. Congress never actually appropriated the $50,000 they had authorized in the bill and for the next 40 years the Monocacy battlefield remained in private hands and continued to be actively farmed. The monuments too, remained in the ownership of their respective states and the Daughters of the Confederacy. In 1964, the State of Maryland erected a monument in honor of the centennial anniversary of the Monocacy battle.

**CONCLUSION**

The upheaval of the American Civil War affected communities like Frederick throughout the mid-Atlantic and the southern states. Recovery would take decades, beginning with the Reconstruction era of the late 1860s to early 1870s through the memorialization period of the 1880s and 1890s. For those who wished to commemorate the sacrifices made at the Monocacy River crossings on July 9, 1864, the wait was significantly longer, delayed by politics, war, and the Great Depression. Chapter 3 focuses on the long road leading up to the establishment of Monocacy National Battlefield in the National Park System in 1976.

---
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CHAPrer 3: ESTABLISHING MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

The Great Depression impacted all aspects of the federal government as well as the daily lives of most American citizens. But the election of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932 brought about many changes that began to improve conditions across the nation. Many of these changes occurred in 1933 within the first 100 days of his presidency. Using the power of Executive Order, President Roosevelt introduced sweeping economic programs to reinvigorate the US economy. The president also began to reorganize the government bureaucracy, hoping to improve efficiency and eliminate redundancy.

In June 1933, Roosevelt transferred administration of the nation’s battlefield parks, sites, and monuments from the War Department to the Department of the Interior. The National Park Service now oversaw battlefield preservation and interpretation.221 Under this program the Department of the Interior received 50 War Department “reservations,” including 11 national military parks and their adjoining national cemeteries, and 11 battlefield sites including Monocacy.222 In September 1933, Gettysburg Superintendent James R. McConaghie submitted a report on the condition of “Monocacy Battlefield Site,” noting that “the Government owns no land” and that the monument plots “are all in bad condition” and “badly located.” McConaghie proposed a development of the battlefield following the Antietam Plan:

Quite briefly it appears that if lands were acquired for a circulatory drive which would lead through the important positions with perhaps monument areas properly located along the drive wherein to reset the present monuments more correctly a proper development would be accomplished. A number of markers giving the story would complete.223

But the Monocacy legislation then on the books authorized only one acre of land to be donated to the government and $5,000, which had essentially
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been refused by the Monocacy Battlefield Association as inadequate. Even with the new legislation of 1934 establishing the Monocacy National Military Park and authorizing $50,000, the current economic conditions of the 1930s precluded any further development.

Throughout the Great Depression of the 1930s, national and state parks infrastructure benefited from several of Roosevelt’s work programs – the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Works Progress Administration (WPA) among others – for physical improvements funded by the government. Still undeveloped as a park, the Monocacy battlefield did not benefit directly from the work programs and improvements seen in parks across the nation. However, as a site within the National Park System, the foundation was laid for its future development. That development would have to wait though, delayed by the Depression, World War II, and by the 10-year NPS improvement plan known as Mission 66.

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE FOUNDING PRINCIPLES AND THE MISSION 66 VISION**

The National Park Service was created as a federal agency within the Department of the Interior by an Act of Congress in 1916. The “Organic Act” stated the Park Service’s twin purpose of conservation and recreation: “the Service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments and reservations . . . to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”

Within two years of this enabling legislation, Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Lane added a third governing principle, “that the national interest must dictate all decisions affecting public or private enterprise in the parks.” This principle provides guidance for the balancing act between National Park Service goals and those of state and local interests.

These governing principles informed the development of the National Park Service and its administration of the growing number of parks under its purview. By 1930, the NPS administered 23 national parks and 32 national

---


In 1933, the 72 battlefield properties were added as well. Many of these parks benefited from Roosevelt’s Depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) program, which focused its efforts on state and national park infrastructure.

In 1941, the United States’ entry into World War II put a stop to all NPS improvements. Conrad L. Wirth, appointed director of the National Park Service in 1951, recalled that period in his memoir *Parks, Politics, and People*:

Within a couple of years all emergency recovery funds of the thirties were diverted to prepare for war, and the yearly appropriation for the Park Service dropped from the 1940 high of nearly thirty-five million dollars to a low of under five million dollars in 1945. All construction, of course, was stopped, maintenance was cut to the bone, and deterioration of facilities set in. Because of gas rationing, travel through the parks was cut to a mere trickle.

For the already established parks, this was a difficult time. But for sites like Monocacy National Military Park, still awaiting its initial appropriation (authorized in 1934), it was a devastating blow that put fulfillment of the park’s enabling legislation on hold for several more decades.

Under the guidance of Director Conrad Wirth, the Mission 66 program of much-needed improvements to the nation’s national parks was initiated in 1956. It reiterated the NPS paradigms of conservation, recreation, and national interest, but was also influenced by Wirth’s father, Theodore Wirth, a career park planner who viewed public parks as a deeply personal experience for visitors. Mission 66 visitor centers, support facilities, and interpretive installations were planned specifically to enhance the visitor experience. A renewed attention to conservation of the natural or cultural features that were, in fact, the purpose of the park was also part of the Mission 66 package. Congress appropriated over a billion dollars through the 10 years of the program. Major Civil War battlefields benefited with the addition of fully modern visitor facilities such as the Richard Neutra-designed Cyclorama Building at Gettysburg and the visitor center at

---
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Antietam designed by William Cramp Scheetz Jr. of Philadelphia. But with the attention devoted to improving established parks, the start-up of Monocacy National Military Park remained neglected.

ESTABLISHING MONOCACY NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The 1934 legislation establishing Monocacy National Military Park came at a difficult time for any expectation of appropriations from Congress outside of the emergency programs put forward by President Roosevelt. Lewis W. Douglas, director of the Bureau of the Budget, in fact objected to the language of the Monocacy bill, allowing for condemnation and purchase of land by the government. In order to avert a veto from the president, on June 18, 1934, Maryland Representative David J. Lewis and Senator Millard E. Tydings provided written assurance that “any money necessary to acquire land under the bill shall be raised by private subscription.” Three days later, the president signed the bill and the long-awaited Monocacy National Military Park became a reality, at least on paper.

Charles McC. Mathias, chairman of the Monocacy Battlefield Association (MBA), initiated talks with NPS Director Arno B. Cammerer as early as April 1934, in an effort to get the Park Service thinking about the future Monocacy battlefield park. In May 1934, Verne E. Chatelain, with the NPS Branch of Research and Education, provided some historic background on the battlefield for Assistant Director Demaray. Then, following the passage of the legislation in June, a flurry of communications regarding the new park commenced. As early as July, Rep. Lewis inquired about potential appointments of maintenance personnel, perhaps in the hope of recommending some of his constituents. By August, James R. McConaghy, superintendent at Gettysburg National Military Park, was


231 Charles McC. Mathias (“Chairman”) to Hon. Arno B. Cammerer, April 24, 1934, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.

appointed coordinating superintendent for Monocacy, and in September, Department of the Interior Administrative Assistant E. K. Burlew noted that Clarence R. Rogers was recommended to be the superintendent at Monocacy. In his response to Burlew’s memorandum, Demaray acknowledged that Rogers was qualified, but at a salary too high for a park “such as Monocacy is to be when established,” adding, “no money has been appropriated from the Treasury and no tender of land has been made. As a consequence there is little chance of any position being established at this proposed national monument [sic] for some time to come.” 233

Indeed, a full year passed before Monocacy became the subject of renewed activity. In July 1935, Assistant Director George E. Moskey requested clarification from Supt. McConaghie concerning the park’s acreage:

According to our statistical table we are reporting one acre of Government owned lands constituting Monocacy National Battlefield site. However, our Land Division has no record of the Government owning any land at Monocacy. If you have a deed, or copy of one, conveying this tract to the United States please send it to this office, together with the abstract of title. 234

McConaghie’s reply did not come until October 30, in which he reported that “the government does not own any property at the Monocacy Battlefield Site.” 235 The Monocacy Battlefield Association also became active again in July 1935, when Charles Mathias called an executive committee meeting to discuss the as-yet undeveloped plans for the battlefield park. The local newspaper indicated a renewed interest in the battlefield as an important site on the “Washington-Lincoln-Gettysburg Memorial Boulevard,” then in the planning stages. 236

Finally, on September 7, 1935, then-Acting Assistant Director (NPS) Verne E. Chatelain sent two NPS junior historians, Col. Thomas L. Hofferman and Ruth Graham, to visit the battlefield. They first explored the landscape by car, viewing the monuments and markers previously placed by the states.
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and the MBA. Then on September 9, Hofferman met with Charles Mathias to discuss planning arrangements. While Hofferman and Graham conducted historic research of the battlefield, Mathias and the MBA provided the NPS with a map marked to indicate “the area which, in the judgment of our Executive Committee, should be included,” here described in Mathias’s letter as:

Memorandum to Verne Chatelain from Ruth Graham, “Report on Field Investigation of Monocacy Battlefield, Frederick, Maryland, Sept. 7, 1935,” Folder “Planning Documents/1930s-1940s,” Interpretive Files, Drawer Mb-Mz, MNB Library. Photographs of the three sign markers identified by Graham in her report are located in the archives of the Historical Society of Frederick County. According to that source, the signs were in place as early as 1920. It is unknown who placed the signs.
Farm of Glenn H. Worthington and brother, 283 acres,
Farm of John H. & Wm. G. Baker, 240 acres, [Thomas Farm]
Property of Geo. Edw. Yaste, 30 acres [on Reel’s Mill Road]
In addition to these properties, it was thought by the Committee that the
Waltz Property of about 25 acres and not shown on the map should be
acquired. This property represents the high point overlooking the valley,
and would make an excellent site for an observation tower.238

The map referred to by Mathias was drawn in 1932 by local engineer W.
Jarboe Grove and was used for a presentation to “The President of the
United States and the Members of The Washington-Lincoln Memorial
Gettysburg Boulevard Commission.”239 (Figure 4)

MBA members Charles Mathias, Howard D. Baker, and James H. Gambrill
Jr. next traveled to Washington on October 10, 1935, at the request of
Acting Assistant Director Chatelain, to “go over some of the problems
together.”240 The “problems” probably revolved around the large amount
of land expected to be purchased, something that Congress and President
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Roosevelt would not support. While in Washington, the MBA committee also met with Rep. Lewis, who promised to enlist Sen. Tydings to enter discussions with the National Park Service. What followed is unknown as all documented activity concerning Monocacy National Military Park fell silent for the next 13 months.

In November 1936, the issue of the one acre of land authorized in the 1929 legislation once again caused confusion. In a memorandum to Assistant Directors Demaray and Conrad L. Wirth, NPS Editor-in-Chief Isabelle Story noted that since the government did not own the one acre of land (thought to have been transferred from the War Department) at Monocacy, it should not be classified as a “Battlefield Site,” but rather be classified as an area “authorized but not established.” The memo was referred to G. E. Moskey, who confirmed that the government did not own any acreage at Monocacy. In the meantime, NPS Junior Historian Alvin P. Stauffer submitted a two-page report on the history of the Monocacy battle.

Director Cammerer called an office conference on the Monocacy development issue in June of 1937. In response, Ronald F. Lee, then-acting assistant director, had a map prepared with “recommended boundaries” for the park. Unfortunately this boundary map did not remain with the Monocacy records. However, Junior Historian Ruth Graham explained the map in a memorandum to Branch Spalding, acting assistant director of Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings:

I. The area marked in green represents the maximum boundaries or limits of land required for a National Military Park at Monocacy.

This area includes all of the ground on which intensive fighting took place, the deployment of troops not actively engaged and by including all of the important roads and river crossing, combines some of the strategical with all of the tactical features as well as giving scenic control.

II. The area marked in yellow represents a second scheme which includes the area on which intensive fighting occurred.
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This would allow for a small area on the Hagerstown and Baltimore roads for the erection of markers. It would include the monuments and markers which have been erected on the battlefield.

III. The area marked in red includes the minimum area believed necessary for the establishment of a park. It comprises only the area where the fighting occurred for the possession of the Washington Road. It would include the site of Wallace’s Headquarters, the few remaining trenches, and the monuments now on the field.243

Graham qualified the proposed boundaries with the statement: “it is believed that the maximum amount marked would not be feasible,” due to the high quality of the farm land, the “substantial houses and barns,” and the difficulties presented by the railroad.

Several months later, in November 1937, a more detailed vision for the Monocacy battlefield park was presented by Harry T. Thompson, NPS assistant chief landscape architect in the Branch of Plans and Design. Following a visit to the battlefield site, Thompson submitted his report entitled The Monocacy Battlefield. In it, Thompson laid out a plan for development of the battlefield park that would greatly reduce the amount of land necessary for purchase:

The problem as it now presents itself seems to be how to preserve the scene of the battle as nearly as possible as it was in 1864 for the benefit of future generations without saddling unnecessary expenses on the Government for development, maintenance and operation of the area. Several solutions to the problem are possible as follows:

1. To purchase only such lands as are necessary to preserve the scene of heavy fighting, comprising approximately 4,000 acres.

2. To purchase three, or possibly four, vantage points, each consisting of not more than five acres, from which views of the battle area may be obtained.244

Thompson believed that a wholesale purchase of land would be “very difficult … because of the lack of funds for this purpose and the high acreage value of the agricultural lands involved.” He then proceeded
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to detail his plan to preserve the battlefield while keeping the land in private ownership, “especially if satisfactory agreements can be made with the owners to keep the area as far as possible in its present condition.” (Figure 5)

The entire scene of the fighting may be viewed from three, or possibly four, vantage points. . . . Each of these may be located in proximity to existing state or county roads, thus eliminating the cost of road construction and maintenance. Each of these vantage points might consist of three to possibly five acres of ground upon which an overlook shelter might be constructed. Some sort of directional arrows together with brief explanations might be provided, thus making attendants or guides unnecessary. Such small Government-owned areas might well be maintained by one or two caretakers.245
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A “scenic easement agreement” with the landowners for the remaining land would, noted Thompson, “of necessity be quite liberal in its general terms since the cost of rigid restrictions might cause the cost to approach the value of the land itself.” Thus, he recommended that landowners not be prevented from selling “road frontage for commercial purposes . . . should unforeseen opportunities arise.” The agreement would not be legally binding but would rather “produce a cooperative spirit between them and the Government and will give the latter an opportunity to secure such lands as may be endangered from the encroachment of future development.”

Thompson concluded with recommendations for the steps needed to complete the suggested development program, including his mistaken assumption that the “present law authorizes the acquirement of only one acre of land,” leading him to suggest that new legislation would be needed to allow for the purchase of the three or four, one to five-acre parcels.246

The Thompson report appears to have generated some interest within the NPS Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings and the Branch of Plans and Design, who issued a “joint concurrence” on the report’s plan for the future park at Monocacy.247 In August 1938, a Master Plan for the Monocacy National Battlefield Site was reportedly prepared by Landscape Architect Walter H. Sheffield. The master plan, apparently based on the Thompson plan, was revised in May 1939 and approved by Coordinating Superintendent James McConaghie.248 In December of 1939, NPS Director Arno Cammerer wrote a letter to Charles Mathias in which he reiterated that “no appropriations for the purchase of the necessary land have been made by the Congress,” and that no funds appeared to be forthcoming. With that he referenced “certain studies” (Thompson’s plan and probably the master plan) that identified the significant vantage points from which visitors could view and understand the battlefield. “Do you think,” Cammerer inquired, “there is any possibility of the local citizens arranging for the acquisition of the necessary lands to carry out the plan outlined

246 Thompson, “A Report.” It was the 1928 bill, H.R.11722, which limited the “acquirement” of land to one acre. The 1934 legislation creating the Monocacy National Military Park states clearly that, “title to the lands deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been acquired by the United States” (48 Stat. 1198).

247 Vint and Spalding to the Director [Cammerer], Dec. 7, 1937, Folder “0-31 Monocacy,” Box 2610, RG79, Central Classified Files (Entry 11), NARA II.

248 Sheffield to McConaghie, Aug. 26, 1938; McConaghie to Regional Director, Region I, May 26, 1939, Folder “0-31 Monocacy,” Box 2610, RG79, Central Classified Files (Entry 11), NARA II. Neither of these plans was found with the Monocacy records housed at NARA II.
Thus began a new round of meetings and reviews throughout the year of 1940.

Beginning in February 1940, Director Cammerer met with the MBA committee (Mathias, Baker, and Gambrill), “to discuss the development of Monocacy National Military Park,” and concluded with the recommendation that the site be visited “to determine on the ground the vantage points and the access roads needed.” In April 1940, Conrad Wirth, then NPS supervisor of Recreation and Land Planning, wrote to Mathias that Dr. Charles W. Porter (associate historical technician) and Oscar Bray (associate engineer) would be visiting the site to review the feasibility of a proposed road, noting in a second letter that some of the proposed road work “can be done by a side camp from the CCC camp at the Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Project.” Porter and Bray submitted their reports in May. While Oscar Bray’s report focused on the feasibility of constructing the connecting road, Dr. Porter’s report fleshed out the vantage point plan developed by Thompson three years earlier:

The recommendation of the present report is that the selected vantage points be arranged in a single line on the east side of the Monocacy River. This would exclude site C of Mr. Thompson’s report, but would retain the vantage points that he selected at A and B. In between A and B, an intermediate site D and a parking overlook E should be developed. … The four sites selected, A, D, E, B, overlook the four strategic areas, or river crossings, which the Union Army had to defend, viz. The Washington Road Bridge, the B. & O. Railroad Bridge, Crum’s Ford, and the Baltimore Road Bridge (“Stone Bridge”). The historical guided tour would proceed from A where the first phase of the battle occurred and would follow the Union line of retreat to D overlooking the scene of the struggle at the Railroad Bridge, where Union entrenchments are still preserved and can be included in the small purchase area for parking and development. From there the guided tour would proceed to E along a scenic river drive following the Union line of retreat as far as Crum’s Ford. Leaving the Union line of retreat, the guided tour would then cross the Ford and run along the battle line of attack along the Baltimore Pike and across the Stone Bridge to site B overlooking the scene of the final phase of the battle.

249 Cammerer to Mathias, Dec. 18, 1939, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
250 Herbert E. Kehler, chief, Historic Sites Division, to the Director [Cammerer], Feb. 21, 1940, Folder “0-31 Monocacy,” Box 2610, RG79, Central Classified Files (Entry 11), NARA II.
251 Wirth to Mathias, April 19 and April 30, 1940, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
Porter concluded, “It is believed that four sites connected in the manner described would tell the whole story of the Battle of Monocacy, and would constitute a national military park of the Antietam type.” 252 (Figure 6)

Finally in June 1940, Wirth detailed the results of the studies to Mathias in a letter, including the somewhat stricter scenic easement proposal:

These vantage points may vary in size from 1 to 3 acres, depending on topography. In each case, except at site “C” [probably Porter’s site E], it

will be necessary also to acquire approximately 1 acre of land that may be used as parking space for automobiles of visitors to the vantage points. It appears desirable to connect these points with a road following the general course of the Monocacy River, as shown on the attached map. Existing roads may be used for this purpose, except for approximately .80 mile where a new road must be constructed and approximately .85 mile where the old abandoned county road must be reconstructed.

In addition to the land necessary for the vantage points, parking areas and connecting road, it is desirable that scenic easements be secured over the land... These easements should provide for the continued use of the lands for general agricultural purposes; no commercial signs or advertising to be erected thereon, and buildings to be limited to residential structures or structures incidental to farming operations, except with the approval of the National Park Service. ...

It is proposed that interpretive markers be placed at each of the four vantage points, that these be connected with accompanying parking space by a simple foot trail, and that the road between Baltimore Pike and Washington Pike be constructed and/or reconstructed by this Service, using CCC funds and personnel wherever possible. It will be necessary to secure an appropriation item for approximately $15,000 for the construction of a bridge across Bush Creek near the railroad track.  

While the road and bridge would be funded by the federal government, the required land purchases were expected to be funded locally “and donated to the Federal Government.” Cammerer concluded, “If the local citizens approve these plans, we will then be in a position to recommend them for approval by Secretary Ickes.”

Mathias responded positively concerning the proposal, but he requested blueprints showing the exact acreages that would be required, noting that “it would be well to get the general approval of the owners of the land,” before making the proposal public. Those plans were provided by Acting Director DeMaray on August 8, 1940. Overlook Site B, located on a bluff above the “Jug” Bridge, provided a sweeping view of the battle area around the old stone bridge (Figure 7); Site D was located on the north side of the B&O Railroad tracks at the village site of Frederick Junction (Wallace’s Headquarters) (Figure 8); Site A was located on a bluff between the Thomas and Worthington farms (no blueprint available). No blueprint was provided for Site C [Crum’s Ford], though Demaray noted, “it will be

253 Cammerer to Mathias, June 11, 1940, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
254 Ibid.
255 Mathias to Cammerer, June 13, 1940, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
necessary to acquire a small area at site ‘C’ sufficient for parking space for four or five cars.” 256 Again, the response to the NPS plan from Mathias and the “local committee” was positive. However, they underscored the vital importance of the road development to the success of the plan. 257

256 Demaray to Mathias, Aug. 8, 1940, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
257 Mathias to Demaray, Oct. 1, 1940, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
In October 1940, Demaray began hedging on the plan, noting that the CCC involvement was “possible” and that they “might be assigned to work on the parking areas and reconstruction of the road connecting points “A” and “B.” … but the CCC cannot be used for construction of the bridge across Bush Creek near the railroad track or the necessary railroad grade separation [underpass].”  

He emphasized that the land would have to be acquired first to establish the park, after which “the Service would then be in a position to request an appropriation item for the funds necessary for the construction of the bridge and grade separation.” But by the fall of 1940, the ongoing war in Europe was escalating while Japan expanded its hostile activities in Asia. In October the US government instituted a civilian draft, indicating a shift in the US posture of neutrality. Demaray continued, “In view of current expenditures for national defense purposes, the Bureau of the Budget may not be inclined to approve these appropriation items.”  

In February 1941, Mathias indicated vague “progress” on the land purchases, with one of the land owners completely unavailable for another month. However, in that following month on March 11, 1941, Congress approved Roosevelt’s “Lend-Lease” program authorizing US aid to Great Britain (and later Russia) in the war against Germany. The United States declared war on Japan in December 1941. Throughout the four years of US involvement in World War II, National Park Service appropriations were drastically curtailed and once again the Monocacy National Military Park would have to wait for a better economic climate.

THE BLACK HOLE: NO ACTIVITY ON BATTLEFIELD DEVELOPMENT AND US 240 CONSTRUCTED

With the end of World War II in 1945 the states and the federal government turned to evaluate domestic conditions resulting from the singular focus of men, material, and money on the war effort. First on the list of many state officials was infrastructure, and in particular, limited access roads. Highway improvements would not only provide employment for men returning from the war, but they would also help to move materials for continued

258 Demaray to Mathias, Oct. 14, 1940, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
259 Ibid.
260 Mathias to Demaray, February 15, 1941, Theresa M. Michel Personal Files.
261 Early in 1944, then-coordinating superintendent at Gettysburg, J. Walter Coleman, inquired if the NPS would like a proposal for Monocacy development, while pointing out that there was apparently no “local interest” in the project at the moment. The response from Region One director, Oliver G. Taylor, referred to Monocacy as “one of the least pressing jobs of this kind in the whole of Region One,” and noted that no boundaries had ever been approved. (Coleman to Reg. Dir., Region One [Taylor], Jan. 28, 1944; Taylor to Coleman, Feb. 1, 1944, Folder “0-31 Monocacy,” Box 2610, RG79, Central Classified Files (Entry 11), NARA II)
industrial development and improve access to developable land outside of the cities. Money from the federal government, however, would not be forthcoming in amounts supportive of such an ambitious program.

The idea of an Interstate Highway System first appeared in 1939 in a report to Congress written by the Bureau of Public Roads entitled *Toll Roads and Free Roads*, referenced in a 1976 review of highway improvements by the US Department of Transportation:

> the study explored and documented the need for a system of interregional superhighways, with connections through and around cities. A 26,700-mile non-toll network was proposed, with the recommendation that the Federal Government share the construction cost at more than the traditional 50 percent Federal aid rate.\(^{262}\)

Under President Roosevelt, the initial idea evolved into the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which identified 40,000 miles of potential interstate highways. Appropriations to the states for these projects remained stagnant, however, during and immediately following the war.

In Maryland, Governor William Preston Lane Jr. (1947–1951) pressed forward with a five-year highway building plan known as the “1947 Maryland Highway Program.” The program proposed construction of “limited access expressways in the Baltimore and Washington regions.” The Maryland legislature endorsed Lane’s plan by passing what would become known as the “Expressway Act of 1947”: “An Act … authorizing the State Roads Commission to construct, maintain, repair and operate bridges, tunnels and motorways, including a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay,” funded by bonds, tolls (bridge), and a gas tax increase.\(^{263}\) The act empowered the State Roads Commission to acquire necessary rights-of-way by purchase or by condemnation through eminent domain. Among the projects authorized was the Washington National Pike, a dualized, limited access highway that would parallel the old Georgetown Pike, then identified as US 240 [SR 355].\(^{264}\)


The new US 240 alignment was planned to run between the Thomas and Worthington farms, the ground at the center of the most intense fighting during the 1864 Monocacy battle. Oddly, no correspondence from NPS or the Monocacy Battlefield Association has been located concerning the highway alignment, which sliced through the battlefield boundary identified by Dr. Porter in 1940, a boundary apparently never officially approved. The highway would isolate the home of the late Glenn Worthington, who had been so instrumental in bringing Monocacy Battlefield to national attention, from the rest of the battlefield landscape.

In April of 1950, the State Roads Commission acquired the rights-of-way through the three farms. The property owners – including Charles Geisbert (Lewis Farm), C. Edward Hilgenberg (Thomas Farm), and the Mathias family (Best/Trail Farm) – had little recourse given the State Roads Commission’s power of eminent domain provided for in the 1947 legislation. The alignment through the Thomas Farm (then owned by the Hilgenbergs) cut access to the Worthington Farm lane, which shared part of the Thomas Farm lane, requiring a conveyance of land on the southwest side of the new highway from the Hilgenbergs to the Worthingtons for a new lane.²⁶⁵ (Figure 9)

Grading work for the new alignment began immediately, according to the December 1950 publication of the annual State Roads operating report.²⁶⁶ By 1951, the segment of the new US 240/Washington National Pike from US 15 [SR 85] at Evergreen Point (Frederick) to the Montgomery

---

²⁶⁵ Frederick Co. Deed Book (FC DB) 496, p. 394. The Hilgenbergs purchased the Thomas Farm from heirs of Wm. H. Baker in July 1949 (FC DB 479, p. 464).

²⁶⁶ Report of the State Roads Commission of Maryland for the years 1949-1950 (Baltimore: Maryland State Roads Commission, 1950), 173. Right-of-way deeds: FC DB 484, p. 264 (Hilgenberg); DB 484, p. 87 (Mathias); and DB 484, p. 90 (Geisbert).
In 1956, then-President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s dream of a uniform interstate highway system, substantially funded by the federal government, became a reality with the passage of “The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.”267 The Washington National Pike/US 240, which by then extended as far south as the Capital Beltway (Interstate 495), was designated Interstate 70S. In 1972, the US 240 identifier was dropped and in 1975 it received a new designation as Interstate 270.268

Despite the obvious intrusion of an interstate highway through the heart of the Monocacy battlefield, a 1959 survey of the landscape – part of a thematic study entitled “The Civil War” completed by the National Park Service – found that “much of the battlefield remains in open fields and woodland.”269 Though the Park Service clearly remained aware of the battlefield, no movement toward development was forthcoming, particularly since there appeared to be little or no local interest at the time.270 The year 1956 had been the start of a 10-year intensive program of national parks improvements known as “Mission 66.” Geared

Figure 10: 1951 Maryland highway map showing the completed section of Rt. 240 and planned Rt. 15 Frederick by-pass

---


269 As cited by Barry Mackintosh, “Monocacy Battlefield, Maryland, Trip Report, 5/26/71,” manuscript provided by Monocacy MNB Acting Superintendent Andrew Banasik, summer 2016.

270 In 1947, Acting Regional Director (Region I) Elbert Cox wrote in a memorandum, “There apparently is little, if any, local interest evidenced in the project, and the service is not attempting to stimulate any.” (Cox to Supt. Morristown National Historical Park, Nov. 19, 1947, Folder “0-31 Monocacy,” Box 2610, RG79, Central Classified Files (Entry 11), NARA II)
toward bringing existing parks up to “modern” postwar standards, the funding bonanza of the Mission 66 era failed to impact unrealized parks like Monocacy.

The 1959 Civil War thematic study was initiated as the Park Service geared up for the upcoming centennial anniversary of the Civil War that would begin in 1961 and last through April 1965. In 1963, Baltimore News American feature writer J. William Joynes began a campaign to highlight Monocacy as “Maryland’s Lost Battlefield,” noting in a July 7, 1963 article that “the National Park Service disclaims any ownership or interest in it.”271 Despite the apparent lack of national interest in Monocacy, local interest was renewed through the Frederick County Civil War Centennial Commission, then headed by C. Lease Bussard. In September 1963, the group erected 40 signs around the battlefield to improve the visitor experience.272 (Figure 11) National recognition of the battle centennial came on July 7, 1964, when Congress passed Public Law 88–357, authorizing the president of the United States “to issue a proclamation which shall designate July 9, 1964, as ‘Monocacy Battle Centennial,’ in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy, and which shall call upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”273 The act initially authorized the Department of the Interior (presumably the National Park Service) to help arrange the celebration, but it was amended to instead authorize the United States Civil War Centennial Commission, “to cooperate with the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission and with Frederick County Civil War Centennial, Inc., in the observance of the Monocacy Battle Centennial.”274 Locally, the 1964 Centennial observance of the Monocacy battle began on July 5 with a rededication of the Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) monuments. The ceremonies were followed by a reenactment of

274 To Commemorate The 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Monocacy, commemorative booklet, Frederick County Civil War Centennial, Inc., 1964.
the Monocacy battle, “The Battle That Saved Washington,” held at the Frederick Fair Grounds. On July 9, a dedication ceremony for the new Maryland memorial, recently erected next to the United Daughters of the Confederacy monument on the Best/Trail farm, featured Maryland Governor J. Millard Tawes as the guest speaker.\footnote{Ibid.}

The centennial commemoration briefly stirred local interest in the Monocacy battlefield, but it did not produce any new movement toward development of the national park there. Many of the men instrumental in the drive to establish the park had passed away – Glenn Worthington in 1934, James H. Gambrill Jr. in 1951, and in 1967, Charles McC. Mathias Sr. – their dream of a national park at the Monocacy battlefield still unrealized. Despite the deep commitment to Monocacy his father had shown, when Charles McC. Mathias Jr. was elected to Congress in 1960, his focus steered...
toward civil rights and protecting the Chesapeake Bay. He advocated for establishment of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Maryland as well as protections for Antietam National Battlefield and Assateague National Seashore, but apparently he did not press for the Monocacy park development. Following his election to the Senate in 1968, Mathias’s successor, Representative Goodloe E. Byron, finally took on the task of bringing the Monocacy National Battlefield to fruition.

CONCLUSION

It was the diligent work of influential men that kept the dream of a Monocacy Battlefield park alive through the difficult decades of the first half of the 1900s. Although local and federal interest in the park waned as the years stretched on, the vision for Monocacy never faded completely. The election of Rep. Goodloe E. Byron brought renewed interest and fresh vigor to the task. Chapter 4 develops the history of establishment of the Monocacy National Battlefield’s boundaries and eventual land acquisition.

Chapter 4: Monocacy Battlefield Boundaries and Land Acquisition

Currently the Monocacy Battlefield covers 1,647 acres. Most but not all of the land belongs to the National Park Service. Some is privately owned but under scenic easement.

As it was originally planned in 1929, the legislation to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Monocacy stated, “Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of commemorating the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to (1) acquire not to exceed one acre of land, free of cost to the United States, at the above named battlefield, (2) fence the parcel of land so acquired, (3) build an approach to such parcel of land, and (4) erect a suitable marker on such parcel of land.”

Five years later on June 21, 1934, Congress passed more expansive legislation to create a national military park at the battlefield of Monocacy. The act designated the battlefield as “Monocacy National Military Park.” It authorized the secretary of the Interior to take actions including condemnation, purchase or lease of battlefield lands, and it provided for appointment of a superintendent who would manage roads, monuments, and historic resources within the park. This act concluded by authorizing $50,000 for carrying out its provisions. This legislation did not create boundaries or list any particular land to be part of the military park. Although the $50,000 was authorized, it was never appropriated or used. Legislators assumed that lands for the park would be donated.

National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmark Designation for “Monocacy Battlefield,” 1973

By 1973, there was still no boundary designated for Monocacy Battlefield and the federal government did not own any of the land. With the exception of small bits of property that Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Vermont owned for their monuments, all of the battlefield land was privately owned. A threat materialized that prompted a National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmark nomination, the establishment of boundaries, and subsequent legislation in 1975 to authorize acquisition of land. In 1972 the Frederick County Board of

277 H.R. 11722, approved, March 1, 1929.
County Commissioners adopted a master highway plan that proposed a Frederick County feeder road. The proposed road was a circumferential limited access expressway that would have linked major traffic corridors passing through Frederick – I-270, I-70, US 40 and US 15. The proposed path of the highway in the vicinity of the Monocacy Battlefield cut through the Worthington and Thomas farms, slicing them in two, and may have resulted in the demolition of some historic buildings associated with the battle. There would have been an interchange at the intersection of I-270 and the proposed feeder road. In addition, the Frederick County Master Plan, adopted August 9, 1972, proposed a rapid rail transit facility with a station located at the Monocacy Junction area.278

Apparently the threat of the feeder road was known to the National Park Service as early as the spring of 1971. Barry Mackintosh of the History Division made a trip to Monocacy to view and evaluate the battlefield and prepared a trip report on May 26, 1971. He described the battlefield and conditions there, discussing the monuments, viewshed, Thomas, Worthington, and Gambrill properties, as well as non-historic commercial and residential infill. Mackintosh noted the lack of signage directing visitors to the battlefield and the untended condition of the monuments. He concluded his report, “Aside from this major highway [I-70S (now I-270)], the battlefield is relatively unspoiled (although some might compare this situation to a man who, aside from having a broken neck, is in good health). The general absence of modern development cannot long continue, however. … [T]he tide of population and development flowing out of the I-70S corridor to Frederick will inevitably engulf the battlefield unless it receives some level of governmental protection.”279

In 1973 the National Park Service prepared a National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmark designation for “Monocacy Battlefield,” authored by Horace J. Sheely Jr. with the Division of History, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service. For that effort the National Park Service created boundaries for the battlefield National Register nomination. Edwin C. Bearss, supervisory historian, National Park Service plotted out the boundaries, along with John G.
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Parsons, chief, Urban Coordination and Environmental Impact Division, National Capital Parks. As drawn for the nomination, the battlefield had two separate sections, a larger southwest tract, containing about 1,200 acres in the Frederick Junction area, and a smaller northeast tract containing approximately 300 acres in the vicinity of Jug Bridge (Figures 12 and 13) The National Register boundaries are different from the official boundaries of Monocacy National Battlefield and did not coincide with property lines or geographic features. According to John Parsons in an interview conducted for this administrative history, the boundaries were determined from winter view site lines from core areas of the battlefield. The southwest section captured parts of the Worthington, Best, Baker, Gambrill, and Thomas farms, while the northeast section caught the National Pike crossing of the Monocacy River and lands to the north and south on the west side of the river.

**SUITABILITY/FEASIBILITY STUDY, PROPOSED MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, MAY 1976**

The Office of Cooperative Activities, National Capital Parks (now National Capital Region), National Park Service prepared a Suitability/Feasibility Study for the then-proposed Monocacy National Battlefield with four alternative proposals for protection of the battlefield, identified as A, B, C, and D. Alternative A (Figure 14) used boundaries identified in legislation introduced by Goodloe Byron as H.R. 3830, which eventually passed as Public Law 94–578 in October of 1976. Under this alternative the boundaries encompassed 650 acres covering the Worthington, Thomas, and Baker farms. Fee acquisition was proposed for the Worthington Farm and the eastern tip of the Thomas Farm, bordered by Route 355, Araby Church Road, the Monocacy River, and a fence line that ran from Araby Church Road to a point near the river. The remaining 310 acres would be protected by scenic easement.

---

280 John Parsons’s title was given in 1976 as chief, Urban Coordination and Environmental Impact Division, National Capital Parks in the Suitability/Feasibility Study, Proposed Monocacy National Battlefield, May 1976. Later, his title became associate regional director for Lands, Resources and Planning.

281 Monocacy National Battlefield National Register Nomination, 1973. Note that 1979 GMP and other sources say that the NHL listing was July 1, 1975. The document was signed and dated by the Keeper of the National Register in 1973, however.

282 John Parsons interview, Sept. 20, 2016.

283 All information in this section, unless otherwise cited, is from Suitability and Feasibility Study, Proposed Monocacy National Battlefield, Frederick County, Maryland, Office of Cooperative Activities, NPS, May 1976, n.p.
Alternative B (Figure 15) proposed a much larger boundary with a visitor orientation facility on the Lewis Farm, near, but independent from the then-proposed overlook off I-270. For this alternative, scenic easements were required for 1,030 acres of land and fee acquisition of 470 acres including the Worthington Farm, the eastern end of the Thomas Farm, as in Alternative A, and the Lewis Farm, and land along the unnamed ridge north of the railroad and east of the river, along with connecting land along the river. The boundary was expanded in Alternative B to include land on either side of I-270 at the south end of the battlefield and portions of the Best and Markell farms at the north end.

The third alternative, C (Figure 16), shared the proposed overlook off I-270 that was to be developed by the State of Maryland where an orientation
facility would be installed. Alternative C anticipated acquisition of scenic easements over 1,100 acres in the vista from the overlook, plus National Park Service fee acquisition of the Worthington House with 36 acres to include its access road and immediately surrounding grounds, and 144 acres in front of the overlook, the Lewis Farm, so that the National Park Service could control vegetation and protect the view from the overlook. The Park Service boundary encompassed the Worthington, Thomas, Baker, Lewis, and Best farms, plus a small area of land west of the river and I-270 and north of the railroad.

Alternative D was the no action option. Future land use projections showed that much of the battlefield and its environs would be developed for residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Construction of the proposed

Figure 13: National Register nomination boundary map showing NE section (NPS)
Frederick County Freeway would slice through the battlefield with its interchange at I-270 cutting further into the Worthington and Thomas landscapes. The Suitability/Feasibility Study noted that since the battlefield was a National Historic Landmark, if federal funds were to be used for the freeway, the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation would have to concur that the undertaking would have no adverse effect on the property.
PUBLIC LAW 94–578, PASSED OCTOBER 21, 1976, ESTABLISHES BATTLEFIELD BOUNDARY

The threats of the Frederick County feeder road or freeway and the rapid rail station precipitated activity to protect the battlefield and initiated the National Park Service’s role as manager of the landscape. Judge Robert Clapp, who owned the Thomas Farm, contacted Congressman Goodloe Byron in 1972 in an effort to preserve his property from the path of the proposed expressway. Congressman Byron immediately introduced legislation to protect the battlefield, but without success, until February...
27, 1975, when he introduced H.R. 3830. It was incorporated into H.R. 13713 and became Public Law 94–578 on October 21, 1976.\textsuperscript{284} The National Historic Landmark designation prepared and listed in 1973 prevented

\textsuperscript{284} Miller, Wihry, and Lee, Inc., Assessment of the Alternatives - General Management Plan for Monocacy National Battlefield, 1; also Suitability and Feasibility Study, Proposed Monocacy National Battlefield, Frederick County, Maryland, Office of Cooperative Activities, NPS, May 1976.
the construction of the Frederick County feeder road through the battlefield. National Historic Landmark designation requires mitigation of adverse effects caused by federally funded or licensed projects, under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The adverse effect of the proposed Frederick County feeder road through the battlefield was obvious.

Congressman Byron’s legislation addressed several national parks, but for Monocacy in particular, it amended the 1934 act, changing the name of the battlefield military park to Monocacy National Battlefield. More importantly the 1976 law placed administration, development, preservation, and maintenance of the battlefield in the hands of the secretary of the Interior and authorized appropriation of up to $3,525,000 for the acquisition of lands. Another $500,000 was authorized for development of public facilities on the battlefield. The secretary of the Interior was directed to develop a master plan within three years. The new law referenced a battlefield boundary, “generally depicted on the drawing entitled ‘Boundary, Monocacy National Battlefield,’ numbered 894–40,000 and dated May, 1976.” (Figure 17) According to the Suitability/Feasibility Study for the proposed Monocacy National Battlefield, the modest boundary proposed in H.R. 3830 and later authorized in H.R. 13713

---

285 Interview with John Parsons, former associate regional director for Lands, Resources and Planning, Sept. 20, 2016.
286 Public law 94-578-October 21, 1976.
included essentially the Worthington Farm, Thomas Farm, and Baker Farm, for a total of 650 acres.\footnote{287}

Goodloe Byron also established an advisory commission, the Monocacy Battlefield Commission in 1977. Made up of local individuals with Civil War expertise or interest in Monocacy Battlefield, they worked with the National Park Service to formulate plans for the new park.

**BOUNDARY INCREASE, NOVEMBER 10, 1978, PUBLIC LAW 95–625**

In 1978 Congress increased Monocacy’s boundaries as part of omnibus parks legislation. Goodloe Byron made a motion to include expanded boundaries for Monocacy National Battlefield in the parks legislation.\footnote{288}

When passed on November 10, 1978, the parks legislation became Public Law 95–625. For Monocacy, the law added approximately 587 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled, “Boundary Map, Monocacy National Battlefield,” numbered 894–40,001 and dated May 1978. The law also appropriated $3.5 million for the battlefield’s development. (Figure 18) This was in addition to the 1976 appropriation, bringing the total to $7 million.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{boundary_map_monocacy.png}
\caption{February 1976, “Boundary Map, Monocacy National Battlefield” (Federal Register)}
\end{figure}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[287] *Suitability/Feasibility Study, Section A, Alternative A, n.p.* [Note that the 1979 GMP and other NPS sources say that acquisition was authorized for up to 1000 acres. This does not appear in the narrative of the law.]
\item[288] Letter, Goodloe E. Byron M.C. to H. Thomas Summers, April 20, 1978, MNB Library.
\end{footnotes}
The boundaries depicted on the map included essentially the Best, Worthington, Thomas, Baker, and Gambrill properties. The increased boundary was an effort intended to bring more of the core area of the battle into the park, as recommended by the Monocacy Battlefield Advisory Commission. The commission worked with the National Park Service and Congressman Goodloe Byron to promote the boundary increase. The increase added the Best, Geisbert (Baker), and Gambrill properties, although the National Park Service did not yet own these properties. The new boundary map followed property lines, unlike the National Historic Landmark map, which followed site or view lines.

Unfortunately, Goodloe Byron, tireless advocate for Monocacy Battlefield, did not live to see the final passage of the bill. He died of a heart attack while jogging on the C&O Canal towpath on October 11, 1978. He was seeking reelection in November of 1978. When he died a month before the election, the Democratic State Central Committee unanimously nominated Beverly B. Byron, Goodloe’s wife, to replace her late husband on the November ballot. Mrs. Byron won the election and served in the US House of Representatives until 1993. She was also an active and dedicated supporter of the battlefield and served on the Monocacy Battlefield Advisory Commission that Goodloe appointed.

**FIRST GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, 1979**

In 1979 the National Park Service completed the General Management Plan required in the 1976 legislation to be done within three years. It presented four alternatives for the development of the park and included maps with the boundary that placed the five historic Monocacy farms – Best, Gambrill, Thomas, Baker, and Worthington – within the park. The base map presented in the General Management Plan was the same as 894–40,001 (Figure 18), which was referenced in Public Law 95–625 in 1978. The General Management Plan was officially titled *Assessment of the Alternatives – General Management Plan for Monocacy National Battlefield, Frederick County Maryland*. At this point, no land belonged to the National Park Service. All battlefield land was held privately except for public roads.
and rights-of-way as well as the small parcels belonging to states who
maintained monuments on the battlefield.

The General Management Plan presented four alternatives for park
development ranging from maintaining a battlefield overlook and visitor
station adjacent to the present overlook along I-270 to full development
of the park with National Park Service land ownership and interpretive
facilities. In 1979 the State of Maryland was in the planning stages for
the I-270 overlook and the GMP’s Alternative A would have created
an interpretive overlook near the one that the State of Maryland was
proposing. A second overlook would be created on the west side of I-270
to accommodate southbound traffic. This was the least impactful alternative.
No land would be acquired, except what was needed for the west side
overlook and a picnic area.

Alternatives B, C, and D were more ambitious. Alternative B focused on the
Gambrill property and proposed making the Gambrill Mansion a visitor
and interpretive center. A trail system would lead to points of interest on the
Gambrill property and cross Route 355 to include views from the Thomas
Farm. A maintenance facility would be constructed in the corner of the
Gambrill property. This alternative contemplated acquisition of the Gambrill
property and small parcels attached to it and also a portion of the Thomas
Farm at its eastern tip.

Alternative C proposed the Thomas House as the hub of the park and
its visitor and interpretive center. The Thomas and Worthington Farms,
where the most intense battle action occurred, would be developed for
interpretation, accessed by a system of trails connecting lands on both
sides of I-270, including the Vermont and Pennsylvania monuments.
This alternative used the Thomas House as both a visitor center and
administrative headquarters. Alternative C required acquisition of the
Thomas and Worthington Farms and restrictions placed on the Best, Baker,
and Gambrill properties to preserve the viewshed.

The most comprehensive of the four alternatives was D, which proposed
an entrance facility and parking lot at the north end of the Best Farm near
the location of the Maryland and UDC monuments. The Best farmhouse
under this alternative would have become the interpretive center and
administrative offices. Loop trails would extend outward from the Best
House, crossing the railroad and the river. Alternative D was the only
option that gave visitors the opportunity to experience the area around the
railroad bridge on the Gambrill Farm, the Thomas Farm, the Worthington House, and Brooks Hill, which were key sites in the proposed park.  

PUBLIC HEARING, JULY 9, 1979

A public hearing for the Monocacy National Battlefield’s Assessment of Alternatives – General Management Plan took place on July 9, 1979, for the purpose of presenting the four alternatives and allowing interested members of the public to comment. Antietam National Battlefield superintendent Virgil Leimer presided over the meeting with National Park Service representatives Larry Steeler, interpretive specialist, and John Parsons, associate regional director, Lands, Resources, and Planning, making presentations. Congresswoman Beverly Byron was also in attendance. Leimer explained the plan’s alternatives and the difference between fee (ownership) and non-fee (easement) acquisition.

Five attendees spoke on the proposed acquisition and development plan. Most speakers were in favor of the park’s development. Generally the speakers were opposed to alternatives A and B because they were not comprehensive enough, and preferred Alternative D. A representative from the Hagerstown Civil War Round Table advocated for additional land to be taken into the proposed park, on the north side of the railroad, east of the river, where earthworks and trenches are still in place.

J. O’Neil Jenkins, owner of the Worthington Farm, also spoke at the hearing. His business, Jenkins Food Corporation, acquired 14,000 acres of land in Frederick County to grow produce for his canning operation. Finding development pressure in Frederick County too great, he moved his company to Maryland’s Eastern Shore, but retained the Worthington Farm. He stressed the importance of the National Park Service acquiring all of the land proposed for purchase now rather than waiting until escalating land prices made the cost prohibitive. He pointed out the recent $40 million development of the Francis Scott Key Mall just north of the battlefield as a major factor.

Kelley Litteral, an attorney representing a group of business people, opposed the National Park Service’s acquisition of property along the west side of the Monocacy River and Interstate 270. This area was referred to as “Parcel 7” and was adjacent to the Frederick County wastewater treatment plant and 60 acres of land to the north of the railroad, which the owners
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intended to develop. Moreover, a right-of-way for a sewer line to the Bush Creek area was also planned.

Judge Robert Clapp spoke about property owners who would be displaced if the park acquired lands. Although he supported the proposed battlefield development, he reminded the National Park Service that Goodloe Byron promised that Clapp could remain on his own land for the rest of his life.295

Eventually most of the recommendations put forth in Alternative D were implemented. Alternative D provided a comprehensive approach to restoration and protection of the battlefield as well as public access and opportunities for interpretation and recreation. Access to the park was encouraged by signage from the Frederick interchange of Interstate 270 north on State Road 355. The actual park entry was to be from SR 355 onto the Trail property. This approach to the battlefield was commensurate with the approach of the Confederate troops.296

**LAND ACQUISITION**

**Boundary Expansion, 1980, Public Law 96–607**

In 1980 the battlefield’s boundaries again expanded. Public Law 96–607, passed December 28, 1980, stated that “the battlefield shall comprise the area within the boundary generally depicted on the map entitled Monocacy National Battlefield, numbered 894/40,001A dated April 1980.”297 The new law also authorized an appropriation of additional funds, beyond what had already been appropriated, up to $725,000 for acquisition of lands and $1.25 million for development. This legislation brought the battlefield boundary to essentially its present shape. The added lands were north of the railroad, the finger and fist-shaped projection that included earthworks, a blockhouse site, and the Camp Hooker site on an unnamed ridge along the east side of the river. Most of this land the National Park Service currently holds under scenic easement.

The battlefield’s boundaries, because they followed property lines, are not the same as the original boundaries established for the National Register/National Historic Landmark listing. The NR/NHL boundaries were based on winter sight lines from the core areas of the battlefield, while the
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297 Pub. L. 96–607, title XIV, §140(a), Dec. 28, 1980, 94 Stat. 3546. We were unable to locate this map (EBW 2018).
park boundaries were based on property lines of the acquired (or to be acquired) lands. In some places the park’s legislated boundary is beyond the NR/NHL boundary, and in other areas, the NR/NHL boundary extended beyond the park’s boundary. The National Register nomination was updated in 2004, but the boundaries were left as originally drawn.

The activity that brought Monocacy Battlefield’s boundaries to their present outline resulted from years of intermittent but dedicated advocacy and effort on behalf of preservation of the cultural and natural landscape. After initial actions in the 1930s, a concerted effort toward preservation through defining the boundaries of the area to be protected, and then acquiring property through purchase or easement took shape in the early 1970s. Congressman Goodloe Byron rallied key support in Congress, followed by Congresswoman Beverly Byron who succeeded him. Support also came from Civil War roundtable groups, the local newspaper, the Frederick News-Post, and key local historians such as Judge Edward S. Delaplaine. The combination of congressional, local, and National Park Service support drove the acquisition of the battlefield lands with relatively little opposition.

**LAND PROTECTION PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, 1983**

The Land Protection Plan developed in 1983 replaced the Land Acquisition Plan, which had been approved on August 24, 1979. During the Ronald Reagan administration (1981–1989), the Interior Department, starting in 1981 “attempted to curtail park acquisition. Former Secretary James G. Watt proposed a moratorium on park purchases and diversion of acquisition funds for other purposes.”

Previously, in April of 1979, the Department of the Interior established a policy for land acquisition that encouraged acquisition in fee for the National Parks. According to the 1979 policy, “The National Park Service will acquire lands and waters in fee simple or less-than-fee interest within areas of the National Park System consistent with legislation or other congressional guidelines and executive orders to assure the protection of the natural, scenic, cultural, recreational, or other significant resources and to provide for adequate visitor use.”

The 1979 policy resulted from a sharp acceleration of National Park Service
acquisition of private property holdings. Each park was directed to prepare a land acquisition plan. Monocacy laid the groundwork for its plan with the 1979 General Management Plan with its alternatives on park development. According to the NPS policy, “Each area of the National Park System with an active land acquisition program shall have a land acquisition plan. The plan shall be developed by the park manager and approved by the Regional Director. The purpose of the plan shall be to inform the park staff, land acquisition personnel, affected landowners and the general public of the Service’s land acquisition program for the area.”

The Department of the Interior adopted a new policy statement on May 7, 1982. Due to decreased federal funding to the Land and Water Conservation Fund that provided money for land acquisitions, parks were directed to find alternatives to purchase of land. According to the new policy, parks were to “Use to the maximum extent practical cost-effective alternatives to direct Federal purchase of private lands and, when acquisition is necessary, acquire or retain only the minimum interests necessary to meet management objectives.” They were also asked to “Cooperate with landowners, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and the private sector to manage land for public use or protect it for resource conservation.” Under the new policy, land acquisition plans were to be replaced with land protection plans by September 30, 1985.

As a result of the new policy, Monocacy National Battlefield prepared its new Land Protection Plan, which was approved in October of 1983. According to the plan, Monocacy’s boundary contained 1,670 acres, and the land acquisition process was currently underway. Monocacy in 1983 owned 419.83 acres consisting of five parcels, the Worthington Farm, the Gambrill Farm, and three small properties, two on the east side of Route 355, south [east] of the river and one on Araby Church Road at the intersection with Baker Valley Road. According to the Land Protection Plan, “In the past, the National Park Service has most often used direct acquisition and management of land to protect significant historical resources. In response to budgetary constraints as well as other considerations the NPS is exploring alternative methods of preserving the historic scene at Monocacy. Although alternatives to direct acquisition are
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outlined in this plan, direct acquisition is still considered appropriate under certain resource protection circumstances.\textsuperscript{304}

The Land Protection Plan created priorities for protecting land by tract within the park’s boundaries. Core battlefield properties were the highest priority: Thomas, Best, and Baker farms, Brooks Hill, plus smaller holdings near the railroad junction on the east side of the river. Fee purchase was proposed for all of these properties, except for the Best Farm and the Baker Farm which were proposed for scenic easement. The plan recommended acquisition by donation of the state-owned monuments and the UDC monument. The plan also sought a right-of-way from the B&O Railroad to allow access across the tracks for park visitors. Most other properties within the boundary were to be protected with scenic easements.

Monocacy was not alone in its preference for fee acquisition. In fact, there was a congressional oversight review of the Department of the Interior land protection program. The US House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs formed a subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks to conduct oversight review and prepare a report. Congresswoman Beverly Byron served on both the main committee and the subcommittee. The findings were published in June 1984. The focus of the review was on the Department of the Interior’s efforts to halt or delay new park land purchases. In addition, according to the report, Interior Department officials had suggested deauthorizing certain urban parks, but the idea was dropped after great public outcry. The committee’s report found the following:

The Department also withdrew the National Park Service’s authority to approve land purchases, initiated new policies and requirements for land protection plans that would deemphasize fee acquisition, and greatly increased the number of procedural reviews for acquiring parkland.

The effect of these new requirements was that the Park Service’s land acquisition program came to a virtual standstill. Funds appropriated for individual units were not being spent. Fewer acres were acquired than during any comparable previous time. The Park Service’s obligation rate, which previously averaged 75 percent a year dropped to 51 percent in fiscal year 1982.

The delays in acquiring parkland may have constituted an illegal impoundment of funds. They did create substantial hardships on many

\textsuperscript{304} Ibid., 7.
property owners and caused numerous threats to the resources of affected parks. Specific examples of these problems are cited in the report.\textsuperscript{305}

Specifically for Monocacy National Battlefield, the report stated, “The very existence of this park has been threatened because of the [Interior] Department’s refusal to acquire the land. Although federal purchase was authorized in 1976, and funds have been appropriated for acquisition, as of April 1984, only 422 of the 1,220 authorized acres within the park boundaries have been acquired, with the two main properties within the core of the battlefield still unprotected.”\textsuperscript{306} The report concluded,

The National Park System today is admired and copied throughout the world. The pressures facing it are large and growing. Parkland acquisition is but one part of an overall program for the management for some of the Nation’s most important natural, cultural and recreational resources. As we approach the 21st century, the task that remains is the same as the one that was faced by generations in the past. Considering the national treasures that are involved, it is a task that deserves the best effort that the Nation’s leaders can give.\textsuperscript{307}

Despite the challenges of the Interior Department’s policies in the 1980s, Monocacy managed to purchase land in fee or scenic easements on 15 properties during the decade, more than any other decade in its existence. Most likely the ability to make purchases when the Interior Department discouraged such acquisitions had to do with strong congressional and local support for Monocacy National Battlefield. The first National Park Service acquisition at Monocacy was the fee purchase of the Gambrill Mill property, December 16, 1981, from A. Earl Vivino and Jean J. Vivino, for 134.36 acres. Next, in 1982, NPS purchased the Worthington Farm from Jenkins Brothers, Inc., containing 281.83 acres.\textsuperscript{308}

\textsuperscript{305} Report, Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, accessed Dec. 19, 2016, p. 2, \url{http://njlaw.rutgers.edu/collections/gdoc/hearings/8/84603618/84603618_1.pdf}, Rutgers Law Library, Camden, NJ. The report asserted that the Interior Department’s refusal to spend appropriated land acquisition funds constituted a deferral or rescission of budget authority under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. That act required all proposed executive impoundment of funds to be reported to the Congress. The Interior Department had not submitted the required reports (Ibid., 13).
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\textsuperscript{308} Monocacy National Battlefield Land Records Table, Vertical File, Mb–Mz, Folder, Monocacy Land Acquisition, MNB Library.
In 1984, NPS purchased part of Wallace Headquarters Area/Gambrill Distillery site in two separate parcels from George A. and Mary Eckenrode. NPS purchased 6.38 acres on the north side of the railroad, from Francis H. and Barbara M. Ladson in June 1987. This land included the blockhouse site and trenches on the north side of the railroad and the east side of the river. In December of 1985 and in June of 1987, the Park Service purchased scenic easements on two tracts from the Ladsons totaling approximately 122 acres with the site of Camp Hooker and the unnamed ridge east of the river and north of the railroad. These were non-fee purchases.309

On June 28, 1989, the National Park Service acquired three additional parcels from Betty B. Geisbert. The acquisition included the Lewis Farm, containing 60.97 acres, and two separate tracts comprised of the Baker Farm (76.23 acres) and Brooks Hill (177.68 acres), the main farm along Baker Valley Road. On Baker Farm land the Geisberts retained a life estate, which continues in effect. In addition to these, acquisitions included a number of smaller parcels scattered around the battlefield. The National Park Service acquired the two large remaining core areas of the battlefield, the Best and Thomas farms in 1993 and 2001 respectively.310

LAND ACQUISITION FUNDING, PUBLIC LAW 102–202, 1991
Congresswoman Beverly Byron introduced a bill on February 20, 1991, which authorized up to $20 million for land acquisition at Monocacy National Battlefield. Approved on December 10, 1991, the law stated, “there are authorized to be appropriated up to $20 million for acquisition of lands and interests in lands for purposes of the Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland; such sums shall be in addition to other funds available for such purposes.” This appropriation was for purchase of the Best Farm, which was zoned “industrial” and in the sites of developers who wanted to turn the farm into an office or industrial park. The farm’s potential for commercial/industrial development had driven its appraised value higher.

The National Park Service acquired the largest part of the Best Farm on August 9, 1993, from multiple heirs of Theresa Trail Mathias, who died in 1988. The Hermitage/Best Farm had been in the McElfresh-Trail families since 1835. While the heirs generally preferred that the farm go to the National Park Service rather than being developed, they did not all agree on the best way for the land to be transferred. The assessed value was high because the farm was zoned for commercial and industrial development. The IRS valued the farm for estate tax purposes at $13 to $17 million, with an estate tax of 55 percent and 13 percent interest on the unpaid balance. In
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addition there was Maryland estate tax and interest on the unpaid balance. The heirs could not afford the estate tax without selling the property.\textsuperscript{311} The process was slow and frustrating, and while the Best/Trail Farm was within the boundary of Monocacy National Battlefield, appropriation of funds was not consistent, particularly at the rate of the valuation of the property.

John Parsons, associate regional director for Lands, Resources and Planning with the National Capital Region, who was negotiating purchase of the Best/Trail farm for the National Park Service, recalled that there were 12 heirs, one of whom wanted the land to be transferred to an American Indian tribe recipient. After that heir died, the purchase moved forward. According to John Parsons, the rest of the heirs were relieved because they wanted to sell the property. Moreover, Congressman Roscoe Bartlett, who followed Beverly Byron in that office, pressed the National Park Service to remove most of the Best/Trail farm from the battlefield’s boundary so that it could be developed. Bartlett received no support for that position from the National Park Service.\textsuperscript{312}

When the Best Farm finally conveyed to the National Park Service, the transaction consisted of transfer of four separate parcels deeded over a two-year period. The first was for the bulk of the farm, 220.25 acres, deeded on August 9, 1993. This parcel, identified as NPS Tract 101–12, lies between Maryland Route 355 and I-270, and north of the Monocacy River. The purchase price was $7,110,000. The second purchase was on September 20, 1994, for a small 14.33-acre parcel located at the northwest corner of the farm at the east side of I-270, tract 101–40, which conveyed for $973,000. The final two parcels transferred on May 4, 1995. One of these contained 46 acres, located on the east side of route 355 and west of the rail spur leading into Frederick, tract 101–41, which sold for $3,400,000. The last parcel, tract 101–42, is 13.56 acres, which is a small triangular piece on the west side of I-270. The National Park Service did not purchase this last piece. Instead it received a donated easement. The total of all of these parcels adds to the entire acreage of the Best Farm, 294.14. The total acquisition cost $11,483,000.\textsuperscript{313}

The final property to come into National Park Service ownership was the Thomas Farm, which had been in the ownership of Judge Robert Clapp.

\textsuperscript{311} Theresa Mathias Michel interview, Sept. 8, 2016, and handwritten notes in Theresa Michel’s personal files shared with the interviewers.
\textsuperscript{312} John Parsons Interview, Sept. 20, 2016.
Ironically, it was Judge Clapp who got land acquisition started at Monocacy National Battlefield, with his opposition to the proposed Frederick County freeway that would have sliced through his farm and the adjoining Worthington Farm. Judge Clapp contacted Congressman Goodloe Byron for help in stopping the freeway. However, Clapp did not want to sell his land to the National Park Service in either fee or easement during his lifetime. Judge Clapp died in November of 1997. The National Park Service purchased the farm in 2001 from the family, with a life estate reserved on the main house for Josephine Clapp (Robert’s wife). The National Park Service took full possession of the property in 2008, but the house was unoccupied from 2002 to 2008.

With the acquisition of the Thomas Farm, the National Park Service owned, either through fee purchase or scenic easement, all six of the battlefield’s main component properties, the five main farms, plus the Ladson Tract east of the river and north of the railroad. In addition, Monocacy received its own superintendent in 2003. Prior to 2003, Antietam National Battlefield managed Monocacy, and provided a “site manager,” usually Antietam’s assistant superintendent. (See Chapter 5 for details on Antietam National Battlefield’s role in the development of Monocacy National Battlefield.) With land acquisition largely accomplished, Monocacy National Battlefield built a new visitor center at the north entrance of the battlefield in 2007.

**The Process of Land Acquisition**

The National Park Service can acquire fee or non-fee interest in land. Fee interest involves acquiring full ownership and title to the land, either through a negotiated purchase price with a willing seller, or through condemnation. Non-fee or “less-than-fee” interest refers to easements, primarily scenic easements, where the National Park Service purchases substantial rights and conditions to the land, but not ownership.

Condemnation, a legal proceeding handled in district court, occurs when the property is a critical piece of the battlefield landscape and the seller is unwilling, or when the seller feels that a better price could be had through the condemnation process. This was the case with the condemnation proceedings with the acquisition of the Geisbert properties constituting the Baker and Lewis farms. If a property owner does not feel that the
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price offered by the NPS is enough, condemnation may provide a way of achieving a higher purchase price. According to John Parsons, prices to landowners who sell through the condemnation process can be higher than through a straight negotiated sale.\textsuperscript{317}

The National Park Service initiates the process of land acquisition. When the NPS was interested in a property, it approached the owners, and the first step was to do an appraisal and based on that appraisal make the owner an offer in writing. If the owner felt the offer was too low, the owner could select condemnation as an alternative. With condemnation a jury may make an award higher than the appraisal amount.\textsuperscript{318}

In procuring properties, the National Park Service follows a “Land Acquisition Plan,” which is an internal document that indicates which lands the Park Service would like to buy (own in fee), and which they would like to preserve under easement. The plan also specifies the conditions for the scenic easements and what control NPS will have over the property in the future. The land acquisition staff proceeds based on the steps laid out in the land acquisition plan. For scenic easements, the land is appraised based on the conditions of the easement. Property owners with stronger easements with more controls over what they do with the land are paid 80–85 percent of the appraised value of the property. Easements with fewer conditions might require payment of 60 percent of the appraised value. The property owners are reimbursed for the rights to alter the property that they are giving up. The park’s General Management Plan guides the NPS use of the land once it is acquired.\textsuperscript{319}

\textbf{DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, JULY 2008}

In 2008 Monocacy National Battlefield issued a \textit{Draft General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement}. It was approved as final in 2011. According to this document, “Monocacy never has had a general management plan or the precursor master plan.”\textsuperscript{320} The 1979 General Management Plan document was only briefly mentioned and it was not listed in the bibliography. The earlier effort was “largely designed to plan for the opening of the national battlefield and the purchase of property,” which had been accomplished.\textsuperscript{321} By 2008 the 1979 plan had become obsolete. The 2008 draft GMP noted that “General management plans are intended to be long-term documents that establish and articulate a management
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philosophy and framework for decision-making and problem solving in units of the national park system. Such plans usually provide guidance during a 15–20 year period.” Moreover, the large population growth in Frederick County since the 1970s led to the development of commercial property along the north and northwest boundaries of the battlefield and dense residential development to the south. The development increased commuter and commercial traffic through the battlefield and impacted the historic views and vistas, introduced noise, and created safety concerns. Monocacy had been pressured to allow more road and utility corridors through park lands further threatening the battlefield's appearance and integrity. Plant and animal habitats diminished, forcing concentrations of habitats and introduction of exotic species onto the battlefield landscape. These conditions underscored the need for a plan of management to protect the battlefield for the next two decades.

In laying out its Primary Interpretive Themes, the 2008 draft GMP acknowledged that Monocacy’s landscape is rich with historical themes that extend far back in time before the Civil War, a “crossroads of history” that provides context for understanding the Civil War in general and the battle of Monocacy specifically. The GMP makes clear that much historical activity happened at Monocacy before the Civil War. The National Park Service sponsored in-depth research and interpretation of such aspects of pre-Civil War history as slavery on the L’Hermitage (Best Farm), initial settlement, and development of the landscape, which was greatly influenced by James Marshall, whose house is the centerpiece of the Thomas Farm.

The 2008 GMP offered four alternatives for battlefield use, management, and development. Alternative 1 was the no action option, continuing with the then current management strategy. The other three alternatives offered other options to achieve the battlefield’s mission and mission’s goals. Alternative 4 was the National Park Service’s preferred option.

While the GMP’s Alternative 1 was the “no action” option, Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 proposed varying degrees of action to benefit the battlefield. The plan also assessed environmental impacts of each of the alternatives. The National Park Service’s preferred alternative, number 4, included construction of a pedestrian deck over I-270 to connect the Thomas and Worthington farms, also proposed in Alternative 2. Alternative 4 was ultimately chosen and many of its components were complete or underway by the time the draft GMP received final approval in 2011.
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The proposed deck over I-270, which has not been constructed, would mitigate for the intrusion of the busy commuter expressway that cuts the battlefield in two. Due to increased traffic on I-270, in 2002 the Federal Highway Administration and the Maryland State Highway Administration released a *Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f)* Evaluation with alternatives and mitigating measures for widening the highway through the battlefield. Alternatives included adding as many as two lanes in each direction to the interstate. Any increase in size of I-270 would negatively impact the battlefield with reduction of battlefield lands, noise increase, and additional visual interruption of the landscape. One of the options proposed as mitigation was to construct a landscaped deck across I-270, which would be covered with soil and crops and fencerows to recreate the visual scene. The GMP preferred Alternative 4, which included a pedestrian trail across the bridge, following the path of the original access road to the Worthington Farm.\(^{324}\)

**GMP Alternatives 3 and 4 placed the administrative offices in the Thomas House, which has happened. A concrete blockhouse near the corner of Baker Valley Road and Araby Church Road and a toll house moved to a site near the corner of Araby Church Road and MD 355, both on the Thomas Farm, were proposed for removal and that has occurred.**\(^{325}\)

**ACQUIRING THE MONUMENTS**

Monocacy National Battlefield has five commemorative monuments. As part of the growing interest in memorialization, in the early 1900s, the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Vermont as well as the United Daughters of the Confederacy erected monuments commemorating specific actions at Monocacy. These commemorative efforts began in 1907 with the New Jersey monument. It is located on the Best Farm lands (L’Hermitage), along the south side of the railroad, west of the Georgetown Pike. It is near the old (pre-1830s) route of the pike from the ferry crossing and commemorates the Fourteenth New Jersey Regiment, part of the Sixth US Army Corps. The second memorial to be placed was the Pennsylvania monument dedicated in November of 1908. It is located on a half-acre plot that formerly belonged to Araby near Araby Church, on the east side of the old Georgetown Pike (now Araby Church Road). The monument commemorates the Sixty-Seventh, Eighty-Seventh, and 138th regiments of Pennsylvania volunteers. The Vermont monument, dedicated in 1915 at the intersection of Baker Valley Road and Araby Church Road, commemorates efforts of the 10th Vermont infantry. These three markers pay tribute to Union regiments who fought at Monocacy. There is also a monument to
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Confederate forces that was dedicated at the fiftieth anniversary of the battle on July 9, 1914. The United Daughters of the Confederacy placed this monument. It is located on the Best Farm west of the Georgetown Pike at the north edge of the property. The last monument to be located at Monocacy was dedicated by the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission on July 9, 1964. It is situated on the property of the United Daughters of the Confederacy monument. The New Jersey and Vermont monuments still belong to their respective states, with agreements with the National Park Service for maintenance of the grounds and structures. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United Daughters of the Confederacy conveyed title to their properties to the National Park Service in 1994 and 1997 respectively.  

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK UPDATE AND BOUNDARY REVISION, 2012-2016

In 2012, the Monocacy National Battlefield contracted an update to the National Historic Landmark documentation. An advisory group made up of representatives of the National Historic Landmarks Program, American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP), National Park Service National Capital Region (NCR), Monocacy National Battlefield, and the contractor met regularly to guide the formation of the NHL update. One of the update’s goals was to enlarge the NHL’s boundaries to link the two separated northeast and southwest sections in the original NHL by designating an area along the Monocacy River to include Crum’s Ford and part of the Union force’s retreat route, and connect with the southwest section. The NHL boundary was expanded to include Hughes Ford of the Monocacy River, north of Jug Bridge and adjacent lands near the Frederick Airport. The southwest section was expanded to include all of the National Park Service boundary for Monocacy National Battlefield, plus areas of the original NHL that extend beyond the National Park Service boundary. The initial boundary recommendation has been revised slightly based on feedback largely from the City of Frederick and Frederick County. The final recommended boundary revision is pending review by the National Historic Landmarks Committee of the National Park System Advisory Board.

Aside from Monocacy National Battlefield’s property that it owns or holds scenic easements on, the remainder of land within the updated NHL boundary is either owned privately or by local municipalities. Public hearings ensued to inform and receive comment from the property owners.
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owners and the interested public in the newly added areas of the NHL to the north of Monocacy National Battlefield. Private landowners were generally supportive of the National Historic Landmark designation, once they understood that there was no infringement on their property rights.\textsuperscript{328} Both the City of Frederick and Frederick County expressed concerns about the addition of city- and county-owned property into the updated NHL boundary.

**LIFE ESTATES ON MONOCACY PROPERTIES**

Two Monocacy Battlefield properties have, or had, life estates: the Baker and Thomas farms. The National Park Service purchased the Thomas Farm in September 2001, after the death of Judge Robert Clapp. As part of the terms of sale, the deed reserved unto the grantor “during the Grantor’s life and no longer (life estate) the rights of use and occupancy of a 1.977-acre parcel of land, as more particularly described in Exhibit ‘A,’ attached hereto and made a part hereof, and the improvements located thereon, together with the right of ingress and egress to and from the above referenced reserved premises to Araby Church Road, subject to the terms and conditions as mutually agreed by the Grantor and Grantee and memorialized in an Agreement executed by both parties and dated, September 1, 2001.”\textsuperscript{329} The reserved land included the house and its immediate grounds.

The problem for the National Park Service with this life estate was that Josephine Clapp left the house in 2002 and spent the remainder of her life in a retirement home. She died on July 10, 2011.\textsuperscript{330} The house was not maintained after Clapp left and the National Park Service only had limited access to the interior. As the house deteriorated, damage occurred, most devastatingly when radiator pipes froze and burst, flooding the northeast area of the house in 2007. The National Park Service maintained the exterior of the house, installing a new roof and repairing windows during the period of the life estate. With Clapp living permanently elsewhere, the life estate was ended in January of 2008.\textsuperscript{331}

The other life estate property is the Baker Farm, where 15 acres including the house, grounds, and outbuildings is held as a life estate. The 28 acres

\textsuperscript{328} Interview with former superintendent Rick Slade, Oct. 14, 2016.

\textsuperscript{329} FRDB, 2966/1048.


also includes a second house outside of the main complex. This life estate is still in effect. The National Park Service acquired three parcels from Betty B. Geisbert, et al., containing 314.88 acres on June 28, 1989, which included the Baker and Lewis farms. The NPS acquired the land by condemnation as opposed to fee purchase. This involved a Civil Action handled by attorneys for the plaintiff (NPS) and the defendant (Geisbert).332 The family continues to farm the land, renting it back from the Park Service, and retains a life estate on the dwellings and other buildings. According to John Parsons who was involved in the negotiations for the National Park Service, a life estate is “where they can stay for life and farm, and we deduct from the purchase price what we think their life tenancy might be.”333

The actual price paid for the property was $2,575,000, according to the deed.334 John Parsons recalled that condemnation awarded the Geisberts over $3 million, so the difference could account for the deduction for their life tenancy.

Earle Geisbert in his interview for this administrative history stated that the family’s relationship with the Park Service has been very good over the years, but it is not the same as owning the property themselves.335 One of the biggest problems with the National Park Service, he noted, was overpopulation of deer, which destroy his crops and intrude on farming operations.

RENTING OF BATTLEFIELD AGRICULTURAL LAND
Keith Wiles rents over 400 acres of farmland on the battlefield, the Best, Worthington, and Thomas farms. His great grandfather began farming the Best Farm in 1924 and the family lived there until 1998, five years after the National Park Service acquired the farm. The Park Service asked him to continue farming the land with a rental permit that is renewed every five years.

In his interview for this administrative history, Keith Wiles noted that as the park has grown in visitation and staff there are more regulations than there were in the past when it was smaller. One of the biggest restrictions is that he is not allowed to hunt deer and groundhogs that obstruct farming operations. Like Earle Geisbert, Keith Wiles noted that the biggest problem was the overpopulation of deer on the farmland. There are no particular guidelines or regulations about the type of crops that he can grow or

332 FRDB, 1586/64.
333 John Parsons Interview, Sept. 20, 2016.
334 FRDB, 1586/64.
livestock on the land he rents, but he noted that he is required to protect the viewshed and also archeological resources, which does affect farming practices to some degree. The positive outcome of the relationship with the National Park Service, Wiles noted, is that it stopped development of the land and thus allowed him to continue farming.\textsuperscript{336}

\textbf{SCENIC EASEMENTS}

The National Park Service has easements on several properties within its legislative boundary. With a scenic easement, the National Park Service does not own the land, but it purchases from the owner an easement that restricts what can be done on the land so that the viewshed and battlefield setting are protected.

Among these easements is a tract of bottomland west of I-270 and between the river and the railroad belonging to Frederick County. It is adjacent to the county’s Ballenger-McKinney Wastewater Treatment Facility. Identified by the Park Service as Tract 101–34, it contains almost 60 acres, and is under scenic easement. According to the GMP, no acquisition would be necessary unless the county decided to sell the property and development was imminent.

Tract 101–42 is a triangular piece of the Best Farm containing 13.56 acres. It became separated from the rest of the farm when Route 240/I-270 was constructed in the 1950s. This small separated piece is on the west side of I-270. The battlefield has a scenic easement with a height restriction on the property and believes that no acquisition would be necessary because of difficulty of access.

The Park Service also has a scenic easement on the Ladson Tract, on the east side of the river and north of the railroad. This tract is considered important for its associations with the battle and would be purchased if the owner were willing.

Two tracts on the east side of Baker Valley Road, identified as “101–23” and “101–31” are privately owned within the battlefield sensitive viewshed and have unacquired scenic easements. The National Park Service would purchase them if they became available.\textsuperscript{337} In FY 2012 Monocacy National Battlefield submitted a NPS Land Acquisition Ranking System (LARS) request for purchase on these two parcels, containing 20.33 acres. The estimated purchase amount was $1 million. At the time, the larger parcel was for sale, and the smaller parcel’s owner was willing to sell “in a couple

\footnotesize{336 Keith Wiles Interview, Oct. 14, 2016.}
\footnotesize{337 Draft General Management Plan, 2008, 50.}
of years.” Neither parcel was protected by any easement. The Civil War Preservation Trust acquired a portion of Tract 101–31 (2.56 acres designated as Tract 101–50) on December 15, 2017.

A small, approximately two-acre tract known as “101–25” adjacent to the Lewis Farm is privately owned and the National Park Service will seek a scenic easement on this property. Acquisition in fee is not deemed necessary.

The purpose of scenic easements is to preserve the historic agricultural character and setting of the battlefield. Appendix E of the 1983 Land Protection Plan contains scenic easement conditions that were written for Antietam National Battlefield in 1979. The easement property will be used for agricultural purposes exclusively, plus any existing housing.

- Commercial feed lots are prohibited.
- No commercial or industrial buildings or structures are permitted.
- No public utility installations are permitted.
- No residences other than existing are allowed.
- No exterior painting or resurfacing of structures can take place without approval of the Secretary of the Interior.
- No advertising signs or illuminated signs are permitted.
- The topography of the land shall be maintained.
- Land shall be kept neat and orderly.
- The land shall not be subdivided.
- No mobile homes except for temporary use if the main dwelling is damaged by fire, storm or otherwise.
- The Secretary of Interior or designee is permitted on the property by appointment with the owner to ascertain compliance with provisions of the agreement.
- The land remains under exclusive control of the grantor and is not open to the public.

RIGHT-OF-WAYS/ROADS, RAILROADS, AND UTILITIES
A number of public roads and right-of-ways bisect Monocacy National Battlefield. Of course, the most obtrusive is I-270, which cuts the park in two, creating a barrier and noise as well as disrupting the viewshed. The State Roads Commission holds a right-of-way for approximately 45 acres for I-270.

Maryland 355 also cuts through the battlefield, but it more or less retains the alignment it has had since 1828. The State Road Commission holds a right-of-way for approximately six acres for route 355. There is also a public right-of-way for the portion of Baker Valley Road that has National Park land on both sides, on the northern part of the Baker Farm and the southern part of the Thomas Farm.

CSX (former B&O) Railroad has almost 20 acres of right-of-way for its tracks, which cut through the northern portion of the battlefield. This rail line is very active and is a formidable barrier to accessing the northern parts of the battlefield in the Monocacy Junction area. However, unlike I-270, the railroad is in its historic location and played a major role in the battle. Over the years, various plans have been put forth for crossings of the railroad right-of-way to provide visitor access to the junction area, most recently the Public Access Plan/Environmental Assessment (2017), which includes design and construction of a pedestrian sidewalk along Maryland 355 to connect the north and south sides of the railroad right-of-way. So far, no plan has come to fruition.

In addition to these right-of-ways, there are also existing right-of-ways through the battlefield for power lines, telephone lines, water and sewer lines.

EXTERNAL ISSUES FACING MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD
As of 2017, Monocacy National Battlefield has acquired most of the land that it would like to have within its boundary. That land is protected either through fee ownership or scenic easement. The easement property could potentially be acquired, if the owners wish to sell.

Monocacy is an island of preserved cultural and natural landscape, surrounded by commercial, industrial, and residential development. Frederick County’s Ballenger-McKinney Wastewater Treatment facility stands at the edge of the battlefield, across the river from the Worthington Farm. While the wastewater treatment plant is not in the boundary of the national battlefield, it is in the boundary of the National Historic Landmark.
The densely developed environment around Monocacy National Battlefield produces actions and activities that threaten the battlefield. These threats include water and sewer lines through the battlefield to service the growing developed area; transmission lines; cell towers, new or expanded roads, particularly I-270; increased traffic on smaller roads through the battlefield; and expanded waste treatment facilities. None of these activities is generated or initiated by the Park Service, but all potentially have a major impact on the cultural and natural landscape and setting of the battlefield.

Another external problem for the park is flooding of the Monocacy River and Bush Creek, which happens periodically. Much of the battlefield is in floodplain and when there is flooding, damage occurs to low-lying structures, in particular, Gambrill Mill and trails and footbridges that the Park Service has constructed for interpretive purposes.

Susan Trail, who served at Monocacy from 1997 to 2011, as site manager and then as superintendent, reported in her August 31, 2016 interview for this project that toward the end of her tenure at Monocacy, her focus shifted to external issues.

Because of where Monocacy Battlefield’s located, at the intersection of major roads, railroads, water lines, sewer lines, everything seemed to come through Monocacy. We were heavily affected by the growth that was going on in the surrounding area, and to give some examples of that, I-270, bisects the battlefield and one of the things that I spent a lot of time working on with the state, was the planning for widening the interstate through the battlefield and working with them on, their environmental impact study and other planning documents trying to figure out [that] if the interstate was expanded how would we minimize impact to the battlefield. We have water lines and sewer lines, rights of way, through the battlefield, so we had to work with the county on a new water line that came through the park through an existing right of way that was, pretty disruptive. Power lines: we worked with a utility and the state government on a power line that they wanted to expand, just outside the battlefield, and then, the incinerator, which was the big project toward the last couple of years when I was here that the county wanted to build on the other side of the Monocacy River, that would have had a huge visual impact on the battlefield. So, this crossroads location that led to all this great history, and has come back to bite us, too.341

341 Susan Trail Interview, Aug. 31, 2016.
Susan Trail noted several major external concerns that affected the battlefield. Perhaps the most significant was the Waste-to-Energy Facility (WTE) proposed for the McKinney Industrial Park adjacent to Frederick County’s wastewater treatment plant. Frederick and Carroll counties partnered on the proposed facility. The WTE as designed consisted of a 152-foot tall building with a 270-foot tall smokestack. The facility was to operate 24 hours a day and was capable of combusting 1,500 tons per day of solid waste and scrap tires. Not only was this facility an aggressive intrusion onto Monocacy’s cultural landscape, there were also concerns about toxic gasses and particulate coming from the incinerator that could threaten humans, livestock, and agriculture. The WTE threat surfaced in 2006 when Frederick County commissioners began studying the possibility of constructing a waste-to-energy facility. Susan Trail, Monocacy’s superintendent, wrote a letter to the Frederick County Board of County Commissioners in December 2007, expressing serious concerns about the proposed incinerator. Other environmental and opposition groups also formed in Frederick County. The Civil War Preservation Trust named Monocacy to its list of endangered battlefields in 2009 because of the threat of the incinerator. Various permitting and compliance processes such as Corps of Engineers permits and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires all federal agencies to take into account the effects of their funding or permitting actions on historic properties, slowed the progress of the proposed WTE facility, and allowed opposition groups to grow.

The WTE controversy continued with groups in opposition and despite environmental studies that showed that incinerators released lead and mercury into the air. In February 2014, Maryland Department of the Environment issued air, water, and soil permits for the WTE project. In April 2014, Carroll County dropped the project. Frederick County abandoned it a short time later because the project was not viable without a partner.

Another external concern was the Potomac Appalachian Transmission Highline (PATH). The power line would not have crossed the battlefield,

but it would have passed nearby to the south and east. PATH consisted of a 765-kilovolt transmission line extending approximately 275 miles from Putnam County, WV, to a proposed Kemptown Substation southeast of New Market, MD. The National Park Service and environmental and citizens groups opposed the project. PATH was first announced in 2007. In March 2008, it received approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission of financial incentives to help support construction. In September 2009, PATH faced a setback when the Maryland Public Service Commission rejected the project’s application on procedural grounds, forcing the applicants to regroup and re-file. By 2010, the project’s in-service date was extended again, to mid-2015.\footnote{US Chamber of Commerce, accessed Jan. 4, 2017, \url{www.projectnoproject.com/2010/12/path-project-west-virginia/}.}

Although Monocacy was not directly impacted, Susan Trail, as superintendent of the Monocacy National Battlefield, attended public meetings: “We are concerned because we (National Park Service) are a landowner.” She noted that the lines could impact historic and cultural areas from the Antietam Battlefield to the C&O Canal and others.\footnote{Accessed Jan. 4, 2017, \url{www.fredericknewspost.com/archive/residents-charged-up-about-proposed-path-lines/article_5f44ebfb-70b7-5930-a0c0-32c13b632cd5.html}.}

The I-270 expansion is a definite external threat to the Monocacy Battlefield. The expansion of the highway from four to six lanes described above could have a significant visual, auditory, and physical impact on the battlefield. The battlefield worked closely with Maryland State Highways Administration on mitigation measures for the road expansion.

Water and sewer lines cross the battlefield, and those existing right-of-ways have been used for expanded water and sewer services for residential and commercial development around Urbana. Disturbances caused by these projects require archeological evaluation and mitigation.

CONCLUSION

In its short history Monocacy National Battlefield has acquired most of the land either by fee or by scenic easement within its authorized boundaries. Its location puts it at jeopardy for frequent threats from infrastructure produced by the intense development surrounding the battlefield. Fortunately, through the efforts of Goodloe Byron, Beverly Byron, sympathetic property owners, and citizens, legislation and funding were put in place to preserve the landscape through acquisition and easement protection.
Until 1976, when Rep. Goodloe E. Byron’s legislation formally established boundaries for the Monocacy National Battlefield, administration of the site was coordinated either directly through the Washington National Park Service office or through the Gettysburg National Military Park superintendent. While the coordinating superintendent managed any records relating to site administration, the Washington staff worked directly with the local Monocacy Battlefield Association (MBA) on park development (see Chapter 3). This arrangement sufficed as long as the park remained undeveloped and local citizens remained engaged in the process. By November 1947, however, Region One Acting Director Elbert Cox wrote, “There apparently is little, if any, local interest evidenced in the project, and the Service is not attempting to stimulate any.” As pressure from the public for the park waned and the duties of NPS Washington staff and the Gettysburg superintendent increased through the postwar and Mission 66 periods, attention to developing the Monocacy site faded. Acting Regional Director Cox’s letter was the last correspondence found in the National Archives records relating to Monocacy.

The 1934 legislation creating the Monocacy National Military Park provided for a superintendent to administer “the affairs” of the park, under “the supervision and direction of the National Park Service,” a role initially filled by the Gettysburg superintendent. The superintendent’s duties were limited to “the opening or repair of such roads as may be necessary to the purposes of the park, and to ascertain and mark with historical tablets or otherwise, as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, all breastworks, earthworks, walls, or other defenses or shelters, lines of battle, location of troops, buildings, and other historical points of interest within the park or in its vicinity.” The new language used in the 1976 legislation, which replaced Section 4 and eliminated Section 5 of the 1934 bill, expanded the scope of the park management, both for development of the

347 Cox to Supt. Morristown National Historical Park, Nov. 19, 1947, Folder “0-31 Monocacy,” Box 2610, RG79, Central Classified Files (Entry 11), NARA II.
348 H.R. 7982 (1934), Section 4. The original (1934) language stated: “The affairs of the Monocacy National Military Park shall, subject to the supervision and direction of the National Park Service of the Interior Department, be in charge of a superintendent, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.”
349 H.R. 7982 (1934), Section 5.
new park and its maintenance as an historic property: “The administration, development, preservation, and maintenance of the battlefield shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666) [Historic Sites Act].” The Historic Sites Act (Section 462h) provided that the Secretary of the Interior, “through the National Park Service,” was authorized to:

Operate and manage historic and archaeologic sites, buildings, and properties acquired under the provisions of sections 461 to 467 of this title together with lands and subordinate buildings for the benefit of the public, such authority to include the power to charge reasonable visitation fees and grant concessions, leases, or permits for the use of land, building space, roads, or trails when necessary or desirable either to accommodate the public or to facilitate administration.

The 1976 legislation authorized over $3 million for land acquisition at Monocacy (up to 650 acres within the established boundary) and $500,000 “for the development of essential public facilities.”

The new legislation was significant because it established a park boundary (not done in the 1929 and 1934 bills) and authorized money to purchase the land. But the new bill also required that “a final master plan for the full development of the battlefield consistent with the preservation objectives of this Act,” be prepared, “within three years of enactment of this section” (1979). The plan should include:

(1) the facilities needed to accommodate the health, safety, and interpretive needs of the visiting public;

(2) the location and estimated cost of all facilities; and

(3) the projected need for any additional facilities within the battlefield.

No money could be appropriated until the General Management Plan was completed in 1979. The GMP guided the NPS in its land purchases even before visitor facilities could be contemplated. By then Congress had expanded the Monocacy National Battlefield boundary to nearly

---


1,200 acres and doubled the authorized monies for land purchases.\textsuperscript{353} The boundary was again expanded in 1980 in order to include the earthworks and blockhouse site near the railroad bridge.\textsuperscript{354} This time, while over $700,000 was allocated for land purchases, more than a million dollars was authorized for facilities development. Thus, as the shape of the park revealed itself, the role of its administrators evolved from land issues to public use planning, cultural resource preservation and maintenance, interpretive plans, and finally the actual opening of the park and the associated refining of the management plan as visitation increased.

In order to begin the long process of park development, on December 22, 1976, Antietam National Battlefield staff took on the assignment of administering Monocacy National Battlefield.\textsuperscript{355} This arrangement lasted until 2003 with more staff members becoming involved as the physical park grew. After its official opening in 1991, Monocacy National Battlefield received its own park staff, and in 2003, gained its own full-time superintendent.

**COORDINATING SUPERINTENDENTS AND STAFF: EVOLVING ROLES**

In a press release issued in March 1977, Antietam National Battlefield Superintendent A. W. “Andy” Anderson (1974–1978) announced that the Monocacy National Battlefield “project” would be under the management of Antietam. Acting as coordinating superintendent, Anderson’s role from 1977 through 1978, when he left Antietam, included conducting “inspections, planning, and meeting with public groups concerning Monocacy National Battlefield.”\textsuperscript{356} Andy Anderson arrived at Antietam as a management assistant for C&O Canal-Antietam in 1971, at a time when the park shared administration with the new Chesapeake & Ohio (C&O) Canal National Historical Park. Anderson became superintendent of Antietam in 1974. The Antietam administrative history notes that, “Superintendent Anderson had to rebuild Antietam after its separation from the C&O Canal in terms of staffing, staff morale, funding, and improving the park. He stated the rebuilding was ‘like starting a new area.’”\textsuperscript{357} His work reforming


\textsuperscript{356} Snell and Brown, “Antietam...Administrative History,” 437, citing a 1983 interview with Supt. Anderson.

\textsuperscript{357} Ibid.
Antietam no doubt helped Anderson in his role with Monocacy, there literally “starting a new area,” but also likely made it difficult for him to divide his time between the two projects.

Coordinating Superintendent Anderson did have help however. Even before Antietam staff became involved, John G. Parsons, chief of the Urban Coordination and Environmental Impact Division in the National Capital Parks regional office, took the lead on Monocacy, filling several roles through initial development: “I started working at Monocacy in 1971 … my goal in Monocacy over that whole period of time went from legislative – actually establishing the National Register boundary, then administration to authorize the land acquisition...and also I was in charge of planning.”

At the request of Rep. Goodloe E. Byron, Parsons aided NPS historian Ed Bearss in establishing the National Historic Landmark (NHL) boundary for Monocacy Battlefield in 1973, effectively stopping the planned “Frederick Beltway” through the heart of the battlefield. Though the NHL boundary did not follow property lines, Parsons recalled that their intention in setting the extensive boundaries at the time was to avoid the “problems we were having at Antietam, at Manassas, with encroachment,” so I said “Ed, we’re not going to let this happen again. We’re going to buy everything. We’re gonna put it inside this National Register [NHL] boundary, and then if we can get the boundary expanded, or identified through legislation, we’ll have the whole thing. We won’t leave to future generations, to go by the Wendy’s that’s going on the corner, or the car dealership, or whatever.”

Apparently unknown to Bearss and Parsons was an EPA-funded Frederick County sewerage treatment plant, planned to be located on the west side of Monocacy River, across from the Worthington Farm – now within the Monocacy Battlefield NHL boundary. In order for that project – also fully supported by Rep. Goodloe Byron – to move forward, Parsons recalled, “We went through an elaborate process with EPA and allowed them to build the thing.”

The “elaborate process” was in fact the “Section 106” review process established by the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 designed to protect
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historic properties endangered by federally funded or federally-permitted projects. The environmental review concluded that the Ballenger Creek Sewerage Treatment Plant would have an “adverse effect” on the Monocacy Battlefield National Historic Landmark. Consultation between the EPA, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Maryland State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Frederick County Metropolitan Commission resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which outlined “prudent and feasible alternatives that would avoid or satisfactorily mitigate adverse effects on the National Register property.” The mitigation agreement (dated 1975) required archeological survey prior to all construction activity; design review of facilities and landscape design to assure mitigation of “visual effects”; and finally, “The Frederick County Metropolitan Commission shall initiate steps to have the Monocacy Battlefield area designated a historic zone under applicable local zoning laws.”361 As of 2017, Frederick County zoning maps appear to indicate that this last provision was never completed.

John Parsons’s role shifted to working with Congressman Byron through the legislative process through 1975 and 1976. With passage of the 1976 bill formally establishing the Monocacy National Battlefield boundary and authorizing land purchases, Parsons moved into planning mode. Initially this involved preparing the way for land purchases with the General Management Plan and through public meetings. As Parsons noted in a June 1977 newspaper interview, “public input is necessary to make the plans meaningful.”362

Beginning in September 1977, Parsons and Coordinating Superintendent Anderson were provided with significant public input in the form of the Monocacy Battlefield Advisory Commission, a group of 12 local citizens invited by Congressman Goodloe Byron to aid in developing plans for the new park. Some were local historians/preservationists, some businessmen, some county employees, one was his own wife, Beverly Byron, but all were personally interested in the development of the Monocacy National Battlefield.363 The list included:

Mrs. Pat Sanner, Co-Chairperson

361 Miller, Wihry, & Lee, Inc., Assessment of Alternatives – General Management Plan, 1979, Appendix D.
363 Snell and Brown, “Antietam...Administrative History,” 467.
Mr. Tom Summers, Co-Chairperson; formerly the chair of the Frederick County Civil War Centennial Committee

Mrs. Beverly Byron, wife of Congressman Goodloe E. Byron

Mr. James F. Cupino Jr.

Mr. Harry L. Decker, local historian and President of the Historical Society of Frederick County

Judge Edward S. Delaplaine, Maryland Court of Appeals jurist and local historian

Gregory J. Hayward, Esq., West Point graduate, Vietnam veteran, and lawyer in Frederick

Mrs. Ann B. Hooper, a local Braddock Heights historian

Mrs. Dana Keister, Dir. Frederick Co. Dept. of Historic Preservation

Mr. Gilbert L. Kingsbury, Dir. Frederick Co. Parks & Rec. Commission

Mr. Arnold W. Schofield, NPS historian, Harpers Ferry National Historical Park

Mr. Nicholas W. Wood, Editor, *Frederick News-Post*

Congressman Byron described the commission’s purpose to a local newspaper reporter, whose resulting article noted, “they would be charged with studying alternative plans for development of the 650 acres of farmland,” and that their “recommendations will be forwarded to the Park Service and utilized in making land use decisions.” (Figure 19)

At their initial meeting in November 1977, the Monocacy National Battlefield Advisory Commission met with John Parsons to learn exactly what their role would be in relation to the Park Service. Parsons, who then


365 “Monocacy Battlefield Commission,” folder “Civil War Centennial,” Interpretive Files, Drawer Mb-Mz, Monocacy National Battlefield Library, Frederick, MD.

described himself as “associate director of cooperative activities with the NPS,” explained that the commission would begin by aiding the NPS in gathering historic research on the battle and the battlefield landscape. He emphasized, however, that the commission was “only an advisory group volunteering its services to Congressman Byron,” with no official connection to the Park Service. The group had already toured the battlefield, with Harry Decker sharing his knowledge of the battle and the significance of the landscape encompassed by the several farms. (Figure 20) Beverly Byron recalled the MNBAC role:

it was a group that … got together, with some of the people from the Park Service and looked at what land – what pieces of property should have been protected. How do we protect them? What’s the next step in – in moving forward with the creation of the park?

---

367 “Monocacy Battlefield Park plans in embryo state,” The News, Nov. 4, 1977, Box “Monocacy,” folder “New Media – Newspapers – Monocacy: Articles and Clippings 1977 thru 1982,” Antietam Museum and Library Service, Antietam National Battlefield, Sharpsburg, MD. In September 1977, John Parsons was appointed the Associate Regional Director, Land Use Coordination, for the National Capital Region (formerly National Capital Parks). In this capacity he took on the role of overseeing the land acquisitions.

That next step would not come until after the GMP was completed in 1979.


Leimer oversaw the development of the Monocacy Land Protection Plan in 1983. Still, of the more than 1,600 acres authorized by Congress within the park boundary, only 420 acres – the Worthington and Gambrill properties – had been acquired by the federal government. Supt. Leimer moved forward to begin preservation of the Worthington farmhouse, securing $60,000 in FY1983. The Williamsport Preservation Training Center was slated to do the initial stabilization work.

Despite the slow pace of land acquisitions, in 1986 Leimer’s administration oversaw the development of a Statement for Management of Monocacy National Battlefield. Prepared by Park Ranger Gordon Olson under the signature of Superintendent Leimer, the report outlined the current status...
of the park and its cultural and natural resources and recommended avenues for future preservation and interpretation of the landscape. Olson identified the expanding light industrial development north of the battlefield as the “greatest threat to the battlefield’s integrity,” citing the potential for re-zoning by the county of agricultural land within the park’s authorized boundary. In Appendix B of the report entitled “Status of Planning,” Olson listed the six planning documents completed or under development for the park: Suitability/Feasibility Study (NPS, 1976), Assessments of Alternatives GMP (NPS, 1979), General Development Plan (NPS, 1981), Land Protection Plan (ANTI, 1983), Development Concept Plan - Bush Creek (NPS, under development), and Wayside Exhibit Plan (NPS, 1981) [another was submitted in 1986]. The list of “Proposed Plans,” which were planning documents recommended but not yet initiated, included:

- Resources Management Plan
- Cultural Landscape Report [completed 1993]
- Interpretive Prospectus [completed 1995]
- Statement for Interpretation [submitted annually beginning 1991]
- Scope of Collection Statement
- Fire Management Plan
- Water Resources Management Plan
- Administrative History [completed 2018]
- Structural Fire Prevention Plan [completed 1990/91]
- Crime Prevention and Physical Security Plan
- Hazardous Tree Management Plan
- Historic Structures Reports as appropriate [completed as appropriate]
- Flood Response Plan
- Documented Safety Program
- Historic Structures Preservation Guides as appropriate.
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In 1987, Antietam National Battlefield again came under new administration with the arrival of Superintendent Richard J. Rambur (1987–1993). As coordinating superintendent for Monocacy, Supt. Rambur spearheaded the eventual opening of the park in 1991. According to Susan Moore, who served as assistant superintendent under Supt. Rambur, it was Rambur who felt that opening the park to the public was crucial to the battlefield’s survival “so the public could use the park and be invested in the history to fight the development pressure.”373 Despite the continued resistance of the owners of the Thomas Farm to acquisition, additional land purchases of the Lewis and Baker farms brought the park’s potential closer to reality. And with the appropriation of land acquisition funds for the Best Farm in 1991, the plan was nearly complete.

OPENING OF A NEW NATIONAL PARK
On June 30, 1991, just two weeks before the planned Monocacy National Battlefield park opening, Antietam clerk/typist Cathy Beeler was hired as Monocacy’s first interpretive ranger.374 She immediately worked on putting together the event celebrating the park’s opening on July 13, 1991. Over 350 invitations had already been sent out, but the event program was not yet prepared. Ranger Beeler was assigned that task. The program, as completed, included remarks by the Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan, Maryland Governor William Donald Schaefer, US Senator Paul Sarbanes, and US Congresswoman Beverly Byron. The keynote speaker was historian Frank Cooling.375 Director of the National Capital Region, National Park Service, Bob Stanton and Antietam National Battlefield Superintendent Richard Rambur also spoke. (Figure 21) Following the park opening ceremony there was a reception with a catered meal, hosted in three tents on the ground near the Gambrill Mill. The Ninety-Sixth Pennsylvania Regiment and the Twelfth Virginia Regiment reenactment groups participated with gun salutes and the Federal City Cornet Band provided music. The newly refurbished ground floor of the Gambrill Mill, which had become the new park’s visitor center, was opened to attendees in its first public function.376

373 Interview with Susan Moore, Nov. 7, 2016
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When Cathy Beeler began her duties at Monocacy, Supt. Rich Rambur created the position of site manager and assigned Antietam’s assistant superintendent, Susan Moore to fill the job. Susan Moore was the first of three site managers, followed by John Howard and Susan Trail. All of them also served as assistant superintendents at Antietam. When Susan Moore came on board as site manager, there were just three full-time employees, two in addition to herself. Cathy Beeler, the new interpretive ranger joined Tom Kopczyk, the law enforcement ranger who lived on the second floor of the Gambrill Mill. In addition there were two seasonal employees and three volunteers. Susan Moore, Tom Kopczyk, and Cathy Beeler had offices in the Gambrill Mill ground floor space. After the maintenance facility was constructed to the southeast of the Gambrill Mill, the site manager’s office and the law enforcement ranger’s offices moved to that space.

As site manager for the new park, Susan Moore managed day-to-day operations, coordinated maintenance and administration with Antietam, handled advertising, and attended public meetings. She, along with Cathy Beeler and Tom Kopczyk, cleaned up the mill and grounds when the river periodically flooded the building. Antietam National Battlefield provided maintenance, natural resource management, and administration for Monocacy. Susan Moore attended weekly staff meetings at Antietam. Site Manager Moore felt her most important accomplishments, in addition to the park’s opening, was the stabilization of the Worthington House, rehabilitation of the Gambrill Mill, and development of the nature trail on

**Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band Concert</td>
<td>Federal City Cornet Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Colors</td>
<td>Living History Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Anthem</td>
<td>Federal City Cornet Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation</td>
<td>Rev. John Schilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>Superintendent Antietam Monocacy National Battlefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Stasman Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Capital Region National Park Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorable Beverly Byron 6th District, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorable Paul S Sarbanes United States Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorable Manual Logan Jr Secretary of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorable William Donald Schaefer Governor of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Battle of Monocacy”</td>
<td>Dr. B Franklin Cooling Chief Historian Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Mr. Nelson R. Vay Central Maryland Heritage League, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon Cutting</td>
<td>Dignitaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediction</td>
<td>Rev. John Schilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Salute</td>
<td>Living History Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taps</td>
<td>Federal City Cornet Band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21: 1991 Monocacy National Battlefield Opening Program (MNB Library)**
the Gambrill property. She scheduled encampments and monthly events to encourage people to come to the battlefield. At the time Moore was at Monocacy, the only area open to visitors was the Gambrill property. While the National Park Service owned the Worthington Farm, it was gated and not yet accessible to visitors. Susan Moore felt that the most important information she could pass on to new superintendents is, “have the outreach with your local constituency and beyond, so that when problems or conflicts arise, you already have a relationship, . . . you can work through the issues with an established relationship so that they are more civilized.”

When Rich Rambur left as superintendent of Antietam in 1993, Susan Moore became superintendent, and John Howard eventually joined the staff as assistant superintendent, and as part of that duty became the new site manager for Monocacy.

John Howard served as Monocacy’s site manager, beginning in spring 1994. When Susan Moore left Antietam in 1996, Howard became superintendent, but he continued to work at Monocacy one day a week until Susan Trail took over as assistant superintendent of Antietam and site manager of Monocacy in 1997. At first John Howard’s office was on the ground floor of the Gambrill Mill, but it eventually moved to the maintenance building. He worked on-site at Monocacy four days a week. He worked at Antietam one day, Tuesdays, when there were staff meetings. During John Howard’s time as site manager, Monocacy hired its first maintenance staff, Gene Wolfe. In addition, Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) workers assigned to Antietam were transferred to Monocacy for two days out of every 10. They helped with cleaning of the ground and landscape and constructing the parking lot along the Worthington Lane at Baker Valley Road. A new seasonal ranger with a one-year appointment joined the growing staff to assist Cathy Beeler. In 1995, the Williamsport Preservation Training Center left Williamsport, MD, and moved its headquarters into the Gambrill Mansion, changing the name to the Historic Preservation Training Center.

John Howard considered one of his major accomplishments as site manager to be getting the park to have a “seat at the table” in review of nearby development projects and getting county officials and developers to see Monocacy as more than an area of greenspace, but rather as a nationally significant historic site. The first of the development challenges was the Target Shopping Center just to the north of the Best Farm. While the National Park could not stop this commercial development, it at least participated in reviews, and was able to exert control over bright lighting of the area to minimize its impact on the battlefield. According to Howard, “it doesn’t sound like
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much, but to me it was always a way to get the battlefield involved with the
development around there. There’s just so much of it, it was very difficult to get
a seat at any table. And to me, this was a great success because that led to the
train station. Working with Maryland Transit [Authority] and people like that,
who helped us later on, getting the junction cleaned up. You know, we really
didn’t do that. We gave the idea to MTA and they said, ‘Well let’s see what we
can do.’ They worked with CSX to get it cleaned up.”

Howard felt that it was important for site managers and superintendents
to be aggressive with developers, local governments, and other partners in
asserting that the park is an important resource and revenue maker with both
historical and monetary value. As well, the park’s manager or superintendent
needs to be aggressive with outreach and building relationships. Site
Manager Howard also viewed encouraging staff to think about how to get
visitors involved with the Worthington and Best farms and to get visitors
out and walking the battlefield to make their experience more complete and
memorable as major accomplishments during his tenure. Interpretive signage
and the development of paths and trails helped to further this objective. A
major problem that John Howard encountered was construction of large
sewer and water lines through the park, “ramrodded” by the county. These
lines had been planned and were under construction for years, even before
the park was staffed. Although Monocacy Battlefield objected, the lines
proceeded, without benefit of archeological review or compliance. The park
was able to get archeologists on site with help from the state, and to get the
height of the manhole access covers lowered from 10 feet above ground to
a reduced projection. John Howard believes that the park came of age with
the Waste-to-Energy (WTE) threat, 2006–2014, which happened after he
left. For the first time, he said, the park got involved very early in the process.
Before that it was reacting to events or issues that were already planned or
underway. With WTE, the park took a leadership role early on.

The next and last site manager was Susan Trail, who moved into the role
when she became assistant superintendent of Antietam National Battlefield
after John Howard took on the responsibilities of superintendent. At first
Susan Trail split her time between the two parks, but as responsibilities at
Monocacy increased, she spent more and more of her time at Monocacy.
As site manager, Trail ran the day-to-day operations of the park, answering
to the superintendent of Antietam, ensuring that the park was operating
smoothly, that the visitor contact station was open, and maintenance and
law enforcement needs were being addressed.

---
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BUILDING A PARK: SUSAN TRAIL, MONOCACY’S FIRST SUPERINTENDENT

Except for Cathy Beeler, who served at Monocacy from 1991 to 2011, Susan Trail had the longest tenure of any of Monocacy’s management staff. She began as site manager of Monocacy and assistant superintendent of Antietam in 1997, under Superintendent John Howard. When Monocacy National Battlefield became an independent park in 2003, Susan Trail served as its first superintendent. She left in 2011 to become superintendent at Antietam National Battlefield.

In her interview for this administrative history, Susan Trail spoke of her goals for Monocacy as its first superintendent. “What I set out to do was to build a park, and that was my priority, to get this park up and going.” She had four overarching goals: 1) to preserve all of the historic buildings and structures because they were not in very good condition; 2) to expand visitor access to the park; 3) to build a new visitor center; and 4) to increase staff to provide the expertise to accomplish the goals. As part of the work to meet the goals, a new General Management Plan was completed in 2008, to establish the battlefield’s strategic direction, in terms of how the park was to be developed.381

To meet the first goal, Monocacy National Battlefield partnered with the Historic Preservation Training Center, which by this time had offices in the Gambrill House and a workshop in Frederick, to stabilize, repair, or restore most of the park’s historic buildings. According to Susan Trail, one of the major accomplishments during her time at Monocacy was rehabilitation of the Thomas House into park headquarters. Another was the exterior restoration of the Worthington House.382

The second goal of expanding visitor access to the park resulted in the development of hiking trails through Worthington Farm and opening of access to the Best and Thomas farms. Linked with expansion of visitor access was building a new visitor center, the third goal. The original visitor center in the Gambrill Mill housed both the visitor station on the ground floor and park offices on the second floor. The mill, because of its historic function and reliance on water power is in a low-lying area, not far from the river. As a result, it frequently flooded when the river level rose. Moreover, the growing park had outpaced the size of the small and vulnerable mill building. Planning for the new visitor center started in 1998, and through line item funding, the new center was constructed and the grand opening held in July of 2007.383

---
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To carry out the ambitious plan, staffing increased, with division chiefs or managers in charge of defined areas – maintenance, interpretation, natural resources, cultural resources, and law enforcement. These divisions brought professional expertise to manage respective areas of focus. From 2000–2005, staffing ramped up to accommodate the growing park. Cathy Beeler, who started at Monocacy in 1991 as a ranger, eventually became chief of resource education and visitor services (interpretation). Andrew Banasik held the title of natural resource program manager, Joy Beasley served as cultural resource program manager, Todd Stanton served as chief ranger (law enforcement), and Tina Cartwright was appointed facility manager (maintenance).

**GROWING THE PARK: SUPERINTENDENT RICK SLADE, 2013–2016**

After Susan Trail left Monocacy National Battlefield in 2011, Joy Beasley stepped in briefly as acting superintendent. Then Rae Emerson arrived as acting superintendent for a 120-day detail, and Andrew Banasik then became the acting superintendent from December 2012 until March 2013. Rick Slade began his duties as the new superintendent at Monocacy in March of 2013, as the park’s second superintendent. In 2012, the National Capital Region Office conducted a *Transitional Management Assessment Plan (TMAP)* to assess the current issues and structure of the park and provide the incoming superintendent with an objective view of its issues and challenges. Rick Slade remained at Monocacy until May 2016, when he left to become superintendent of Catoctin Mountain National Park. Andrew Banasik again took on the duties of acting superintendent until the current superintendent, Christopher J. Stubbs, began work at Monocacy in late 2016.

One of Rick Slade’s responsibilities as superintendent was juggling personnel to keep the park operational in the face of federal budget cuts and funding shortages. Creative combining and eliminating of positions allowed the park to continue operations with limited staffing. After Jeremy Murphy, who was serving as combined chief ranger and chief of interpretation, left for the chief ranger position at Gettysburg National Battlefield, it became clear that the combining of the chief ranger and chief interpreter positions as one GS-12 position was no longer feasible. The chief ranger position requires a law enforcement commission and expertise in related fields, and finding another interpretation professional with a law enforcement background proved difficult. The two positions were separated again, each as a GS-11, and two vacant GS-9 interpreter field positions were eliminated instead. Doing more with less became an important aspect of Rick Slade’s tenure at Monocacy as a result of federal government sequestration in 2013.
From a peak staff of 15, the park’s employees have been reduced to 12. Due to reduction in funding for the park and federal sequestration, positions have not been filled when vacancies occur, and two jobs have been merged into one position. Joy Beasley left Monocacy after serving as cultural resource manager from 2003–2013 and as acting superintendent for part of 2011–2012. She moved to the position of chief of cultural resources for National Capital Region until January 2016. She is currently the deputy associate director, Park Programs and National Heritage Areas for the National Park Service. When Joy Beasley left Monocacy and based on recommendations in the TMAP, Andrew Banasik became the chief of Resource Management, combining two former positions, natural and cultural resource managers, into one.

Other priorities during Rick Slade’s time as superintendent included the Waste-to-Energy (WTE) plant, discussed in Chapter 4, and the Battle of Monocacy’s 150th anniversary commemoration in 2014. Construction of the WTE was very much a threat until 2014 when Carroll County dropped out of the partnership. Frederick County abandoned the project shortly thereafter. Rick Slade felt that the end of the WTE threat was the most important event associated with his time at Monocacy: “It was important for the park to have been front and center in being vocal about the effects it would have. And I think it engendered a lot of respect and support amongst other stakeholders for the role that the National Park Service can play in helping to advocate and advance a healthy, prosperous, cooperative environment in local communities.”

Also putting the battlefield forward was the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Monocacy. It was part of a series of regionally and nationally promoted Civil War sesquicentennial events between 2011 and 2015. According to Rick Slade, the park was still very young, but the national series of events gave Monocacy a bigger stage and allowed the park to accomplish a number of improvements, including installation of highway signs and funding to install fencing and landscape clean-up. The park worked to capitalize on the support available for the 150th anniversary and use it for upgrades and improvements.

Other accomplishments during Rick Slade’s superintendence of the battlefield included the establishment of a new friends group, the Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation. The new foundation is not affiliated with the old Friends of Monocacy group that had dissolved. The
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nucleus of the board membership of the foundation was former Monocacy board members of the Western Maryland Interpretive Association as well as long-time volunteers at the park.

Promoting the park with the local community and fostering greater recognition about what the park could do for visitors were also important. Rick Slade observed,

> You have to have the visitation. You have to have the people coming to the park, if you want them to support it. So we were trying to shift the balance a little bit to allow some of that, while trying to be very careful that the park doesn’t turn into just a recreational destination. That anyone who comes there, whether they want to primarily recreate or they want to come and see the history, one way or the other, they get a bit of both. And that was really the challenge.  

The broadening of the focus of the park to promote recreation and to cover the area’s early history and the development of the cultural landscape as well as its Civil War significance has helped to increase visitation. Studies began with a Public Access Plan/Environmental Assessment and a Visual Resources Protection Plan to increase visitor access as well as protect significant resources and values at the park.

The National Historic Landmark update discussed in Chapter 4, began in 2012, and involved a great deal of outreach to local citizens and governments. The revised NHL boundary was expanded to link the two separate sections in the original 1973 NHL, and to add more land in the Jug Bridge-Hughes Ford area. Monocacy National Battlefield participated in public meetings to inform landowners about the effects of the NHL expansion. Although the park representatives anticipated opposition from private property owners, the private owners were quite supportive. The opposition, as it turned out, came from Frederick City and County governments as property owners. According to Rick Slade:

> We thought we would likely have more skepticism from private landowners, and we were very careful and conscientious about ensuring that we looped them in. We thought the public side will be a much easier sell because there’s a county park that’s already there. There’s land to the east of the airport where the city really isn’t going to be doing anything, but it was, in fact the opposite. It was the private landowners and those that came to the meetings and that we talked to, were very supportive, once they understood the nature of the designation.  

---
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TURNOVER OF SUPERINTENDENTS
In Monocacy’s short history, there have been three superintendents: Susan Trail, Rick Slade, and Christopher Stubbs. For all three, Monocacy was their first superintendency. Susan Trail was previously assistant superintendent with Antietam National Battlefield, assigned as site manager for Monocacy. Rick Slade came from Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in Atlanta, where he served as chief of Planning and Resource Management. Christopher Stubbs previously served as chief of resources management at Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. As mid-career employees, the likelihood is that Monocacy’s superintendents will continue to move up the career ladder to larger parks. Although Monocacy is still a young park, this pattern of superintendents moving upward in their careers seems to be established. The result has been a relatively frequent change in administrative philosophies and priorities.

PLANNING
GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, 2008
The General Management Plan took a very long time to be completed, according to Susan Trail. By the time it was ready, most of the development of the new park was well underway. The plan was intended to guide management of the park for the next 15 to 20 years and is currently still in effect. It offered four alternatives, ranging from no action to the fourth, preferred, option which was a composite of the most advantageous aspects of the other three alternatives. Alternative Four moved administrative offices from the Gambrill Mill to the Thomas House. It left the maintenance facility on the Gambrill property. Visitors could view the battlefield inside personal vehicles beginning at the visitor center or walk the battlefield on an expanded system of trails. The pull-off areas near commemorative monuments were upgraded to accommodate visitors more safely. The upgrades included relocation of the driveway to the Fourteenth New Jersey monument for safer access. The monument is located south of Route 355 between the railroad and the river. Exhibits were planned for the stone tenant house on the Thomas Farm and in the Worthington House. The most ambitious aspect of the plan was construction of a landscaped deck over I-270 to allow pedestrians to cross the interstate while at the same time experiencing a continuous landscape that would suggest the battle-era experience. While the Maryland State Highway Administration has been supportive of this crossing, it has not been completed. The cost has been prohibitive.389 The plan also called for stabilization, preservation, or rehabilitation of all historic buildings, landscapes, and cultural resources in the park and removal of a few non-historic buildings.

INTERPRETERS AND VOLUNTEERS

Interpretation and visitor services are important departments at Monocacy. Cathy Beeler started in June 1991 as an interpretive ranger and concluded her years at Monocacy in September of 2012 as the chief of resource education and visitor services. Former long-time interpretive rangers include Gloria Swift, who served as the collateral duty curator; Brett Spaulding; and Barbara Justice. The current interpretive rangers are Tracy Evans (who serves as the collateral duty curator) and Brian Dankmeyer. Cathy Beeler began her tenure at Monocacy with visitor services and administration. In her interview for this administrative history, she talked about her work:

I provided front-line visitor services, and that involved providing visitor information to people, initiating programs, tours, any special events, educational programming, providing outreach, doing planning, it also involved things like cleaning the Visitor’s Center, doing payroll, filing, doing the mail, incoming and outgoing mail, for the park, reporting to the park manager, initiating a volunteer program, being the historic weapons coordinator for the program, taking care of petty cash for the park, and any reporting to the regional office about any programs that we did at the park.\textsuperscript{390}

Cathy Beeler initially served under Site Manager Susan Moore, who was then assistant superintendent at Antietam. The park was very new, and Cathy Beeler reported that they were learning on the job how to run a park. In those early days, she spent time getting the community to know that the park existed. She attended meetings of the Frederick County Historic Sites Consortium, visited schools, and attended community events to advertise the park. Part of the problem, Cathy Beeler said, was that the site managers and superintendents were not local. They commuted to the park to work but were not part of the local community. Her advice to future superintendents would be to become more involved with the community to build strong ties between the park and local individuals, organizations and governments.\textsuperscript{391}

Over time the park grew from its initial three employees. By the time Cathy Beeler retired in 2012, there were approximately 40 employees, counting interns and seasonal workers. Cathy Beeler noted several major accomplishments at the battlefield during the time that she was there. Starting with the establishment of the visitor contact station in the Gambrill Mill to the completion of the new purpose-built visitor center in 2007, the steady growth of the park and visitation and the acquisition of key parts of the landscape, the Best and Thomas farms, were major accomplishments.

\textsuperscript{390} Interview with Cathy Beeler, Sept. 28, 2016.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid.
Park visitation has grown dramatically over the years, from 34,553 visitors in 2009 to 113,820 in 2017. Beeler also emphasized the importance of developing an interpretive planning document, which guided interpretation for a 10-year period, and the other landscape and cultural resource studies that informed interpretation of the park for visitors.

Gail Stephens, a Monocacy volunteer from 1997 to 2015, worked under all of the park’s interpreters, doing research on Lew Wallace, the battle, and other parts of Monocacy’s history. Her first job was to work the desk at the visitor station, then at the Gambrill Mill. At the request of Gloria Swift, she began researching Lew Wallace. The result of the research was Stephens’s book, *Shadow of Shiloh, Major General Lew Wallace in the Civil War*. Her next research project was the 1864 campaign and the Battle of Monocacy, focusing on the officers and units who participated in the battle and their positions and movements. Then her research focus moved to Maryland’s participation in the Civil War and events that occurred in Maryland during the war, including research of the US Colored Troops Recruiting Station that was located at Monocacy Junction. The research activity led to the development of the Monocacy Battlefield’s archives and library. For the most part, her duties involved answering questions posed by interpreters.

Since she worked mostly with interpreters and visitors, Gail Stephens’s viewpoint was similar to Cathy Beeler’s. The park should forge a stronger bond with the city and county and work to become better known in the community. She went on to say that there needs to be more connection between park administration and the interpretive staff and that both should have more involvement with visitors. Stephens feels there should be more interpretation: “I think there ought to be some thought given to new interpretive programs. I’m betting there’s a group of nature lovers around here, like a group of people who focus on the flora and fauna, who could take nature walks out there. It doesn’t always have to be Park Service interpretation. Broaden it beyond battlefield, beyond history into nature. And broaden the history story.” Gail mentioned that she would like to see more interpretation of the families who lived on the battlefield properties before and after the Civil War. While the Civil War was the focus during the 150th anniversary, now there is an opportunity to develop interpretation of other areas of interest for both natural and cultural resources.

---
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CULTURAL RESOURCE ACTIVITIES
The National Park Service undertook a large number of cultural resource activities at Monocacy in the late 1990s and early 2000s. They began with general projects and moved to specifics. Initially the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) prepared long-form reports on the Worthington House and on the Gambrill House in 1991. The first major comprehensive project was production of a Cultural Resources Study, completed in 1999 and revised and updated in 2004. There followed almost concurrently a Cultural Landscape Inventory for the battlefield in 2000. This document was updated in 2003. A Cultural Landscape Report was done for the Best Farm in 2005 as well as an Archeological Overview and Assessment of the Best Farm. A Cultural Landscape Inventory for the Thomas Farm came in 2009. The Long Range Interpretive Plan was also completed in 2009. The following year, 2010, saw completion of an Archeological Overview and Assessment and Identification and Evaluation of the Thomas Farm. In 2012, an Update and Expansion of the Monocacy Battlefield National Historic Landmark began. In 2013 there was a Cultural Landscape Inventory for the Worthington Farm and Cultural Landscape Reports for the Worthington and Thomas farms. In 2014, the Archeological Investigation of the L’Hermitage “Slave Village” was published and the List of Classified Structures for Monocacy was updated.396

The various cultural resources reports were completed to clear the way for physical work on Monocacy’s historic buildings, structures, and landscapes. Historic Structures Reports, which map out existing conditions and proposed treatment plans and costs for work on historic buildings were completed for the Worthington House (1995), the Best House (2003), and the Thomas House (2010). The exterior of the buildings on the Lewis Farm were stabilized in 2002–2008, the exterior of the Worthington House restored in 2004, and the exterior of the Best Farm buildings restored over a period from 2006 to 2010. In addition, a Historic Structure Assessment Report (HSAR) was completed for the Best stone barn in 2007 and a HABS recordation for the Thomas barn in 2005. Starting in 2008, the Thomas House underwent a major rehabilitation and renovation project to allow it to be adaptively reused as the park’s headquarters. Staff moved into the building in 2012. While there were other cultural resource projects completed, and others yet to be done, those listed above were major efforts.

Two non-historic buildings were removed: a 1940s concrete blockhouse along Araby Church Road near the Vermont and Pennsylvania monuments in 2007 and an early 1900s toll house, which had been moved from the

Evergreen Point area to a location along Araby Church Road near its north junction with Route 355 in 2013. In addition, an expanded system of interpretive trails for both natural and cultural resources was developed on the Thomas and Worthington Farms.

To undertake all of this cultural resource activity, the superintendent created a position for cultural resources manager in 2003 and hired archeologist Joy Beasley to fill it. With her background in archeology, Beasley promoted the new archeological projects in the park which supported and augmented the documentary record established in the Cultural/Historical Resource Study and the Cultural Landscape Inventories and reports.

**NATURAL RESOURCE ACTIVITIES**

As part of the Monocacy National Battlefield’s development as a national park, the park hired a natural resources program manager, Andrew Banasik. Important natural resource management projects included a Fire Management Plan, setting up a water quality monitoring program, and establishing native warm season grass meadows. A *Chronic Wasting Disease Environmental Assessment* focused on the emerging Chronic Wasting Disease threat to the deer population. The deer problem is significant at Monocacy and was mentioned directly by two interviewees who farm land on the battlefield. Overpopulation of deer leads to disease among the deer and crop damage and also inhibits forest regeneration in the wooded areas of the park. Groundhogs are another source of damage to the landscape, along with erosion of the river and creek banks. Invasive plants are also of concern in maintaining the historic landscape.\(^{397}\)

Monocacy’s more than 1,600 acres is home to a large number of plants and animals. “There are more than 20 species of mammals, more than 100 species of birds, 18 species of reptiles and amphibians, and approximately 40 species of fish documented in the park.”\(^{398}\) The natural habitats for plants and wildlife provide relief from the surrounding industrial, commercial, and residential development and heavily traveled transportation corridors. They help to clean the air, water, and land from resulting pollutants, and provide an oasis of open space with woodland, farmland, and waterways. Trails throughout the park accommodate recreational uses by visitors for hiking, running, bird watching, fishing, and photography. In addition, the Monocacy River is a state scenic river and has been designated as a recreational water trail.\(^{399}\) The recreation potential

---
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increases the number of visitors to the park and provides the opportunity for them to learn about the history of the cultural landscape and the Civil War, while at the same time enjoying outdoor activities and learning about plants, wildlife, and natural features in the park.

The most significant planning effort to date that dealt with natural and cultural resource management resulted in the park’s Resource Stewardship Strategy (RSS) in 2010. The park was one of the first National Park Service sites to serve as a pilot for this planning effort, one which sought to create an integrated cultural and natural resource management vision for parks. Since these two disciplines are inherently linked, especially at sites with rich and varied natural and historic landscapes, the RSS evaluated the current condition of the park’s cultural and natural resources, identified the desired condition for those resources, then laid out long-term strategies for managers to follow to bring those resources to their desired condition. The integrated approach to combining visions for cultural and natural resource management has become the standard for resource management in the NPS and set the stage for the eventual integration of the programs under one chief a few years later.  

In 2011, Andrew Banasik along with other authors prepared a Monocacy National Battlefield Natural Resource Condition Assessment. This report details the condition of air, water, land, flora, and fauna in the battlefield area, and offers recommendations for improvement of the battlefield’s natural resources.

MAINTENANCE

When the park became independent from Antietam National Battlefield in 2003, it kept its own maintenance staff, headed by Tina Cartwright. The facilities division was housed in the maintenance building offices, and the superintendent and natural resource manager moved to offices in the vacated residential quarter in the Gambrill Mill. Maintenance activities involved repairs as needed to buildings in the park, upkeep of roads, trails, and parking areas, grass mowing, and snow removal. Maintenance staff clears vistas and cleans and restores the landscape around monuments and waysides. Maintenance staff also construct, install, and repair fences, including the reconstructed historic rail fencing in front of the Best
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Farm. Flooding has always been an issue at Monocacy, especially for the Gambrill Mill. The building is evacuated and contents removed when a flood occurs. Floods also affect the walking trails, and the maintenance staff is responsible for clean-up, reconstructing, and repairing of trails and landscape after floods. The current Facility manager is Phil Grewe.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT RANGERS**

Law enforcement rangers protect the park’s visitors and resources from criminal activity and natural or human-made disasters. They are required to have training and may serve first as a seasonal ranger to gather field experience. The chief ranger must have a law enforcement commission. Law enforcement rangers, who serve as federal law enforcement officers, perform duties related to the detection and investigation of violations of federal criminal laws, the apprehension and detention of violators, the protection of life and property, and the enforcement of all applicable laws, rules, and regulations. Before Monocacy National Battlefield opened to the public in the summer of 1991, the only staff on-site was a law enforcement ranger who also handled maintenance. Monocacy’s first law enforcement ranger was Tom Kopczyk, who resided on site, with residential space on the second floor of the Gambrill Mill. The ranger’s office later moved to the maintenance facility building, and residential quarters in the mill were converted to office space. Todd Stanton served as chief ranger after Tom Kopczck. Later Jeremy Murphy served as combined chief ranger for law enforcement and also as interpretive ranger. The current (2018) law enforcement ranger is Travis Baker.

**DEVELOPMENT OF RELATIONSHIPS WITH PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS**

All of the former site managers, superintendents, and interpretive staff who were interviewed for this administrative history emphasized the importance of outreach with the local community for the purpose of promoting Monocacy National Battlefield and maintaining good relationships with neighbors. Various commissions, committees, and groups have been instrumental in supporting the battlefield, from its formation as a national park to its current day-to-day operations.

In the late 1930s, Glenn Worthington and others formed the Monocacy Battlefield Association to promote creation of Monocacy National Military Park. Worthington lived to see the designation but died shortly afterward in 1934. The battlefield settled into quiet oblivion until the 1970s.

---
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In September of 1977 Congressman Goodloe Byron established a Monocacy Battlefield Advisory Commission and appointed 12 local people with expertise in Civil War history, regional history, and organization to serve as members. The committee met with representatives from the National Park Service to determine which properties should be protected and how to protect them. They walked over the battlefield properties and worked on issues of access, options for protection, and what should be the next steps in creating the park.\(^404\)

According to John Parsons from the National Park Service, National Capital Region, he worked with the advisory committee in establishing the boundaries of the battlefield and acquisition of properties. He pointed out that Goodloe Byron formed the group to provide credibility to his efforts to create the park by introducing legislation. The advisory committee showed local citizen involvement and support.\(^405\)

The Monocacy Scenic River Citizen’s Advisory Board was created in 1978 and is comprised of 10 members, 5 appointed by the Carroll County Commissioners and 5 appointed by the Frederick County Council. The board provides advice and recommendations to appropriate jurisdictions on land use, land development proposals, and resource management issues that impact the Monocacy Scenic River corridor and its watershed, serving as an advocate for the river and its varied resources. While they are not directly involved with the National Park Service, they are protectors of the river, its landscape and wildlife, as is the Monocacy National Battlefield.\(^406\)

The National Park Service uses both cooperating associations and friends groups as well as volunteers to help with administration, interpretation, and visitor services.

**Friends Groups:** A friends group is any nonprofit organization established primarily to assist or benefit a specific park area, a series of park areas, a program, or the entire National Park System. A friends group can be the vehicle to provide an outlet for citizens’ passion about a park’s mission. Groups vary in size, structure, and purpose, and benefit the NPS in various ways, such as providing volunteer services, assisting with resource management and preservation, conducting fundraising efforts, and
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\(^404\) Interview with Congresswoman Beverly Byron, Oct. 10, 2016.
\(^405\) Interview with John Parsons, Sept. 20, 2016
publicizing important issues. Funding to support the activities of the group comes from donations, and often to a lesser extent, earned income.  

The Friends of the Monocacy Battlefield (FOMB) was incorporated in May 1992, as a partner to the Monocacy National Battlefield. This organization became inactive in 2005. While it functioned, the organization supported battlefield activities such as archeological investigations, special events and programs, park clean-up, and trail construction. In 2006, due to the organization’s inactivity, the IRS revoked the Friends of the Monocacy Battlefield’s nonprofit corporate status.

Gary McLaughlin was a volunteer and founding board member and president of the Friends of Monocacy Battlefield. He began his work with Monocacy in 1992 with a desire to make a contribution to the new park. By 2001 friction was developing between the park and FOMB, with Monocacy staff asserting that FOMB was not adhering to National Park Service friends group policies. Eventually in 2003, the FOMB reorganized with a new board of directors. Nevertheless, the organization ceased to function and became dormant by 2005.

In January 2017 a new friends organization took shape, the Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation. According to a press release on the Monocacy National Battlefield website, “Monocacy National Battlefield


408 Articles of Incorporation, Friends of Monocacy Battlefield, Superintendent’s Office Box #2, “Joy’s Office,” Folder “Friends of Monocacy Battlefield,” Monocacy National Battlefield Headquarters.


410 Memo to Associate Regional Director from Superintendent, Antietam and Monocacy, March 27, 1995, Basement Lateral File, Drawer 2, Folder K-18 “Interpretive Activities 1995, General,” Antietam National Battlefield Headquarters, Sharpsburg, MD.


announced that a partnership agreement has been signed with the newly formed Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation. This new partnership will greatly assist the park with fundraising, recruitment and as a community advocate. Park Superintendent Chris Stubbs hailed this as a great moment in the history of the park, ‘Whether addressing park needs, being a voice in our community or in creating future park stewards, the work of a Friends Group is invaluable.’ Foundation president Jim Hubbard concurred, ‘The Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation is pleased to begin our support for this National Park, which has a number of unfunded projects which, if completed, will enhance the experiences of our visitors.’  

_Historic Preservation Training Center:_ Much of the work that has been done with the historic properties at Monocacy was conducted through the Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC), headquartered at the Gambrill House on the battlefield. HPTC is an entity of the National Park Service that was formed in 1977 and was headquartered with the C&O Canal National Park, at Williamsport, MD, as the Williamsport Preservation Training Center (WPTC). According to its mission statement, “the Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC) is dedicated to the safe preservation and maintenance of national parks or partner facilities by demonstrating outstanding leadership, delivering quality preservation services, and developing educational courses that fulfill the competency requirements of Service employees in the career fields of Historic Preservation Skills, Risk Management, Maintenance, and Planning, Design, and Construction.” HPTC moved its offices to the Gambrill House from Williamsport in 1995, changing its name to Historic Preservation Training Center. HPTC undertook several projects related to preservation of the Gambrill House, as part of the development proposal for its occupancy of the house. On the list of tasks was rehabilitation of the east porch, replacement of the heating system, installation of museum exhibits, and creation of a wayside exhibit on HPTC use of the historic house.

In addition to HPTC’s headquarters, it also maintains a shop and storage facility. Three alternatives were offered for the location of the shop facility in 1995. One was to lease space somewhere in the community. The second

---
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was to combine with the Monocacy maintenance facility and the third was to place it on the Best Farm. Superintendent Susan Moore objected to the second and third alternatives. Alternative two would overcrowd Monocacy’s existing shop and storage building and alternative three would interfere with the agricultural use of the Best Farm, plus, the National Park Service planned a future visitor orientation area on the Best Farm.\textsuperscript{417} HPTC rented warehouse space in Frederick for its workshop and continues to use this space currently.

\textit{American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP):} Like HPTC, ABPP is a unit of the National Park Service. The Secretary of the Interior created the ABPP in 1991. According to the ABPP website, “the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) promotes the preservation of significant historic battlefields associated with wars on American soil. The ABPP focuses primarily on land use, cultural resource and site management planning, and public education.” “The ABPP provides professional assistance to individuals, groups, organizations, or governments interested in preserving historic battlefield land and sites associated with battles. The ABPP also awards grants to groups, institutions, organizations, or governments sponsoring preservation projects at historic battlefields; and state and local governments seeking to acquire Revolutionary War, War of 1812, and Civil War battlefield land.”\textsuperscript{418}

Monocacy partnered with ABPP for the preparation of the revised National Historic Landmark nomination, which Monocacy undertook in 2012–2014. In that effort, ABPP provided research and analysis related to the battle that justified adding more land to the NHL and linking the two previously separate areas of the NHL by a connecting landscape along the Monocacy River.

\textit{Cooperating Associations:} The term “cooperating association” refers to any nonprofit organization with which the NPS has a “Cooperating Association Agreement.” Cooperating associations are established under specific legislative authority to provide program or financial assistance to the NPS in the areas of public education, interpretation, research, and related visitor service activities. Funding to support this work comes from income earned from the sales of educational and interpretive materials, conducting educational programs and field institutes, and raising contributions to support the interpretive and educational mission of the parks. The public face of the cooperating association is most often the

\begin{footnotesize}
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park visitor center bookstore and only organizations with a cooperating association agreement may operate these facilities.\textsuperscript{419}

*Parks and History Association*: Monocacy National Battlefield, like many parks, uses cooperative associations for operating its book and gift shop. With Monocacy’s connection with Antietam National Battlefield, both parks were linked in their cooperative agreements for book store operations. Monocacy’s initial book store was necessarily small, squeezed into a corner of the ground floor of the Gambrill Mill. The first cooperating association to provide book store services to Monocacy was Parks and History Association, a Washington, DC based organization that served parks in the National Capitol Region. The arrangement was supposed to provide financial assistance for both parks, but unfortunately, the expected income did not materialize. In her interview for this administrative history, Susan Trail recalled, “with Parks and History, we just couldn’t get good service from them, at either park, now Antietam of course had a much bigger bookstore and the feeling was, the parks weren’t getting anything back from Parks and History.”\textsuperscript{420} Parks and History Association eventually ceased to exist.

*Western Maryland Interpretive Association*: Susan Trail continued, “so, the bookstore manager of Parks and History, Bob Casey, came to John [Howard] with a proposal to set up an independent Cooperating Association and that’s what was done.”\textsuperscript{421} The new independent cooperating association was Western Maryland Interpretive Association (WMIA). WMIA ran the book stores at Antietam and Monocacy, beginning when it was founded in 2000. Initially, the book store at Monocacy was so small that it did not generate much income. Sales were less than $20,000 a year. After the new visitor center was opened in 2007, Monocacy’s visitation doubled and book store sales doubled. The sales area in the new visitor center was much larger, taking up about a third of the first floor space. WMIA started stocking more books, plus clothing, mugs, and other souvenir items.\textsuperscript{422}

However, before long both Antietam’s and Monocacy’s relationship with WMIA began to sour. Cathy Beeler, Gail Stephens, Susan Trail, and
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Rick Slade in their interviews all noted that they felt that Monocacy was overlooked and that WMIA was much more involved with Antietam’s bookstore. As a result, Monocacy was left without staffing and sufficient stock and did not receive responses to requests for books and items that Monocacy National Battlefield wanted to have available in the store.

After Susan Trail became superintendent of Antietam, the relationship with WMIA continued to deteriorate, with both parks noting concerns over lack of transparency in the financial operations of WMIA, maintaining too much inventory, excessive expenditures, unresponsiveness to bookstore requests, and failure to operate under the terms of the cooperating agreement. When Gail Stephens became chair of the WMIA board, she, along with Susan Trail, Rick Slade, and Bob Casey attended a webinar offered by the Association for Partnerships in Public Lands (APPL) on nonprofits and governments. After an assessment by APPL it became apparent that WMIA’s perspective on what they were supposed to be and the park’s perspective on what WMIA was supposed to be were not the same, and ultimately WMIA and Antietam and Monocacy Battlefields went their separate ways.423

Rick Slade, who became Monocacy’s superintendent in 2013, entered into the WMIA debate after it was underway, but shared the same concerns. He realized that Monocacy’s store operation was not on an equal footing, even proportionately, with Antietam. “I definitely reached out to WMIA and said, ‘Hey, we’d like more of your time and attention, and we’d like to build this store into something that can help you with your revenue models, and will help us by giving our visitors more opportunity to take something back from their park visit, and a store we can be proud of.’” He noted that park staff were frustrated that they did not receive much support: “I hadn’t been there longer than a year, when it became clear from all sides, that there was a need for WMIA to change the way they do business, not just at Monocacy but also at Antietam. As we started to look a little closer, it was clear that the financials weren’t as solid as they should have been, the inventory had really run away from them.” In reference to the APPL assessment, Rick Slade noted that it had become clear that the executive director, the parks, and the WMIA board all had different views of the operation’s purpose.424

Gail Stephens was for many years a volunteer at Monocacy and also served as a board member and board chair of WMIA. She reported in her interview,
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Monocacy was always very much a sort of second thought for WMIA. Antietam was their moneymaker. … Monocacy was an afterthought. … I know there were several times when the interpretive rangers were very frustrated about the fact that [WMIA] didn’t get them things they wanted, and I think it was a lack of focus on Monocacy. … I had to basically beg on the board to get [WMIA] to give us someone, to actually just run the cash register and keep the store stocked and going on busy summer weekends.\footnote{Interview with Gail Stephens, Sept. 20, 2016.}

In the end it became clear that the relationship with WMIA was just not going to work. Stephens, in the role of WMIA board chair said, “I had a discussion with several of the board members, with Susan [Trail] and Rick [Slade], who said it’s just not going to work. We want Eastern National, because they’re a professional organization, they’re easy to work with … [WMIA] was just too divided an organization, so we dissolved. We voted to dissolve, the first of June last year [2015].”\footnote{Ibid.}

Susan Trail said that she and Rick Slade terminated the agreement with WMIA and worked with the regional office to invite Eastern National, a large cooperating association working with some 200 parks to take over the book store operations at Monocacy and Antietam. Eastern National bought out the inventory from WMIA, kept the staff members who wanted to stay, and continued the store operations.\footnote{Interview with Susan Trail, Aug. 31, 2016.} From Rick Slade’s point of view, the answer became pretty clear that the organization was not going to last into the future. … So it dissolved, and, we were able to transition to Eastern National. They’ve certainly picked up operations before, so they had a good understanding of the sort of steps that were necessary, and that’s where it ended. I think though, there was a lot of misunderstanding. I don’t think any of the individual parties, ever really understood or saw the sort of complex dynamic that was at play with the need to define that future direction, what that direction looked like. There was the changeover in the board, some new members came on, some old members had their terms come up, there was a new chair, Gail [Stephens], who really tried her best to steer people in a common direction and really was responsible for the best effort we made to kind of put things on a good track going forward. But it was interesting because when I say the board was going in a different direction from the Executive Director and the parks, the new membership to the board had brought a fourth dynamic to the table. So, as opposed to stabilizing the board, I think bringing in that new membership really put a whole other twist onto it.\footnote{Interview with Rick Slade, Oct. 14, 2016}
Monocacy National Battlefield: an Administrative History

Catoctin Center for Regional Studies: The center was developed through a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and Frederick Community College that began in 1998 and closed in December of 2013. The Catoctin Center was created to promote the research and study of the history and culture of central Maryland and the adjacent areas of neighboring states. Through research projects, teaching, collaboration with other historical organizations, internships, publications, conferences, workshops, and preservation efforts, the Catoctin Center promoted the study of the region’s history and provided students with new learning opportunities.429

John Howard was superintendent of Antietam and Monocacy battlefields when the Catoctin Center began. It started with a discussion between Dean Herrin, who became the director of the Catoctin Center and John Howard. Dean Herrin approached John Howard with the idea of “development of a research arm that would involve the National Parks that were in Frederick Community College’s area of service, which was considered to be, C&O Canal, Harpers Ferry, Catoctin, Monocacy and Antietam, and even Gettysburg if they wanted it.”430 According to John Howard, Frederick Community College was very receptive to the idea, although other educational institutions were also contacted. Antietam National Battlefield and National Capital Region contributed funding to pay Dean Herrin’s salary. The regional director at the time Robert Stanton was an enthusiastic supporter of the Catoctin Center. “He came up, spoke several times at conferences, and he liked what we were doing. It just started as one of those things where sometimes the best ideas are simply when someone walks in and says, ‘What do you think about this?’ And really that’s what it came down to.”431 The cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and Frederick Community College was for five years. It was renewed at the end of each five year period.432 The Catoctin Center for Regional Studies closed when the National Park Service no longer had funding available to support it.
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CONCLUSION
Monocacy National Battlefield is still a very young park. Its third superintendent has recently come on board. Yet in its short life, Monocacy has accomplished much in terms of land acquisitions, preservation of the landscape and buildings, warding off threats, growth in visitation and recognition, and establishing itself in the community.
As Monocacy National Battlefield has grown over the years since its officially opening to the public in July 1991, its role and activity in researching, assessing, and interpreting natural and cultural resources have evolved as well. While the knowledge base and preservation of resources have increased as the park matures, protecting the cultural and natural landscape from numerous threats remains a challenge.

MANAGEMENT PLAN EVOLUTION
Over the history of Monocacy National Battlefield, there have been various studies proposing management strategies and alternatives. Each of these reports reflects the philosophies of management of the battlefield at the time it was prepared. Among these studies are the following:

- Proposed Monocacy National Battlefield Suitability/Feasibility Study, 1976
- Assessment of the Alternatives – General Management Plan, 1979
- Land Protection Plan, 1983
- Foundation Document, Monocacy National Battlefield, 2015

**SUITABILITY/FEASIBILITY STUDY, 1976**
The 1976 *Suitability/Feasibility Study* resulted from the 1975 National Register/National Historic Landmark listing for Monocacy Battlefield and Goodloe Byron’s H.R. 3830, introduced February 27, 1975, proposing acquisition of approximately 650 acres. The purpose of the *Suitability/Feasibility Study* was “to analyze the options for protecting the area upon which the Civil War battle of the Monocacy River, July 9, 1864 was fought.” The first part of the 1976 report provided an analysis of historical events and existing and proposed conditions within and surrounding the battlefield area. The second section of the report offered three alternatives
for protection of the battlefield. A fourth alternative attempted to predict what would happen if there was no Federal action. The report made no recommendations, intending the review of alternatives to be objective.\textsuperscript{433}

The report noted the importance of studying the vegetation patterns that existed around the battlefield. “Through the protection of wooded areas, the historic scene can be protected. The wooded areas then can be utilized to screen planned future developments which would otherwise be visible to the battlefield visitor.”\textsuperscript{434} The report warned that care must be taken not to put visitor services and recreation facilities in areas of historic significance, but indicated that a trail system linking major historic sites and giving the opportunity to walk along the river would be appropriate.

\textbf{ASSESSMENT OF THE ALTERNATIVES – GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, 1979}
In 1979, when Monocacy Battlefield was still being established, the National Park Service prepared an \textit{Assessment of the Alternatives – General Management Plan (GMP)}. In developing and evaluating a list of alternatives, the authors of the 1979 GMP identified nine critical factors. These factors included the relationship of the battlefield to Frederick County and the surrounding region, access, natural and cultural environment, condition of historic resources and their potential for restoration and adaptation, opportunities for interpretation and recreation, anticipated visitor use, appropriate levels of development, and appropriate amount of land acquisition.\textsuperscript{435}

The plan discouraged increased vehicular traffic through and around the battlefield, because of small roads and difficult intersections. It encouraged increased pedestrian traffic through the battlefield and the development of trails with interpretive signage to accommodate the additional foot traffic. The plan advocated for visitor services, facilities, and interpretive programs to be developed in existing buildings. No new buildings should be constructed. Finally, the GMP recommended that recreation opportunities should be restricted to activities supporting the park’s purpose as a national battlefield and perhaps adding limited picnic areas and canoe landings.\textsuperscript{436} To carry out the recommendations, the plan proposed that lands within the battlefield’s boundaries be acquired in either fee or less-than-fee circumstances.
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LAND PROTECTION PLAN, 1983
Monocacy National Battlefield prepared a Land Protection Plan in 1983. The plan replaced an earlier Land Acquisition Plan, prepared in 1979 in conjunction with the Assessment of Alternatives – General Management Plan. The new Land Protection Plan covered only land within the battlefield’s boundary that was currently in private or state ownership. It did not address the 419.84 acres that the National Park Service owned at the time, nor did it include 51.74 acres maintained as right-of-ways by the State of Maryland for I-270 and State Route 355. The rest of the acreage within the boundary was “either actively farmed, and therefore retains a resemblance to the historic scene, or it is occupied by single family residences.”437 Existing non-historic residences in the new plan were deemed acceptable, but construction of new residences was considered to be incompatible with park objectives. The report pointed out the threat from the dense commercial and industrial development north of the battlefield. “The industrial zones north of the park have allowed recent construction of lumberyards, a motel, a shopping mall and a restaurant. These uses are not compatible with the purposes of the park and pose the greatest threat to the battlefield’s integrity, particularly if re-zoning is allowed to occur within the park boundary.”438

STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT, 1986
The 1986 Statement of Management reiterates many of the conclusions in the 1983 Land Protection Plan. After discussing specific cultural and natural resources on the battlefield, and visual resources, which include high points with vistas of the landscape, the report focused on land use and trends. It pointed out that the expanding metropolitan areas of Washington and Baltimore were forcing Frederick County to make a transition from its rural character to urbanization. “Examination of the area surrounding the park shows that the land-related pressures resulting from changes in use are immediate and real.”439

The report noted that Frederick County prepared a Comprehensive Development Plan in 1984 that designated the 100-year floodplain of the Monocacy River as a Conservation Zone, which prohibited all development except for limited recreation. A considerable portion of the battlefield park is covered by the floodplain Conservation Zone. However, land north of the Conservation Zone was zoned commercial/industrial, and that zoning designation extended into the park. To the south of the
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Conservation Zone, most land in 1986 was zoned agricultural. The report predicted that with the urbanization of Frederick County, land close to I-270 and Urbana “may be susceptible to residential development.”\textsuperscript{440} Other development mentioned that had taken place and that should be addressed due to its impact on the park was a liquor store along MD Route 355, just south of the Monocacy River, a used car lot and junkyard on Ball Road, and a new wastewater treatment plant on the north side of the Monocacy River near Ballenger Creek. The liquor store was to be removed and the report suggested vegetative screening for the other two facilities.\textsuperscript{441}

The 1986 report noted that the National Park Service owned 425.88 acres of the total of 1,659.04 acres in the park. That left 1,231.28 acres unprotected, 1,174.36 of which were privately owned. There was just under $5.5 million of unused acquisition funding remaining.

The \textit{Statement of Management} considered three alternative levels of development of the park, and how each would affect visitation. Monocacy National Battlefield was not officially open for visitors, but local residents used the park area for fishing, canoeing, horseback riding and hiking. The park kept no records of this activity. The first alternative, “Level One,” offered no development or additional interpretation on the actual battlefield site, but the battlefield would be protected through fee and less-than-fee acquisition. “Level Two” included physical development on the battlefield, such as unmanned interpretive units, a picnic area and self-guided interpretive trails. “Level Three” added a staffed interpretive center on the battlefield. Visitation estimates ranged from 10,000–50,000 average per year for “Level One” to 300,000–360,000 for “Level Three.”\textsuperscript{442}

The \textit{Statement of Management} report saw access to the park as the primary issue for visitation. The park needed to be appropriately signed, either at the Urbana or the Frederick exit from I-270. At the time the report was written in 1986, the approach to the park from the Urbana exit was more attractive, while the approach from the Frederick exit was shorter. The Frederick exit was also already designed to accommodate high traffic volume and had visitor amenities, e.g., hotel, restaurants, and gas stations. Other visitor use issues noted in the report were the difficult intersections at Araby Church Road and Baker Valley Road with Route 355. These smaller roads already had a fairly high volume of traffic. There was also concern that pedestrians might try to cross I-270. Moreover, there were no recreational facilities in the park for visitors, such as trails and picnic
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areas. The report recommended preparation of three planning documents: an Interpretive Prospectus, a Resources Management Plan, and a Cultural Landscape Report. These recommended planning documents were eventually completed.

**DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, 2008, FINAL APPROVAL 2011**

In 2008, more than 20 years after the last management report, the Monocacy National Battlefield produced a *Draft General Management Plan – Environmental Impact Statement*. (The final plan was approved in 2011.) This document remains in service today as the current *GMP*. The earlier reports focused on land protection within the boundaries, while acknowledging threats from the outside. The current *GMP* finds that “the major threat to the integrity of the battlefield comes from outside – traffic growth. This growth affects visitor safety and circulation, increases the pressure to widen roads, and causes noise and air pollution.” The *GMP* continues, identifying another threat, “development around the boundary which affects national battlefield viewsheds, increases runoff into the Monocacy River and other streams, and decreases biodiversity.”

Monocacy’s *GMP* sets out to articulate a management philosophy and framework for decision-making and problem solving. Like other management documents prepared earlier, the *GMP* notes that while the battlefield is surprisingly intact, the surrounding area is undergoing major change. Housing, commercial, and industrial developments are spreading on all sides, and since the region is part of an expanding Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area, these threats are not likely to go away.

The four alternatives presented in the *GMP* were discussed in Chapter 5. By the time the *GMP* was completed, much of the development and protection activity recommended in the preferred alternative had already been done.

**FOUNDATION DOCUMENT, 2015**

In 2015 Monocacy National Battlefield produced a *Foundation Document* that provides basic guidance for planning and management decisions. It includes an assessment of planning and data needs and identifies planning products to be developed. It also includes a list of planning documents already completed and establishes a baseline for future work.

The *Foundation Document* identified Monocacy’s fundamental resources and values as 1) the battlefield landscape, 2) historic structures, 3) archeological resources, 4) museum collections, 5) views and vistas, and 6) commemorative atmosphere. Other important resources and values were
natural communities and appropriate recreation opportunities. Interpretive themes included the Battle of Monocacy, but expanded to include other important avenues for interpretation such as Monocacy’s significant history during the 1700s and early 1800s as well as wider connections with the Civil War, slavery, experience in a border state, and environmental stewardship and preservation of the natural landscape.

These management documents reflect Monocacy’s progression through time as it matured from a new national battlefield park with no land, no facilities, and no visitors to a fully operational national park with diversified interpretive programs, complete visitor services and facilities, and fee or less-than-fee ownership of nearly all property within the boundaries. While all of the documents show concern for threats from outside development pressure, the early reports dealt with lack of protection within the park’s boundaries, unprotected lands, unrestored buildings, and the possibility of commercial and residential development within the park’s boundaries. Over the years, the park grew in stature within the community, acquired property, and was able to restore or at least stabilize all of the pre-Civil War buildings and remove some non-historic buildings. The battlefield installed trails, waysides, and exhibits to improve the quality of the national park. Management focus shifted from basic protection and acquisition to enhanced interpretation, visitor services, and research.

NATURAL RESOURCES
Proposed Natural resources at Monocacy face many difficulties, often relating to the surrounding land use. These challenges “include encroaching development, increasing population density and housing density, high road density, low proportion of protected areas, excessive numbers of white-tailed deer, and exotic and invasive plants.” The dense residential, commercial, and industrial development and transportation corridors around and through the park reduce habitat for plants and animals, forcing them into the park’s island of agricultural and natural landscape for refuge and that contributes to the overpopulation of deer.

NATURAL RESOURCE CONDITION ASSESSMENT, 2011
While the excessively large deer population threatens the health of the deer, it also threatens the health of the forest, field, and crop lands. The park’s *Natural Resource Condition Assessment*, prepared in 2011, cited deer overpopulation as a factor affecting several different threats to the natural landscape. One area of concern is forests. Monocacy has patches of forested area, which interconnect, although the overall forested area is small. The forests provide habitat for birds and animals. The report
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Chapter 6: Resource Stewardship and Public Use

recommended preserving the forested area by limiting future fragmentation and minimizing stresses to wooded areas. Deer overpopulation in the forests was noted as causing stress by limiting regeneration, trampling, overgrazing, and reducing habitat for other wildlife. Deer overpopulation was also noted on croplands and pastures. The report recommended deer population reduction to assure that the forests are healthy and that agricultural rentals on the croplands remain viable.\textsuperscript{447} Two farmers who were interviewed for this administrative history stated that overabundance of deer was the biggest problem they faced in farming land from the National Park Service.\textsuperscript{448}

Other threats to the natural landscape include exotic plants and insects which degrade or intrude upon native species. The \textit{Natural Resource Condition Assessment} recommended a park-wide survey to detect exotic species followed by active control measures for infestations. Likewise, the report recommended that “future assessments of natural resource condition would be improved by developing inventories and monitoring of bird, small mammal, and insect communities within native grassland habitats.”\textsuperscript{449} The report encouraged transition to greater amounts of native warm-season grasses.

A major aspect of the battlefield’s natural landscape is the serpentine Monocacy River that travels 58 miles through Frederick County from Pennsylvania to the Potomac River. It has been designated as one of Maryland’s Scenic and Wild Rivers. Monocacy National Battlefield is in the lower section of the river’s path. Increasing residential, commercial, and industrial development, particularly in the southern half of Frederick County, has affected the river’s water quality. Nutrient levels are high and oxygen levels are low, caused mainly by agricultural and industrial runoff. This condition allows for excessive algae growth and harms indigenous species of fish.

Monocacy National Battlefield as a river partner is working to protect the portion of the river that flows through the park. According to Monocacy’s \textit{Natural Resource Condition Assessment},

- wetland and waterway habitats show some signs of acidification, low oxygen, and high nutrients, indicating degraded habitat value which is reflected in the regionally low benthic [bottom of the river] index of biotic integrity and moderate fish diversity. It is recommended to identify and work with partners to reduce non-point source nutrient inputs from the
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watershed, as well as continue to implement (and begin to monitor) best management practices in agricultural lands. Additionally, efforts should continue to establish riparian buffers where appropriate, in consideration of cultural resources and historic vistas.\textsuperscript{450}

While establishing vegetation buffers helps to control agricultural runoff from inside the park, much of the runoff problem occurs upstream. Agricultural land within the park is already in high compliance with best management practice, but the condition assessment report recommends “compliance monitoring as well as to research new techniques of sustainable agriculture that would maintain historical land use while maintaining maximum resource condition in habitats managed for natural resource values within the park.”\textsuperscript{451}

**FLOODING**

Much of the Monocacy Battle occurred on the floodplain. Significant floods take place almost once a year, but one in January 1996 was particularly damaging, especially to the Gambrill Mill visitor center. In the 1800s, much of the riverbank was cleared of buffering trees for agriculture, which leads to erosion and increases damage from flooding. The Gambrill Mill and surrounding fields are often flooded during sudden and seasonal high precipitation. This flooding has damaged foundations of buildings and electrical wiring and has affected crops in surrounding fields. Park staff regularly had to evacuate materials, furniture and documents from the Gambrill Mill when flooding was forecast, during its time as the park’s visitor center. While the mill’s function has changed, the threat of flooding continues. Encouraging native plant life along the river helps buffer the erosive nature of floods as well as absorb (in part) potentially harmful nutrients, waste, and sediments from nearby developments and fields. The US Geological Survey measures the streamflow of the Monocacy at several locations.\textsuperscript{452} (Figure 22)

**EFFECTS OF VISITOR USE**

Increasing park visitation, as Monocacy matures, becomes better known and recognized as a scenic and substantial greenspace within an increasingly developed surrounding, leads to potential damage to the natural environment.

1. Visitors are placing increasing demands on the resources of the park. Management concerns vary from trail erosion

\textsuperscript{450} Thomas and others, Natural Resource Condition Assessment, ix.

\textsuperscript{451} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{452} Monocacy National Battlefield, Geologic Resource Evaluation Report (Geologic Resources Division, Natural Resource Program Center, National Park Service, Denver, CO), 7, 10.
to streambank erosion. Many trails wind through preserved biological, historical, and geologic environments at the park. Many of these are especially fragile, and off-trail hiking promotes their degradation. The park encourages recreation within designated trails and picnic areas. Prohibited use in non-designated areas increases the area of impact and places delicate ecosystems at risk. The Monocacy River enhances the natural beauty of the park. As with hiking, overuse of certain areas can lead to contamination and degradation of the ecosystem and increased erosion of stream banks.\footnote{453}

\section*{CULTURAL RESOURCES}

Chapter 1 includes discussion and historic context of the properties that make up the Monocacy National Battlefield. During the 1990s and 2000s, the battlefield accomplished much in researching, recording, documenting, and preserving the main historic properties in the park. In addition to the \textit{Cultural Resource Study/Historical Resource Study} and \textit{Cultural Landscape Report}, a series of Historic Structure Reports on most of the major buildings in the park were prepared. There have been some losses. The building presumed to have been General Wallace’s headquarters along the railroad tracks at the junction burned down. This happened after the national park was established, but before it was staffed. The cause of the fire was not determined. The National Park Service has also removed some buildings that were not historic, including one fishing camp building near

\footnote{453 Ibid. 9, Superintendent’s Office File Box #2 “Joy’s Office,” Folder “USGS Cooperative Agreements,” Monocacy National Battlefield Headquarters}
the Monocacy River north of Bush Creek in the early 1990s; a ca. 1940s concrete blockhouse on Araby Church Road, near the entrance to the Thomas Farm and the Pennsylvania and Vermont monuments, in 2007; and a toll house which had been moved to Araby Road near its north junction with MD 355, in 2013.

**PRESERVATION AND REHABILITATION OF STANDING STRUCTURES**

The National Park Service has either stabilized or restored all of the major historic buildings in the park. The work generally was associated with historic structure reports, which ideally are completed before the rehabilitation work begins. A historic structure report (HSR) provides documentary, graphic, and physical information about a property’s history and existing condition. Broadly recognized as an effective part of preservation planning, a HSR also addresses management or goals for the use or reuse of the property. It provides a thoughtfully considered argument for selecting the most appropriate approach to treatment, prior to the commencement of work, and outlines a scope of recommended work. (NPS)

**GAMBRILL MILL/BUSH CREEK AREA**

The first Monocacy property to be rehabilitated was the Gambrill/Bush Creek area. First there was a structural survey of the Gambrill House (Boscobel), prepared in May 1984. At the same time, a structural survey was done for the Gambrill Mill. A *Draft Interpretive Plan, Bush Creek Development Concept Plan* dates from July 1984. This plan recommended removal of non-historic structures, including the Gambrill House, which was built in 1872 after the Monocacy battle. The thought that Boscobel might be demolished prompted some resistance in the local community, and also a National Register nomination for the house written in August 1984, and listed in 1985. The nomination set out to establish Boscobel as significant in its own right for its architecture and for its association with James Gambrill. In addition, there was a *Gambrill Mill Site Evaluation and Brief Special History Study*, completed in December 1984. The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) recorded Boscobel in 1991. In 1993 archeological monitoring accompanied replacement of the Gambrill House septic tank.

With the prospect of the Historic Preservation Training Center moving their offices into the Gambrill House, the National Park Service prepared a *Draft Development Concept Plan/Environmental Assessment* in June 1994.
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WORTHINGTON HOUSE

Extensive stabilization work was done on the Worthington House in the mid-1980s after acquisition. A Historic Structure Report was completed in March 1995. The following year the exterior trim was painted on the house.457 Other than the painting, the house was mothballed. In fact, the Worthington House was featured in the National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 31, Mothballing Historic Buildings, published in 1993. Louvered covers were placed at all windows to protect the original sash and allow ventilation. In 2004 the deteriorated Worthington House was rehabilitated. The project closeout report notes that extra brick and slate for the project had been stacked in the basement. The report also gave paint colors and brands used for the rehabilitation of the house.458 The 2004 rehab work also included reconstructing the front porch, based on historic photos and the actual pieces of the front porch that were stored in the basement. A Cultural Landscape Report was completed for the Worthington Farm in 2013.

Figure 23: View of Worthington Farm trail (PRA 2016)

458 “Project Closeout Information, Contract 1443C3059020905,” Binder “Reports” (shelf, north wall of library), Monocacy National Battlefield Library, Visitor Center.
Monocacy National Battlefield: an Administrative History

LEWIS FARM

In 2002, contractors cleaned and removed lead paint from the exterior of the Lewis House and repainted with Sherwin Williams exterior gloss oil white paint. Richard H. Brown, Antietam’s cultural resource manager, wrote in a memo in July of 2002 to Gene Wolfe (Monocacy maintenance) that there were problems with the contractor’s chain of custody of hazardous waste and that the finished painting job had an excessively rough finish – the wood was gouged from scraping and the surface had not been properly cleaned after scraping. The dispute ended with the contractor being required to return and clean up lead paint chips left on the ground around the base of the house and dispose of them properly. The contractor was not required to repaint the house. The Lewis Barn was stabilized in 2004.


460 Personal communication, Susan W. Trail, 5/8/18.
2006, along with the corn crib. The house was stabilized in 2007–2008 and is currently mothballed.

**BEST FARM**

The National Park Service acquired the largest part of the Best Farm on August 9, 1993, from multiple heirs of Theresa Trail Mathias who died in 1988 (see Chapter 4 for details). The State of Maryland donated the final 60 acres of Best Farm, on the west side of I-270, to Monocacy National Battlefield in 1995. Not long afterward various preservation and rehabilitation projects began on the farm. In September of 1997, the National Park Service contracted to replace the gutters on the Best House. The following year, 1998, there was a work order to rebuild attic sash, and in 1999 to replace the roof. In 1999 Richard Brown, chief, cultural resources at Antietam National Battlefield, recommended removal of the front porch and repointing the chimney on the back side of the house. That work was done in September of 1999, along with replacement of 150 feet of foundation at the back of the house. Also in 1999, the *Monocacy National Battlefield Cultural Resources Study* (updated in 2001 and 2004) provided the history of the property from the mid-1700s forward, uncovering its associations with a French refugee family from the Saint-Domingue slave revolt and its connections with James Marshall who owned and developed much of the land that is today’s Monocacy National Battlefield.

![Figure 27: View of Best Farm (PRA 2016)](image-url)
The Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC) conducted window preservation and mothballing of the house in 2001. That same year, the corn crib rehabilitation was completed. In 2002, a report, Contextualizing the Hermitage, focused on the French connections of the property. In July 2003 a Historic Structure Report was completed on the house. Monocacy National Battlefield prepared the Best Farm Archeological Overview and Assessment in 2005, and in that same year contracted for a Cultural Landscape Report. The secondary house was preserved and stabilized in 2005. In 2006–2007 HPTC rehabilitated the exterior of the main house and prepared a Historic Structures Treatment Record. The stone barn was stabilized and preserved in 2008.

Work continued on the research of the population of enslaved laborers on the Best Farm during the Vincendiere ownership with a Report of Research, Slaves of L’Hermitage, in 2011. This was concurrent with the beginning of archeological investigation of enslaved worker housing on the Best Farm associated with L’Hermitage in the late 1700s and early 1800s. That archeological work produced Archeological Investigation of L’Hermitage Slave Village, in 2014.

A post–Civil War frame bank barn was destroyed in a wind storm in 1992, before the National Park Service acquired the property. A large concrete block equipment shed, a 1940s dairy barn, and a metal pole barn were removed from the scene, ca. 2005.

As of 2017, the buildings on the Best Farm are preserved and protected, but they are not being used or rehabilitated. Factors in the decision to mothball the buildings instead of undertaking full restoration or adaptive reuse have to do with lack of sufficient funds and the buildings’ unlikely adaptability for reuse. Removal or major alteration of important historic features would be required to make the buildings compliant for current use.

THOMAS FARM
The history and context of the Thomas Farm is detailed in Chapter 1. The National Park Service acquired the farm in 2002. It was the last of the major Monocacy properties to come into park ownership. Thereafter, various planning documents provided the roadmap for the treatment and use of the farm and its buildings. In addition to the land, the property retains the historic 1700s main house, a 1700s “tenant house,” and a barn and various
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outbuildings from the 1800s. There were also two concrete blockhouses from the 1900s, one of which has been removed, and a frame toll house which was moved to a site along Araby Church Road from its original location near Evergreen Point. The toll house was removed since it had no relationship to the history and significance of the battlefield, or to the setting and landscape.

Studies of the Thomas Farm began with the Cultural Landscape Inventory of the Monocacy Battlefield in 2000 and concurrently the Cultural Resource Study/Historic Resource Study prepared in 1999 and updated in 2004. In 2000 Richard H. Brown wrote a letter to then Assistant Superintendent Susan Trail with an assessment of the barn on the “Clapp Farm,” asserting the need for stabilization and repair of the barn. In March of 2002, HPTC’s Supervisory Exhibits Specialist sent a memo to Monocacy’s site manager regarding the Thomas Barn Emergency Stabilization Assessment Proposal, stating that the structure was in need of “immediate attention to prevent collapse.”

Monocacy contracted HPTC to make emergency repairs to the barn. Work began in November of 2002 and included repair or replacement of timber framing and foundation repairs as well as a new roof and new siding. Further restoration of the barn and its brick silo was completed in 2009. As part of the barn rehab, the concrete block milking parlor, walkway, and run-in shed were removed. HPTC also worked on the Thomas Farm corn crib in 2003.

In 2005, through a cooperative agreement with Bucks County Community College Historic Preservation Program and the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Monocacy National Battlefield completed recordation of the barn, and the following year for the domestic dependencies. In 2008, a Cultural Landscape Inventory was prepared specifically for the Thomas Farm. Following, in 2010 was the Archeological Overview, Assessment, Identification and Evaluation Study of the Thomas Farm and the Thomas
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House-Thomas Farm Historic Structure Report. Both of these studies were prepared by the National Park Service. The 2008 General Management Plan in two of its alternatives recommended that the Thomas House become the administrative offices for the battlefield. The house was rehabilitated in 2010–2012 as administrative offices, with HPTC doing much of the work. The stone “tenant house” was also rehabilitated and opened seasonally for visitor use in 2016. Rehabilitation for both buildings protected character-defining features, as recommended in the HSR. The HSR also recommended replacement of the Civil War era front porch for the Thomas House.

Other rehabilitation work on the Thomas Farm included preservation and stabilization of the blacksmith shop ruins in 2008, replacement of the Thomas House slate roof in 2007, and restoration and repair of the Thomas House windows and doors.

Other cultural resource projects included restoration of the Fourteenth New Jersey Monument in 2007 and repair, cleaning, and restoration of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Vermont monuments completed in 2008.

BAKER FARM
A portion of the Baker Farm is currently under a life tenancy agreement but significant stabilization, rehabilitation, and preservation projects have occurred on the farm’s structures. The Historic Preservation Training Center completed work to stabilize the bank barn in 2005, resulting in repairs to structural members of the timber framing for the upper story; the cantilevered forebay; the wagon shed attached to the side of the barn; the barn foundation; and the historic brick silo. Additional repair work between 2007 and 2009 resulted in repair of some of the bank barn’s framing bents, installation of downspouts to improve roof drainage, and a significant stabilization of the stone foundation.

Starting in 2008, a large project replaced the concrete culvert pipe that carried Harding’s Run under the Baker Farm entrance lane with a 24-foot span bottomless arched culvert. The concrete pipe was inadequately sized to allow the creek to flow through it without topping the entrance road and eroding the streambank and roadside and the new bottomless culvert allowed the stream to flow freely without impacting safe ingress and egress of the farm’s equipment and vehicles.473

DEVELOPMENT OF TRAILS
The system of walking trails on the battlefield serves multiple purposes; it aids in interpretation of the battle, cultural resources, and also natural

resources. In addition, the trails provide recreational opportunities for park visitors.

The Bush Creek Trail project added a loop trail from the Gambrill Mill visitor center in 1995. Friends of Monocacy Battlefield donated materials for two foot bridges and Boy Scouts from the National Capital Council helped with construction of the trail.\(^{474}\) Alvin Beeman, a Monocacy employee received an incentive award in 1995 for construction of the trail.\(^{475}\) This was the first of Monocacy’s trail system for visitors.

The park’s most extensive trail system, at the Worthington Farm, was completed in 1998. It contains two loops that start and end at the Worthington House. One loop (1.6-mile Ford Loop) travels into the Monocacy River floodplain and passes the historic Worthington Ford and the other loop (1.9-mile Brooks Hill Loop) goes through the forested area of Brooks Hill, passes a scenic overlook of the Baker and Thomas farms, and then loops back to the house adjacent to farm fields. This trail system is the most heavily used in the park, regularly hosting hikers, runners, dog-walkers, and Civil War enthusiasts alike. Both loops provide both natural and historic points of interest along their routes.

Hiking trails were developed on the Thomas Farm in 2004 (Thomas Farm Trail) and in 2007 (Middle Ford Ferry Loop), taking visitors across the scenes of a majority of the fighting during the battle.

From the visitor center, a trail was installed that leads to the railroad junction. The Junction Trail was completed in 2011.

**ARCHEOLOGY**

Aside from archeology conducted in connection with projects affecting the battlefield, such as sewer lines or road construction, there have been two major archeological efforts on Monocacy National Battlefield, one on the Best Farm and one on the Thomas Farm. The first was on the Best Farm, beginning with the *Archeological Overview and Assessment and Identification and Evaluation Study of the Best Farm*, completed in 2005. According to the report’s management summary, the Best Farm became the focus of development activities at Monocacy in 1999. The study was conducted to provide the National Park Service with information about the farm’s cultural resources. A cooperative agreement between the Regional Archeology Program of the National Park Service and the Center for


Heritage Resource Studies and the University of Maryland’s Department of Anthropology enabled the study. The report included an overview and assessment of known archeological and historical information and the identification and evaluation aspect, which involved a Phase I survey and inventory and limited Phase II investigations in areas that warranted further exploration. An investigation focused on the enslaved workers’ housing for L’Hermitage (Best Farm) began in 2010 and resulted in the discovery of evidence of six individual slave dwellings as well as a number of associated features. The six slave houses were approximately 20 by 34 feet each, arranged in a line end to end, well in front of the main house. The archeologists documented the site with shovel test pits, surface penetrating radar, and five foot by five foot excavation units. The findings appear in NCR Regional Archeology Program Occasional Report #20: Archeological Investigation of L’Hermitage Slave Village (2014). Katherine Birmingham, who served as field director under the direction of principal investigator Joy Beasley, won the John L. Cotter Award for Excellence in Archeology for this project in 2014. Other smaller projects occurred on the Best Farm in association with repair and rehabilitation activity on the property.

On the Thomas Farm, the Archeological Overview and Assessment and Identification and Evaluation Study of the Thomas Farm was completed in 2010. Begun in 2003, the project resulted in the identification and investigation of a number of structures features and activity areas on the
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Thomas Farm, including a tavern from the 1700s at the Middle Ford. The tavern, which operated at the Middle Ford from the mid-1700s until about 1830, is the park’s oldest known historic site. Although the ferry and ford were abandoned long before the Battle of Monocacy, they illustrate the vital trade and transportation routes that made Monocacy Junction so strategically important during the Civil War. Moreover, it is one of only a few intact tavern archeological sites from the 1700s known to exist in the region. The report also covered archeological materials from several 1800s outbuildings associated with the Thomas Farm and an 1800s blacksmith shop. Metal detector surveys undertaken on agricultural fields attempted to identify troop movements during the battle, but they were inconclusive because of extensive relic hunting prior to National Park Service ownership. Two pre-historic sites were also recorded. The project was conducted through a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service Regional Archeology Program and the University of Maryland, Department of Anthropology, in conjunction with the Chesapeake Watershed Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit. The Monocacy National Battlefield Cultural Resources staff conducted additional fieldwork in 2008.

**INTERPRETATION AND THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE**

Monocacy National Battlefield opened to visitors in 1991. At that time there were only three employees: a park manager, Susan Moore; a law enforcement ranger, Tom Kopczyk; and an interpretive ranger, Cathy Beeler. The interpretive ranger also handled all administrative duties. In those early days, interpretation was essentially limited to greeting visitors, handing out brochures, and leading occasional tours.

In 1996 Monocacy National Battlefield prepared an *Interpretive Prospectus*, intended to serve for ten years into the future. The prospectus featured six interpretive themes and six interpretive focus areas. The themes concentrated on the battle, its context in the Civil War, and the evolution of commemoration and preservation. The six focus areas were the Best Farm, Worthington House, Gambrill Mill, Railroad Bridge/Railroad Junction, Araby Overlook, and a future focus area, Araby/Thomas Farm. At this point, the Thomas Farm was still privately owned, so there could be no on-site interpretation.

According to the prospectus, the visitor center and starting point for tours and interpretation was to be the Best Farm, with visitor orientation and services in the “old barn,” presumably meaning the stone barn. Civilian life was to be interpreted in the Best House and African American perspectives.
in the “slave quarter” [at that time the Best secondary house was thought
to have been enslaved worker quarters]. Visitors covered military aspects
and commemoration on two loop trails with interpretive waysides, one to
the north for artillery and monuments, and one to the east leading to the
junction and railroad bridge. The prospectus noted that before anything
was done on the Best Farm, there must be a cultural landscape report,
historic structure reports, and an archeological survey.

The Worthington House focus area would have interpreted the battle
through the eyes of a six year old from the house’s basement, where Glenn
Worthington as a child watched the battle unfold. Additional exhibits
were planned for the first floor of the house and interpretive trails to
Worthington Ford and Brooks Hill.

The Gambrill Mill focus area interpreted the mill’s importance to local
agriculture and as a hospital at the time of the battle. Periodic flooding limits
the use of the mill to holding easily removable objects. The second floor,
when it was no longer used as a residence, and the utility building behind,
were to be used for administrative offices. An interpretive trail was planned
to lead to the railroad bridge and eventually cross the river to link with the
trail from the Best Farm. Crossings of Route 355 and the railroad were to
be worked out. The prospectus proposed a pull-off and short trail to the
Thomas Farm Overlook with an interpretive wayside covering the battle and
the historic rural landscape. The Thomas House was to become in the distant
future a major area of interpretation to cover civilian life, slavery, battle
action, and the August 1864 strategy meeting of Grant and Sherman that took
place in the house.479 Cathy Beeler in her interview for this administrative
history noted the Interpretive Prospectus and the later Interpretive Plan as two
of the most important accomplishments during her years at Monocacy.480

In September 2009, Monocacy National Battlefield completed a Long
Range Interpretive Plan that was expected to serve for the next seven to
10 years. The plan’s goal is “to promote Monocacy National Battlefield
resource values through specially planned visitor experiences and
excellence in interpretation.”481 According to the plan’s highlights,

During the next 10 years Monocacy National Battlefield interpretive
services will provide visitors with opportunities to increase their
understanding and appreciation for the park and its resources; to engage
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in local and regional educational opportunities; and to participate in
nationally significant events.

- Expand website to include more interactive components, education
  resources, and research as well as creating and posting lesson
  plans and more.
- Create a pavilion near the visitor center.
- Develop a visitor experience plan to include waysides, audio, video,
  tactile components, 3-D models, and clear etch panels.
- Increase interpretive opportunities with local, current and potential
  park partners, particularly in conjunction with the Civil War
  Sesquicentennial and the National Park Service Centennial.
- Create a trail from the visitor center to Monocacy Junction.
- Develop an historic furnishings plan and exhibit concept plan in order
  to open the first floor of the Worthington House to visitors.
- Develop and implement an exhibit concept plan for the Stone Tenant
  House on Thomas Farm.
- Create a picnic area.
- Improve Gambrill Mill boardwalk trail.
- Establish an educational outreach position.
- Realign Thomas Farm trail to increase opportunities to understand
  the battle better.
- Create and publish additional printed materials including brochures
  and Park Ranger Brett Spaulding’s research.482

Many of these objectives have already been reached as of 2017.

Perhaps the most important boost to visitation at the park was the
construction of the new visitor center at the northeast corner of the
Best Farm. The design of the new building derived from the 1940s dairy
barn that had been removed from the Best Farm complex. While earlier
plans called for the new visitor center to be placed in one of the existing
buildings on the Best Farm, John Parsons urged that it be placed away from
the historic farm buildings. Moreover the hilltop site at the corner of the
battlefield offered better views of the battlefield for visitor orientation.483
The “new” visitor center is easy to see, easy to access, blends well with
the landscape, and has plenty of room for exhibits, visitor orientation, a
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gift shop, library, and offices for the interpretive staff, unlike the cramped and difficult-to-find quarters in the Gambrill Mill. The move paid off. According to the *Long Range Interpretive Plan*, “Approximately 15,000 visitors came to Monocacy National Battlefield annually between 2002 and 2006; however the opening of the new visitor center led to a 41 percent increase in 2007. The impact of the new facility continued to boost visitation throughout 2008, in spite of rising fuel prices and a declining economy, and continues to climb well into 2009.”484 Since then, visitation has continued to increase steadily each year, with 2017 numbers at 113,820 for the year.485

Along with the visitor center, improvements in interpretation include a tour route with improved parking areas and waysides at the Best Farm, Fourteenth New Jersey Monument, Worthington Farm, Thomas Farm, and Gambrill Mill, intended to follow the course of the battle. In addition, a system of trails extends out from several of the tour stops and the visitor center. Fiberglass wayside panels throughout the park help with interpretation. They were produced and installed by the National Park Service Harpers Ferry Center.

Another valuable tool for visitors is expanded access to online material. “The park offers a broad range of visitor information, photo galleries, and interpretive content to its virtual visitors. This includes general information, current park events, comprehensive park management information, cultural history (the Battle of Monocacy, historic structures, the railroad, and settlement of the area), natural history, and stewardship opportunities. The website is frequently updated and is responsive to visitor comments. Based upon visitor feedback (verbally and in writing), it appears to meet their needs and is highly appreciated.”486 Articles based on the archeological reports for the Thomas Farm and the *L’Hermitage* enslaved laborers’ housing excavations appear as extensions to the Monocacy National Battlefield webpage. These documents use information generated from the *Cultural Resource Study* for the park and from the multiple Cultural Landscape Reports as well as Historic Structure Reports and other studies that have built the accumulated knowledge of cultural resources in the park. Similar information is also offered as printed material available to visitors at the visitor center.
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CONCLUSION
Both the 2008 General Management Plan and the 2009 Long Range Interpretive Plan expand the significance of the Monocacy National Battlefield landscape beyond the battle that occurred on July 9, 1864, to include the cultural and natural heritage extending well back into the 1700s. The threads of history from English and Scottish settlement, Colonial French refugee immigrants and their enslaved populations, descendants of whom still likely live in the area, all contribute to a greater understanding of the back story that contributed to the Civil War and Battle of Monocacy.
STAFF, SITE MANAGERS, AND SUPERINTENDENTS’ ACTIVITIES

As Monocacy National Battlefield grew and matured, the day-to-day routine of its management evolved to accommodate the park’s changing role. Site managers and, after 2003, superintendents, were responsible for seeing that Monocacy National Battlefield functioned as smoothly as possible. Prior to the opening of the park to visitors in July of 1991, there was only a ranger on site who handled law enforcement and maintenance. The superintendent of Antietam National Battlefield performed administrative duties. Then, two weeks before the official 1991 opening event, Antietam’s superintendent at the time, Richard Rambur, hired Cathy Beeler, who had been a seasonal employee at Antietam, to be an interpretive ranger for Monocacy. Unlike Antietam superintendents and site managers, she was at Monocacy full time. Susan Moore, assistant superintendent for Antietam, became the site manager.

Cathy Beeler’s first priority was putting together the park’s opening event. With only two weeks to prepare, organizing the event took up most of her initial time. After Monocacy National Battlefield opened to visitors, Cathy Beeler’s job was to provide front-line visitor services including giving out visitor information, initiating visitor programs, handling any special events, providing outreach for the park, and planning. Being one of only two people full time on site, Cathy also cleaned the visitor center; took care of payroll, petty cash, and incoming and outgoing mail; initiated a volunteer program; coordinated the historic weapons program; and handled reporting to the regional office for programs provided by the park.487

There was no real routine in those early days. Tasks were sometimes as simple as opening the visitor center in the morning and waiting for visitors to appear. There was little funding and no direction about what should be interpreted and how. As funding became available, there were more opportunities for planning and formalizing battlefield interpretation. In 1996 the battlefield prepared an Interpretive Prospectus. It guided the park in interpretive planning for the next ten years. It provided a framework for interpretation and development of a volunteer program. The interpretive program freed Cathy’s time to go out into the community to promote

---

487 Interview with Cathy Beeler, Sept. 28, 2016.
the battlefield to schools and among historical organizations such as the Frederick Historic Sites Consortium.\footnote{488}

During 1991 and 1992 Susan Moore worked as site manager, while she also served as assistant superintendent of Antietam National Battlefield. She oversaw day-to-day operations, activities, including design of trails, advertising the park, and law enforcement. She also coordinated with Antietam for maintenance services and administration and attended public meetings. She worked as the superintendent of Antietam from 1993 to 1996.\footnote{489} In the spring of 1994, John Howard became site manager of Monocacy and also assistant superintendent of Antietam. He served this role until May of 1996 when he became superintendent of Antietam. As site manager, John worked four days a week at Monocacy and one day at Antietam, where he reported for staff meetings. His job involved day-to-day supervision of the park and its staff and development of funding proposals from an office in the Gambrill Mill’s first floor, and later in the new maintenance building. After he became superintendent at Antietam in 1996, he spent one day a week at Monocacy and four days at Antietam.

During his time as site manager, John Howard says that he was the public face of the park with regard to dealing with the press, local government, and various organizations. Otherwise his duties varied. If he was the first person to arrive, he opened the visitor center and unlocked the gate. He spent a significant amount of time developing funding requests and personnel requests to grow the park. He also responded to the Regional Office’s information requests. He would meet with Cathy Beeler and Tom Kopczyk to see what they had planned for the day. Occasionally he would go out on the battlefield with either of them to go over projects they were planning or proposing that required Park Service funds. Examples were the then-proposed construction of the Worthington Farm parking lot off Baker Valley Road and how to get visitors out onto the Worthington Farm.\footnote{490}

Another important day-to-day activity for John Howard was looking for ways to use volunteers. One of those ways was for clean-up work. A number of sites within the park had in the past been trash dumps. Much effort was put into cleaning up the park’s landscape. The park had such limited staffing and such limited funds that he spent much of his time figuring out ways to accomplish the basics that were needed to establish the park as a park.\footnote{491}

\footnote{488} Ibid.  
\footnote{489} Interview with Susan Moore, Nov. 7, 2016.  
\footnote{490} Interview with John Howard, Oct. 4, 2016.  
\footnote{491} Ibid.
In February of 1997, Susan Trail became Monocacy’s site manager as part of her duties as assistant superintendent of Antietam. She served as site manager until 2003 when Monocacy became an independent park and Trail became its first superintendent. As site manager, Susan Trail answered to John Howard, superintendent of Antietam. Her job was to make sure the park was running smoothly and that the visitor contact station in the Gambrill Mill was open and that maintenance and law enforcement needs were being taken care of. Susan Trail spent increasing time at Monocacy, doing more work as responsibilities and visitation grew, and less time at Antietam.492

When she became superintendent of Monocacy in 2003, Trail continued to serve under John Howard for a year or two and until Monocacy was moved organizationally to be under the deputy regional director of the National Capital Region. Her duties remained the same in managing operations of the park, but there was more interaction with the regional office in project planning and project management. Her interaction with outside groups also increased as she became the face of the park. Susan Trail’s role expanded over time as the park grew.493

Her daily routine revolved around strategic planning for the park and trying to get funding for projects. The park was always trying to increase financial resources to do the things they wanted to do. While Susan Trail was superintendent, staff increased dramatically and positions for division chiefs were created and filled. The superintendent’s role came to include supervision of the division chiefs and making sure that their operations were running well and that they had the resources they needed to get their jobs done. The superintendent also worked with state and local agencies and interacted with outside groups with issues that affected the park.494

Almost all of Monocacy’s maintenance issues involved the historic buildings and getting repairs made as needed. HPTC did the majority of the rehabilitation work on the historic buildings. The park’s own small maintenance staff took care of gravel roadways and trails, mowing, and trimming. The park was able to work with the Regional Office to acquire funds to take care of major issues.495

While not a day-to-day task, flooding was a major recurring problem in the park and one that had to be dealt with frequently at Gambrill Mill. At

492 Interview with Susan Trail, Aug. 31, 2016.
493 Ibid.
494 Ibid.
495 Ibid.
least once a year staff would have to evacuate the lower story of the mill, take everything out, and store it in another building or in a storage trailer uphill from the mill. There were only a few times when water actually got into the mill, but the threat was present frequently. Staff monitored weather forecasts for flood warnings. Susan Trail reported that there was only one time during her years at Monocacy where the entire building, including offices on the second floor had to be evacuated. When the new visitor center was completed in 2007, flooding was of less concern. Flooding would also damage the trails. The Gambrill Mill Loop Trail along the creek and river was especially vulnerable.496

Susan Trail concluded in her reflections about day-to-day operations during her time as Monocacy’s superintendent: “Everybody was the first. They were the first in their positions, and so we really got to decide what we wanted this park to be, and how we wanted to approach it, and that was really exciting to have basically a blank slate, that we could create, what we really wanted to see here, and I had a really talented group of people who were really able to help me figure this place out. I think we really had a lot of fun and a lot of creativity went into the things that were done here.”497

Rick Slade became Monocacy’s second superintendent after Susan Trail moved on to become superintendent at Antietam. He began his duties in March of 2013 and served until May of 2016. Like Susan Trail before him, he had responsibility for management of the park, working with a senior management team to implement park-wide priorities. By this time, the park had matured and all of the “first” positions were now seasoned and experienced. The park developed a three-year strategic plan while Rick Slade was superintendent. It was time for the park to chart a longer-term direction, and Rick Slade saw this as a key part of his responsibility. The other key responsibility was working with outside partners and stakeholders to garner support and recognition of the park. He spent a lot of time working with Frederick County, Frederick City, and other partners.498

There was no particular daily routine for Rick Slade. Generally he would begin at the visitor center and talk to staff and volunteers there. Then he would go to his office at headquarters at the Thomas House and do computer work. He would typically meet with the facilities manager, Al Kirkwood, in the morning and discuss maintenance issues. He noted that when he first started at Monocacy, there were plenty of staff in the

496 Ibid.
497 Ibid.
headquarters building, but as staffing levels dropped, it was just Rick Slade and Andrew Banasik, who had become both natural and cultural resource manager. He would often go out into the park and talk with seasonal employees and visitors. In the afternoons Rick would work on writing reports and documents, and budget management.499

EVENTS

In addition to these special celebrations, the park holds daily activities from May to October to engage visitors. These include ranger-led interpretive programs, group hikes on the park’s six trails, and hands-on activities for visitors on weekends. A battle orientation program is offered daily. According to the battlefield’s web site there are a number of interpretive and educational opportunities for visitors at Monocacy. These include formal (organized tours) and informal (casual interaction with visitors) interpretation, special events, and Junior Ranger and educational programs. In addition there are archives for research and exhibits.

We strive to ensure that every visitor to Monocacy National Battlefield has an opportunity to make a meaningful connection to the vast array of cultural as well as natural resources the park has to offer. Rangers continually research and prepare numerous programs, exhibits, media and special events to evoke interest and provide information on a variety of topics. They also work with park partners in the community to reach visitors outside our boundary.500

July 13, 1991, Dedication Event Opening the Park to the Public: Cathy Beeler laughed as she remembered being hired as an interpretive ranger for Monocacy National Battlefield on June 30, 1991, and then immediately being told that she had two weeks to put together the special event. Over 350 invitations had already been sent out, but no preparations for a program existed. The event was held at Gambrill Mill, which at that time had no office furniture or visitor accommodation. With display objects borrowed from the Frederick County Historical Society, and some of their old display cases, and office furniture delivered, the Gambrill Mill visitor contact station took shape in time for the event. Three tents in the

499 Ibid.
yard accommodated attendees for a catered meal. Frank Cooling was the keynote speaker and there was an artillery demonstration with a cannon borrowed from Antietam.\footnote{501}

Visitor Center Dedication, June 27, 2007: The next big dedication event was the new visitor center on June 27, 2007. Beverly Byron, former Congresswoman, was the keynote speaker, and the regional director of the National Capital Region provided remarks along with other dignitaries. The event was held in a tent outside the visitor center with 150 invited guests. After the ribbon cutting, guests toured the new facility and had refreshments.\footnote{502} (Figure 30)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure30.png}
\caption{View of visitor center (PRA 2016)}
\end{figure}

Fourteenth New Jersey Monument Centennial Rededication: On July 7, 2007, just after the visitor center dedication, another ceremony commemorated the 100th Anniversary of the Fourteenth New Jersey monument. The National Park Service restored the monument prior to the event. The restoration project included cleaning and removal of biological growth and contaminants from the monument and repair of damaged areas. A plaque commemorating the rededication was also installed at the monument and unveiled at the ceremony.\footnote{503} (Figure 31)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure31.png}
\caption{Fourteenth New Jersey Monument (PRA 2016)}
\end{figure}

\footnote{501}{Interview with Cathy Beeler, Sept. 28, 2016.}
\footnote{502}{“Scheduling Request for NPS Directorate, May 3, 2007,” Superintendent’s Office, Box #2 “Joy’s Office,” Folder “Visitor Center Opening,” Monocacy National Battlefield Headquarters.}
\footnote{503}{Accessed April 18, 2017, \url{https://www.nps.gov/mono/learn/management/14th-new-jersey-monument-restoration-project.htm}.}
Civil War Sesquicentennial Events: The Civil War Sesquicentennial celebration at Monocacy occurred on July 5 and 6 and July 12 and 13 of 2014. The first weekend had extensive interpretive programming that focused on the battle, including living history demonstrations, lectures, guided hiking and auto tours, and children’s programs. The events were scheduled at various locations around the park. The second weekend, July 12 and 13, focused on slavery, the US Colored Troops and recruitment, commemorating the USCT recruiting station at Monocacy Junction during the Civil War, and emancipation, with tours of the Best Farm enslaved laborers’ housing archeological site. In his interview for this project, Rick Slade counted the 150th anniversary event as one of the three biggest accomplishments during his time as superintendent at Monocacy.

National Park Service Centennial Events, 2016: Throughout the National Park Service centennial year Monocacy National Battlefield presented special programs. There was a temporary exhibit in the visitor center museum that presented the history of the National Park Service with past uniforms and memorabilia. Other activities included rare interior tours for visitors of the Worthington, Best, and Thomas houses. In addition, the park rehabilitated the stone tenant house on the Thomas Farm and opened it for visitor use in the spring of 2016. (Figure 32) According to the Monocacy National Battlefield Press Release, “In 2015, a project to rehabilitate the Thomas Farm tenant house for visitor use was completed. The project installed restrooms and drinking fountain facilities, fire and

---

Figure 31: View of Fourteenth NJ monument rededication (NPS)

---

security alarm systems, and prepared the building for future exhibits. In addition, an ADA-compliant path was constructed in 2016 to allow visitors to access the building from Stop four on the Auto Tour.”

Figure 32: View of restored Thomas stone house (PRA 2016)

CONCLUSION

In its short history, Monocacy National Battlefield evolved and grew from an undefined plot of battlefield land, not open to the public, to a full-service national park with complete visitor services and programs. The battlefield overcame substantial hurdles and threats through a committed corps of National Park Service staff, US congressional support, and volunteers.

In the early days of the park, organizers focused on internal issues – determining boundaries, acquiring or protecting battlefield land, and establishing awareness of the battlefield. Later, outside threats dominated. Intense development pressure on all sides of the park with its attendant infrastructure requirements threatened to impact the park in numerous negative ways. These threats continue, as urbanization intensifies around the park, leaving it as one of the largest surviving islands of contiguous open space. Moreover, the National Park Service is forced to do more with less, through hiring freezes, reduced staff, and limited funds that strain maintenance, interpretation, and preservation of the battlefield.

Yet Monocacy has seen remarkable success in building and growing itself, protecting and understanding its cultural and natural resources, and garnering recognition and support at the local and national levels. Dedicated staff, volunteers, and friends are largely responsible for Monocacy’s accomplishments.

RESEARCH AND PRESERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Maintaining vigilance in an environment of continuous development pressure.
2. Keeping up with preservation, protection, and maintenance of historic buildings and sites.
3. Continue with efforts to protect the natural environment, the landscape, and native flora and fauna.
4. Continue research on the special and unique history of the Monocacy cultural landscape.
5. Undertake organization of archived files, which are currently scattered at several locations, including Antietam National Battlefield, at the Thomas House, and at the Monocacy Library in the visitor center. The files should be indexed and referenced.
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APPENDIX 1: TIMELINE OF MAJOR EVENTS/PARK DEVELOPMENT
[Note: This timeline includes the purchase dates of the major farm properties and significant sites, but it does not include all of the smaller acreage purchases or scenic easements.]

1864, July 9 – Battle of Monocacy

1889 – Monocacy Monument Association formed by battle veterans.

1907 – New Jersey Monument erected.

1908 – Pennsylvania Monument erected.

1914 – Daughters of the Confederacy Monument erected.

1915 – Vermont Monument erected.

1928 – Monocacy Battlefield Association (MBA) formed by the Frederick Chamber of Commerce.

1929, March 1 – Congress passed H.R. 11722, “An Act to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland.” The legislated boundary allowed for one acre of privately owned land. (Seventieth Congress, Session II, Chapter 447, 1444)

1932 – Judge Glenn Worthington published his eyewitness account of the battle, Fighting for Time.

1934, June 21 – Congress passed H.R. 7982, “An Act to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Monocacy, Maryland.” No legislated boundary was established. (Seventy-third Congress, Session II, 1198, Chapter 694; 48 Stat. 1198)

1934–1941 – National Park Service analysis of battlefield landscape and park planning coordinated with MBA.

1950 – Maryland State Highway Administration acquired rights-of-way for new US 240 alignment through the Lewis, Thomas, and Best farms and began construction.

1956 – US 240 was re-designated Interstate 70S (later I-270).
1963 – Frederick County Civil War Centennial Commission erected 40 interpretive signs around the battlefield.

1964 – Congress passed H.R. 9094 (Public Law 88–357), authorizing the president of the United States to issue a proclamation designating July 9, 1964, as the “Monocacy Battle Centennial,” in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy.”

1964 – The State of Maryland erected a monument in honor of the centennial anniversary of the Monocacy battle.

1972 – The Frederick County Board of County Commissioners adopted a master highway plan that proposed a Frederick County feeder road that would have cut through the Worthington and Thomas farms.

1973 – Monocacy National Battlefield listed on the National Register of Historic Places and designated a National Historic Landmark.


1976, October 21 – Congress passed H.R. 13713 (Public Law 94–578, incorporating Rep. Goodlow E. Byron’s H.R. 3830), “An Act, To provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.” The act changed the name to Monocacy National Battlefield, authorized purchase of land, appropriated over $3 million for land acquisition and $500,000 for public facilities development, and required a General Management Plan be completed within three years. The legislated boundary encompassed the Gambrill, Thomas, and Worthington farms.

1978, November 10 – Congress passed (Public Law 95–625), authorizing a boundary expansion of 587 acres with an additional $3.5 million appropriated. This boundary added the Best Farm to the legislated boundary.


1980, December 28 – Congress passed (Public Law 96–607; 94 Stat. 3536), again expanding the boundary (1980 map 894–40,001A) to include the northern ridge section including the preserved Union trenches, blockhouse site, and Camp Hooker site.
1981, December 10 – Fee purchase of the Gambrill (Vivino) Farm, 134 acres.

1982, April 26 – Fee purchase of the Worthington (Jenkins Food Corp.) Farm, 282 acres.

1983, October – Monocacy National Battlefield, Land Protection Plan was submitted and approved. Boundary now included 1,670 acres with 420 acres owned by NPS.

1984, October 10 – Fee purchase of the Wallace Headquarters/Gambrill Distillery (Eckenrode) Site, 6 acres.

1986, December 23 – Fee purchase of south part of the Lewis (Baker Valley Syndicate) Farm, 85.5 acres.

1987, June 29 – Fee purchase of blockhouse and trench sites (Ladson), 6 acres.

1989, June 28 – Fee purchase of north part of the Lewis (Geisbert) Farm, 61 acres; fee purchase of the Baker (Geisbert) Farm, 178 acres; fee purchase of Brooks Hill (Geisbert), 76 acres.

1991, July 13 – Monocacy National Battlefield Opening


1993, August 9 – Fee purchase of the Best (Train/Mathias/Collins) Farm, 220 acres.

1994 – Fee donation of the Pennsylvania Monument.

1997, December 1 – Fee donation of the United Daughters of the Confederacy Monument.

2001, September 20 – Fee purchase of the Thomas (Clapp) Farm, 240 acres.

2003 – First full-time superintendent appointed, Susan Trail.

2006 – Waste-to-Energy Facility (WTE) proposed for McKinney Industrial Park. The Civil War Preservation Trust named Monocacy to its list of
endangered battlefields in 2009 because of the WTE plan. The WTE proposal was dropped in 2014.


2012 – Monocacy National Battlefield National Historic Landmark Update and Boundary Expansion initiated (under review, 2018)

2013 – Second superintendent appointed, Rick Slade.

2014 – Sesquicentennial commemoration

2016 – Third superintendent appointed, Christopher Stubbs.
APPENDIX 2: PERTINENT LEGISLATION
(copies attached)

1929, March 1 – Congress passed H.R. 11722, “An Act to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland.” (Seventieth Congress, Session II, Chapter 447, 1444)

1934, June 21 – Congress passed H.R. 7982, “An Act to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Monocacy, Maryland.” (Seventy-third Congress, Session II, Chapter 694, 1198; 48 Stat. 1198)

1964 – Congress passed H.R. 9094 (Public Law 88–357), authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating July 9, 1964, as the “‘Monocacy Battle Centennial,’ in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy.”

1976, October 21 – Congress passed H.R. 13713 (Public Law 94–578, incorporating Rep. Goodlow E. Byron’s H.R. 3830), “An Act, To provide for increases in appropriation ceilings and boundary changes in certain units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.” The act changed the name to Monocacy National Battlefield, authorized purchase of land, and appropriated over $3 million for land acquisition and $500,000 for public facilities development. (94th Congress, 90 Stat. 2738)

1978, November 10 – Congress passed (Public Law 95–625), authorizing a boundary expansion of “approximately five hundred and eighty-seven acres,” depicted on the May 1978 boundary map (894–40,001). (95th Congress, 92 Stat. 3474)

1980, December 28 – Congress passed (Public Law 96–607), in which the 1934 Monocacy Battlefield enabling legislation was amended to once again expand the boundaries to those “generally depicted on the Map entitled ‘Monocacy National Battlefield,’ numbered 894/40,0001A, and dated April 1980.” Over $700,000 was appropriated for acquisition and $1.25 million “for development.” (96th Congress, 94 Stat. 3546)

SEVENTIETH CONGRESS. Sess. II. Chs. 447, 448. 1929.

CHAP. 447.—An Act To provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of commemorating the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to (1) acquire not to exceed one acre of land, free of cost to the United States, at the above-named battle field, (2) fence the parcel of land so acquired, (3) build an approach to such parcel of land, and (4) erect a suitable marker on such parcel of land.

Succ. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this Act.

Succ. 3. The parcel of land acquired under section 1 of this Act shall be under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of War, and there is authorized to be appropriated for the maintenance of such parcel of land, fence, approach, and marker a sum not to exceed $250 per annum.

Approved, March 1, 1929.

CHAP. 448.—Joint Resolution Authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to take steps in an effort to protect citizens of the United States in their equitable titles to land embraced in territory to be transferred from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas and from the State of Texas to the State of Oklahoma as per decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Oklahoma against Texas (1926, 272 United States 21, page 38) and from the State of New Mexico to the State of Texas and from the State of Texas to the State of New Mexico as per decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of New Mexico against Texas (volume 276, page 557, United States Supreme Court Reports), and to give the consent of Congress to said States to enter into compacts with each of the matters relating to such subject matter.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be authorized, and he is hereby requested, to confer with the Governor of the State of Oklahoma and with the Governor of the State of Texas to ascertain if negotiations will be entertained, to the end that an agreement may be reached between the United States, the State of Texas, and the State of Oklahoma, as to the terms upon which said parties mentioned and in interest will accept the land, if any, transferred or to be transferred to each said party by the authority of the final decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the action styled Oklahoma against Texas (1926, 272 United States 21, page 38).

Succ. 2. In the event the Governor of the State of Texas and the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, acting for their respective States, agree to confer with the United States relative to the subject matter mentioned and described in section 1 hereof the consent of Congress is hereby given to the said State of Texas and to the said State of Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement respecting the matter in this Act mentioned and the President is herein authorized and requested to proceed with such conference and to formulate and suggest a compact or agreement to be presented to the Congress and to the Legislatures of the State of Texas and the State of Oklahoma for ratification and if, and when, ratified by each said contracting party, then each said party herein mentioned is hereby authorized to proceed to comply with the obligations in said compact or agreement assumed.
PUBLIC LAW 94-578—OCT. 21, 1976

90 STAT. 2739

(8) In section 8, change the comma to a period and delete “of not less than $5 nor more than $500.”.

(9) Change section 10 to read:

“Sec. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not more than $3,525,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands, and not to exceed $500,000 for the development of essential public facilities. Within three years from the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop and transmit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Congress a final master plan for the full development of the battlefield consistent with the preservation objectives of this Act, indicating:

“(1) the facilities needed to accommodate the health, safety, and interpretive needs of the visiting public; and

“(2) the location and estimated cost of all facilities; and

“(3) the projected need for any additional facilities within the battlefield.

No funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available prior to October 1, 1977.”.

Sec. 209. (a) The boundaries of Olympic National Park as established by the Act of June 29, 1938 (49 Stat. 1241), and as revised by proclamation pursuant to that Act and by or pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1070), and the Act of June 11, 1958 (72 Stat. 185), are hereby revised to include the lands, privately owned aquatic lands, and interests therein within the boundaries depicted on the map entitled “Boundary Map, Olympic National Park, Washington, map No. 149-80-101-B, and dated January 1976, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the “Secretary”) shall, beginning within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, consult with the Governor of the State of Washington, the Board of Commissioners of Clallam County, and the affected landowners, and shall locate a boundary encompassing all of the shoreline of Lake Ozette, including privately owned aquatic lands not within the boundary of the park on the date of enactment of this Act: Provided, That such boundary shall be located not less than two hundred feet set back from the ordinary high-water mark of Lake Ozette: Provided further, That the privately owned lands encompassed within the park by such boundary shall not exceed one thousand five hundred acres. The Secretary shall, within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and following reasonable notice in writing to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of his intention to do so, publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the boundary located pursuant to this subsection. Upon such publication the Secretary is authorized to revise the map on file pursuant to subsection (a) of this section accordingly, and such revised map shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act.

(c) Section 5 of the said Act of June 29, 1938, is amended by deleting the second sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof: “The boundaries of Olympic National Park may be revised only by Act of Congress.”.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, within the boundaries of the park as revised by and pursuant to this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands, privately owned aquatic lands, and interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from any Federal agency. Property so acquired shall become part of Olympic National Park and shall be administered by the Secretary subject to the laws and regulations

16 USC 430q.

Appropriation authorization. 16 USC 430s.

Final master plan, submitted to congressional committees.

Olympic National Park, Wash., boundary revision. 16 USC 251e.

Consultation. 16 USC 251f.

Notice to congressional committees; publication in Federal Register.

16 USC 255.

Land acquisition. 16 USC 251g.
Secretary of the Interior shall have been acquired by the United States and the usual jurisdiction over the lands and roads of the same shall have been granted to the United States by the State of Maryland.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to cause condemnation proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888, entitled "An Act to authorize condemnation of lands for sites for public buildings and for other purposes" (25 Stat.L. 337), to acquire title to the lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto within the said Monocacy National Military Park, and the United States shall be entitled to immediate possession upon the filing of the petition in condemnation in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland: Provided, That when the owner of such lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto shall fix a price for the same, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be reasonable, the Secretary may purchase the same without further delay: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto required for the Monocacy National Military Park: And provided further, That title and evidence of title to lands and interests therein acquired for said park shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into leases with the owners of such of the lands, works, defenses, and buildings thereon within the Monocacy National Military Park, as in his discretion it is unnecessary to forthwith acquire title to, and such leases shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and may contain options to purchase, subject to later acceptance, if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, it is economical to purchase such title to the property: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may enter into agreements upon such nominal terms as he may prescribe, permitting the present owners or their tenants to occupy or cultivate their present holdings, upon condition that they will preserve the present breastworks, earthworks, walls, defenses, shelters, buildings and roads, and the present outlines of the battlefields, and that they will only cut trees or underbrush or disturb or remove the soil, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and that they will assist in protecting all tablets, monuments, or such other artificial works as may from time to time be erected by proper authority.

SEC. 4. The affairs of the Monocacy National Military Park shall, subject to the supervision and direction of the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations of the Interior Department, be in charge of a superintendent, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the superintendent, under the direction of the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations of the Interior Department, to superintend the opening or repair of such roads as may be necessary to the purposes of the park, and to ascertain and mark with historical tablets or otherwise, as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, all breastworks, earthworks, walls, or other defenses or shelters, lines of battle, location of troops, buildings, and other historical points of interest within the park or in its vicinity.

SEC. 6. The said Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to receive gifts and contributions from States, Territories, societies, organizations, and individuals for the Monocacy National Military Park.
92 STAT. 3474

PUBLIC LAW 95–625—NOV. 10, 1978

County, Pennsylvania”, numbered 446–40,001B, and dated April 1978: $166,000.

(6) Fort Caroline National Memorial, Florida: To add approximately ten acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Boundary Map, Fort Caroline National Memorial, Florida”, numbered 5310/80,000–A, and dated April 1978: $170,000.


(9) Gulf Islands National Seashore, Mississippi-Florida: To add approximately six hundred acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Boundary Map, Gulf Islands National Seashore, Mississippi-Florida”, numbered 20,006, and dated April 1979: $800,000.

(10) Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii: To add approximately two hundred sixty-nine acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Boundary Map, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii”, numbered 80,000, and dated August 1975: $292,000.

(11) John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, Oregon: To add approximately one thousand four hundred and eleven acres, and to delete approximately one thousand six hundred and twenty acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Boundary Map, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, Oregon”, numbered 177–30,000–B, and dated May 1978: $3,500,000. The Act of October 26, 1974 (88 Stat. 1461), which designates the John Day Fossil Beds National Monument is amended by deleting the second proviso of section 101 (a) (2). Furthermore, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, the Secretary may, if he determines that to do so will not have a substantial adverse effect on the preservation of the fossil and other resources within the remainder of the monument, convey approximately sixty acres acquired by the United States for purposes of the monument in exchange for non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the monument, and, effective upon such conveyance, the boundaries of the monument are hereby revised to exclude the lands conveyed.

(12) Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland: To add approximately five hundred and eighty-seven acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Boundary Map, Monocacy National Battlefield”, numbered 894–40,003, and dated May 1978: $3,500,000.


(14) Oregon Caves National Monument, Oregon: To add approximately eight acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Cave, Oregon”, numbered 20,000, and dated April 1978: $107,000.
Public Law 102-202
102d Congress
An Act
Dec. 10, 1991
To authorize additional appropriations for land acquisition at Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION.

There are authorized to be appropriated up to $20,000,000 for acquisition of lands and interests in lands for purposes of the Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland; such sums shall be in addition to other funds available for such purposes.


LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—H.R. 990:
HOUSE REPORTS: No. 102-85 (Comm. on Interior and Insular Affairs).
SENATE REPORTS: No. 102-237 (Comm. on Energy and Natural Resources).
June 2, considered and passed House.
Nov. 26, considered and passed Senate.
PROCLAMATION 3598—JULY 7, 1964

DONE at the City of Washington this seventh day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-ninth.

By the President:

GEORGE W. BALL,
Acting Secretary of State

Proclamation 3598
MONOCACY BATTLE CENTENNIAL
By the President of the United States of America

WHEREAS July 9, 1964, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy of the Civil War; and

WHEREAS the gallant stand of the Union troops in this battle near Frederick, Maryland, caused a sufficient delay in the Confederate march on Washington to permit adequate reinforcement of the city’s defenses; and

WHEREAS the Congress, by an act approved July 7, 1964, has requested the President to issue a proclamation designating July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial. In commemoration of the anniversary of this battle and the men who lost their lives in the struggle for control of the Nation’s Capital, I request appropriate officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings in the District of Columbia on that day at half staff until noon and at full staff after noon. I also call upon the people of the District of Columbia to fly the flag in like manner on that date at their homes, churches, and other suitable places.

I urge those who can do so to attend the dedication ceremonies to be held on that date at the site of the battle. Let others, in their home communities, hold ceremonies honoring the brave men of both sides who fought there—men who represented no fewer than twelve States, from Vermont to Louisiana.

Let us honor them, men of North and South, as Americans.

And let us, with the same courage they displayed, seize the opportunity that our generation has to meet the challenges of our own day, always striving “to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice ** * and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity ** *.”

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this seventh day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-ninth.

By the President:

GEORGE W. BALL,
Secretary of State.
available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

Sec. 318. The boundary of Zion National Park is hereby revised to include the area as generally depicted on the map entitled "Land Ownership Types, Zion National Park, Utah", numbered 116-80,003, which map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire the property included by this section by donation only.

Sec. 319. The Act of June 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 1198; 16 U.S.C. 430j) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 1:
   (a) change "national military park" to "national battlefield" and
   (b) change "Monocacy National Military Park" to "Monocacy National Battlefield" (hereinafter referred to as "the battlefield").

The battlefield shall comprise the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Boundary, Monocacy National Battlefield", numbered 894-40,000 and dated May 1976, and delete the remainder of the sentence.

(2) In section 2, change "Monocacy National Military Park" to "battlefield" wherever it occurs.

(3) In section 3, delete "enter into leases with the owners of such of the lands, works, defenses, and buildings thereon within the Monocacy National Military Park, as in his discretion it is unnecessary to forthwith acquire title to, and such leases shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and may contain options to purchase, subject to later acceptance, if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, it is as economical to purchase as condemn title to property: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may enter into agreements upon such nominal terms as he may prescribe, permitting the present owners or their tenants to occupy or cultivate their present holdings, upon condition", and insert in lieu thereof, "lease to the immediately preceding owner or owners any lands acquired pursuant to an agreement that such lessee or lessees will occupy such lands in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act and that ".

(4) Change section 4 to read:

"Sec. 4. The administration, development, preservation, and maintenance of the battlefield shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 583; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 606)."

(5) Repeal all of section 8.

(6) In section 6:

(a) delete "said Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations, acting through the", and

(b) change "Monocacy National Military Park:" to "battlefield", delete the remainder of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof "for carrying out the provisions of this Act."

(7) In section 7:

(a) change "Monocacy National Military Park" to "battlefield", and

(b) delete the comma and "which approval shall be based on formal written reports made to him in each case by the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations; Provided, " and insert in lieu thereof "Provided further, ".
AN ACT

To amend section 5 of Public Act Numbered 2 of the Seventy-second Congress, as amended, be amended by striking out the period at the end of the second paragraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That such limitation shall not apply to advances to receivers or other liquidating agents of closed banks when made for the purpose of liquidation or reorganization."

Approved, June 21, 1934.

AN ACT

Authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of a portion of the Yaquina Bay Lighthouse Reservation, Oregon.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to convey to the State of Oregon (State Highway Commission), for public-highway and park purposes, the unused portion of Yaquina Bay Lighthouse Reservation, Oregon, containing an area of approximately thirty-two acres, more or less, excepting that part of lot 1, section 17; part of lot 1, section 18; and part of lot 5, section 8, all in township 11 south, of range 11 west, bordering on Yaquina Bay which is required for jetty purposes by the War Department, and reserving to the Commerce, Treasury, and War Departments the rights of ingress and egress over the land so transferred and to maintain thereon such facilities as these Departments may at any time require. The deed of conveyance shall describe by metes and bounds the land so transferred to the State of Oregon and contain the express condition that the grantee assumes the obligation of carrying out the purposes of the grant; and provide that the Secretary of Commerce may at any time by letter addressed to the Oregon State Highway Commission notify the grantee in the event it has not begun to perform, or has ceased to perform, any such obligations that the property so conveyed will revert to the United States; and if the grantee does not begin or resume the performance of such obligations within a period of six months from date of such notice, such property shall, upon the expiration of such period revert to the United States without further notice of demand or any suit or proceeding.

Approved, June 21, 1934.

AN ACT

To establish a national military park at the battlefield of Monocacy, Maryland.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to commemorate the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland, and to preserve for historical purposes the breastworks, earthworks, walls, or other defenses or shelters used by the armies therein, the battlefield at Monocacy, in the State of Maryland, is hereby declared a national military park to be known as the "Monocacy National Military Park"; whenever the title to the lands deemed necessary by the
the State of Kansas, constructed under the general authority of the Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 641 et seq.) is hereby designated and hereafter shall be known as the "Keith Sebelius Lake". Any law, regulation, record, map, or other document of the United States referring to the waters impounded by the Norton Dam unit of this project shall be held to refer to the "Keith Sebelius Lake", and any future regulations, records, maps, or other documents of the United States, in reference to these waters, shall bear the name "Keith Sebelius Lake".

TITLE XIV

MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

Sec. 140. (a) The Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Military Park at the battlefield of Monocacy, Maryland" approved June 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 1198) is amended by revising the first section thereof to read as follows: "That in order to commemorate the Battle of Monocacy, Maryland, and to preserve for historical purposes the breastworks, earthworks, walls, or other defenses or shelters used by the armies therein, the battlefield at Monocacy in the State of Maryland is hereby established as the Monocacy National Battlefield. The battlefield shall comprise the area within the boundary generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Monocacy National Battlefield’, numbered 894/40,001A, and dated April 1980, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior."

(b) In addition to other funds available for purposes of the park referred to in subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated up to an additional $725,000 for acquisition of lands and interests in lands and $1,250,000 for development.

TITLE XV

ROGERS C. B. MORTON RECOGNITION

Sec. 1501. The Secretary is authorized to commemorate, at Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland, the contributions of Rogers C. B. Morton, as a Member of Congress, and later as Secretary of the Interior, toward the development of the Seashore and to conservation in general. Such commemoration shall be in the form of an appropriate plaque or monument, suitably located, or may subsequently take the form of dedication of a suitable structure. Within one year of the effective date of this section, the Secretary shall inform, in writing, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate, as to actions he has taken to implement the provisions of this section.

TITLE XVI

WOMEN'S RIGHTS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Sec. 1601. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) The Women’s Rights Convention held at the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel in Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848 was an event of major importance in the history of the United States because it marked the formal beginning of the struggle of women for their equal rights.
APPENDIX 3: SUPERINTENDENT TIMELINE


1978–1987 – Virgil Leimer, superintendent ANB, coordinating superintendent MNB

Susan Moore, assistant supt. ANB, MNB site manager (1991–1993)

1993–1996 – Susan Moore, superintendent ANB, coordinating superintendent MNB


2003–2011 – Susan Trail, superintendent MNB

2011–2012 – Joy Beasley, acting superintendent MNB

2012–2013 – Rae Emerson, acting superintendent MNB (120-day detail)

2013 – Andrew Banasik, acting superintendent MNB

2013–2016 – Rick Slade, superintendent MNB

2016 – Andrew Banasik, acting superintendent MNB

2016–current (2018) – Christopher J. Stubbs, superintendent MNB
APPENDIX 4: LIST OF PERTINENT AGREEMENTS

Friends Groups


Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation (2017–current)

Cooperating Associations

Parks & History Association

Western Maryland Interpretive Association (2000–2015)

Eastern National (2015–current)

National Park Service Related Agreements

Historic Preservation Training Center (Gambrill House occupancy, 1995–current)

Catoctin Center for Regional Studies (1998–2013)

Bucks County Community College Historic Preservation Program, completed Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) recordation of the Thomas barn (2005)

Regional Archeology Program of the National Park Service and the Center for Heritage Resource Studies and the University of Maryland’s Department of Anthropology
APPENDIX 5: MOST RECENT MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTS

(List gathered from Data Store: Integrated Resource Management Applications

Management Reports - General


1996, Monocacy National Battlefield Interpretive Prospectus.

National Capital Region, NPS.


National Capital Region, National Park Service; USGS Earth Resources Observation and Science (EROS) Center.


Management Reports – Natural Resources

1995, Vegetation and Aquatic Survey of the Bush Creek Tract.

1998, Monocacy National Battlefield Natural Areas Inventory for Rare, Threatened and Endangered Plants and Selected Animals with Management Recommendations.


2004, Survey for Rare, Threatened and Endangered Plants and Selected Animals at Thomas Farm and Triangle Woods of Monocacy National Battlefield.


2010, “Digital Geologic Map of Monocacy National Battlefield and Vicinity, Maryland (NPS, GRD, GRI, MONO, MONO digital map).” NPS Geologic Resources Inventory Program. Lakewood, CO.


2014, W. B. Monahan and N. A. Fisichelli. “Recent Climate Change Exposure of Monocacy National Battlefield.” Resource Brief, NPS.

2014, Antietam National Battlefield; Monocacy National Battlefield; Manassas National Battlefield Park Final White-tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. NPS.


Management Reports – Cultural Resources


(not completed)


2010, Worthington Farm, Cultural Landscape Report.


APPENDIX 6: MAPS

1973 National Historic Landmark boundary maps

February 1976 Boundary (894–40,000)

May 1978 Boundary (894–40,001)

1978 EDAW, Inc. Monocacy Battle Map (894–25,001)

1983 Land Protection Plan, Parcel Map, and Parcel List (894–80,002)

Current (2018) Monocacy National Battlefield Auto Tour Map
1973 National Historic Landmark boundary map, NE section.
Monocacy National Battlefield: An Administrative History

February 1976 Boundary (894–40,000)

May 1978 Boundary (894–40,001)
1983 Parcel Map (Land Protection Plan)
February 1976 Boundary (894–40,000)
1983 Parcel Map, parcel list (Land Protection Plan)
Auto Tour Map
BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Dugas-Kerblay Papers. The South Carolina Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

Dulany Papers. Special Collections, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, MD.

État Détaillé Des Liquidations, Paris, 1834. Special Collections, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, LA.


Michel, Theresa M. Personal Files. Frederick, MD.


PRIMARY GOVERNMENT SOURCES

COUNTY

Frederick County Court Records. Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
Monocacy National Battlefield: An Administrative History

Frederick County Estate Records. Frederick County Courthouse, Frederick, MD.


STATE


FEDERAL


Monocacy National Battlefield Records. Record Group 79, National Archives and Records Administration II, College Park, MD.

Monocacy National Battlefield Vertical Files. Antietam National Battlefield Headquarters and Library, Sharpsburg, MD.

Monocacy National Battlefield Vertical Files. Monocacy National Battlefield Headquarters and Visitor Center Library, Frederick, MD.


Quartermaster Claims. Record Group 92, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.

Report. The Select Committee of the Senate Appointed to Inquire into the Late Invasion and Seizure of the Public Property at Harpers Ferry. GPO, June 15, 1860. Ruth Scarborough Library, Shepherd University, Shepherdstown, WV.


PRIMARY SOURCE COMPILATIONS


Tracey, Dr. Arthur. Land Grant Maps, Carroll County Historical Society, Westminster, MD.

MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD: AN ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEWS

Beeler, Cathy, September 28, 2016.
Byron, Beverly, October 10, 2016.
Geisbert, Earl, October 19, 2016.
Howard, John, October 4, 2016.
Michel, Theresa Mathias, September 8, 2016.
Moore, Susan, November 7, 2016.
Parsons, John, September 20, 2016.
Slade, Rick, October 14, 2016.
Stephens, Gail, September 20, 2016.
Trail, Susan, August 31, 2016.
Wiles, Keith, October 14, 2016.

SECONDARY SOURCES


**SECONDARY SOURCE ARTICLES**

Grant, Hannah, and Dean Herrin. “‘And They Did Save It’: The Monuments of Monocacy.” *Catoctin History* 11 (2009).


**ONLINE SOURCES**

American Heritage. [www.americanheritage.com/content/catoctin-center-regional-studies](http://www.americanheritage.com/content/catoctin-center-regional-studies) (link is broken).


National Park Service, “A Quick Guide to Partnering within the National Park Service


REPORTS


MAPS

1858, Isaac Bond. Map of Frederick County, Md. accurately drawn from correct instrumental surveys of all the county roads. https://www.loc.gov/item/2002624018/.

1864, Jedediah Hotchkiss. “No. 15: Battle of the Monocacy, Frederick County, Maryland.” In Report of the camps, marches & engagements, of the Second Corps, A.N.V., and of the Army of the Valley Dist. of the
Department of Northern VA., during the campaign of 1864: [Virginia].
https://www.loc.gov/resource/g3881sm.gcwh0008/?sp=20.


INDEX

Abington, John, 11
access roads, 84, 88, 99, 118
Adams, Henry and Louisa, 40
Advisory Council on History Preservation (ACHP), 100, 133
aerial view, 82
African Americans: free blacks, 19, 38, 39–41, 43; post-Emancipation and, 34, 40–44. See also enslaved blacks; Saint-Domingue; slavery
agriculture, 8, 12, 40, 126, 170
Alexandria, VA, 8, 10
Alien and Sedition Acts, 38
Altogether tract, 21, 25–26, 31
Amelung, John, 25
Amelung Glass Works, 25–26
American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP), 119, 156
American Revolution, 12, 16
Anderson, Alice Thomas, 23
Anderson, A. W. “Andy,” 131–32, 133, 136, 212
Annapolis, MD, 7–8, 16
anthropology, 180–81, 213
Antietam, Battle of, 48–49
Antietam Board, 67
Antietam National Battlefield, 93; development and management of MNB, 107, 115, 123, 131, 133–36, 141–42, 147, 151, 157–58, 187–90; establishment of, 67; monuments, 66; museum, 109, 133–36, 138–39, PATH and, 127; visitor center, 75–76. See also Anderson, A. W.; Beeler, Cathy; Brown, Richard H.; Howard, John; Leimer, Virgil; Moore, Susan; Rambur, Richard; Trail, Susan
Antietam National Cemetery, 64–65
Antietam Plan, 67, 69, 73
Araby. See Thomas Farm
Araby Church, 118
Araby Church Road, 68, 97, 110, 118, 120, 149–50, 166, 172, 177
Araby Farm, 21–22, 24
Araby mansion farm, 22, 26, 33
Araby mill, 22, 23, 28
Araby mills, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28. See also Gambrill Mill
Araby tract, 11, 14, 19, 21–22, 24–26, 28–29, 33, 39, 50. See
also Thomas Farm
Arcadia tract, 11–12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 28, 32, 33. See also Best/Trail Farm
archeology, 14, 39, 44, 133, 149, 154, 217; Best Farm, 176, 179–80,
193, 217; Gambill
Mill/Bush Creek Area, 172; Hammett tavern site, 14; Hermitage slave
housing, 39, 176, 184; NPS Regional Archeology Program, 179–80, 181;
railroad properties, 29; sewer/water line projects, 127, 141; Thomas
Farm, 176–78, 180–81, 184
Army War College, 70–71
Atkinson, William F., 29

Baker, Daniel, 30, 31, 39, 42–43, 55
Baker, David A., 31–32
Baker, Edward, 30, 31
Baker Farm, 11, 25, 30–31, 39, 97, 104, 120–21, 124, 138; acquisition of, 1,
32, 111, 113, 120, 178
Baker, Howard D., 79, 84. See also Monocacy Battlefield Association
Baker, John H., 79
Baker, Travis, 152
Baker Valley Road, 25, 122, 166, 188,
Baker Valley Syndicate, 200, 251
Baker, William D., 31
Baker, William G., 24
Baker, William, Jr., 24
Ball, Turner A. and Elizabeth, 22, 33
Ballenger, Henry, 6, 9
Ballenger Creek, 6, 13, 166; ford, 9, 32, 55
Ballenger-McKinney Wastewater Treatment Facility, 107, 122, 124, 126, 133, 141, 144, 166, 200–201
Ballengers Endeavour tract, 9, 10, 13
Ballenger’s Mill, 9, 32
Baltimore, MD, 7, 22, 23, 34, 36, 52–54, 61, 165, 167
Baltimore County, 9, 18, 24, 53
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (B&O), 86, 111; Civil War and, 30, 50, 52–55, 57, 58–59; construction of, 16, 27–28. See also CSX Rail Line
Baltimore Pike, 54–55, 57, 58, 84, 86
Banasik, Andrew, 143, 144, 150, 151, 212
Bantz, Henry, 21, 31
Bartlett, Roscoe, 114
Basford, Thomas, 13–14
battlefield preservation, 64–72, 156, 195
“Battle that Saved Washington,” 1, 5, 63. See also Monocacy, Battle of
Baugher, Isaac, 22
Bearss, Edwin C., 96, 132
Beasley, Joy, 143–44, 150, 180, 212, 217
Beatty, Charles, 13
Beatty, Thomas, 10
Beckwith, Basil, 18
Beckwith, Benjamin, 14, 18
Beckwith, George, Sr., 18
Beeler, Cathy, 142, 147–148; chief of resource education and visitor services, 143, 182; interpretive ranger, 138, 139, 181, 187, 188, 191–92; WMIA and, 157–58
Beeman, Alvin, 179
Bell, John, 45
Bellumeau, Etienne, 35
Beltway, Frederick, 132
Beltway Plan, 96
Best, David, 20, 39, 41, 47
Best, Elizabeth, 20
Best, John T., 20
Best/Trail Farm (Hermitage), 12, 17–21, 106, 113–14, 181; *Archeological Overview and Assessment*, 149, 176, 179–80; “Conceptualizing the Hermitage,” 176; *Cultural Landscape Report*, 149, 176, 217; Historic Structure Assessment Report for Stone Barn, 149; New Jersey monument, 118; North Hermitage and South Hermitage farms, 20–21; secondary house, 39, 176, 182, 217; structural rehabilitation, 175–76.

*See also* Best, David; Best, Elizabeth; Best, John T.; *L’Hermitage*; Mathias, Theresa Trail; McElfresh, Ariana; McElfresh, John H.; McElfresh, Theresia; Trail, Arthur; Trail, Charles B.; Trail Charles, E.

birds, 150, 168–69, 215

Birmingham, Katherine, 180, 217

Bladensburg, MD, 8, 9, 10

blockhouses: acquisition of, 108, 113, 200; boundaries and, 131, 199; construction of, 50–51; renovation and removal of, 69, 118, 149, 172, 177

Boisneuf, Payen, 15, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39

Bond, Isaac, map, 26, 31

Boscobel, 25, 172. *See also* Gambrill House/Mansion

Boucan Roche plantation, 35


Boy Scouts, National Capital Council, 179

Bradwell, I. G., 68

Bray, Oscar, 84, 85

Breckenridge, John C., 45, 51, 52, 57–58

Brien, John, 19, 28, 32

Brooks Hill, 32, 55, 107, 111, 113, 179, 182, 200

Brown, Benjamin, 29,

Brown, John, 45–46

Brown, Richard H., 173, 174, 175, 177

Buckeystown District, 23, 26, 31

Buckeystown Pike, 6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 18, 47, 55, 57

Bucks County Community College Historic Preservation Program, 177, 213

Burlew, E. K., 77

Bush Creek, 5, 9, 86, 88, 108, 125, 215
Bussard, C. Lease, 92, 93

Byron, Beverly: election to House of Representatives, 105; park opening and, 138; congressional support for MNB, 107, 109, 113, 127, 133; Monocacy Battlefield Advisory Commission, 133–34, 135; Visitor Center dedication and, 105, 192;

Byron, Goodloe E.: congressional support for MNB, 97, 101–2, 104–5, 109, 127, 129; National Historic Landmark and, 132; Monocacy Battlefield Advisory Commission, 133; Robert Clapp and, 108, 115

Cammerer, Arno B., 77, 81, 83–84, 86

Camp Hooker, 108, 113, 199

Carroll County, MD, 126, 144, 153

Cartwright, Tina, 143, 151

Casey, Bob, 157, 158

Catoctin Center for Regional Studies, 160, 213

cemeteries, national, 73. See also Antietam National Cemetery

Center for Heritage Resource Studies, 179–80, 213

Charleston, SC, 35, 36, 45

Chatelain, Verne E., 76, 77, 79

Chesapeake & Ohio (C&O) Canal, 16, 52

Chesapeake & Ohio (C&O) Canal Historical Park, 93, 131, 146,

Chesapeake Watershed Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit, 181

Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, 66, 67

Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), 74, 75, 84, 86, 88

Civil War: xi, 2, 5, 12, 23; centennial of, 72, 92–93, 119, 199, 202; fortifications, 28, 29–30, 60–61; memorialization and, 64–72; origins of, 45–46; sesquicentennial, 144, 183, 191, 193, 201; slavery and, 34, 42, 43. See also Antietam, Battle of; “Battle that Saved Washington”; fortifications; Gettysburg, Battle of; Maryland campaign; Maryland, divided loyalties; Maryland, invasion of; Monocacy, Battle of; monuments and markers; Shenandoah Valley Campaign; South Mountain

Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT), 123, 126, 200–201

Clapp Farm, 177, 200. See also Thomas Farm


Clapp, Josephine R., 24, 115, 120

Clendenin, David, 56
Clifton. See Worthington Farm

Combash Family (Ann Eliza, Charity, Dinah, Elias W., and John Nelson), 41–42

Confederate forces: 6, 32, 108; Army of Northern Virginia, 46–49, 49–50, 51; Breckenridge’s command, 51, 52, 57–58; Early’s command, 51–57, 60–63; Gordon’s command, 57–58; Johnson’s command, 52, 61; Longstreet’s command, 47. See also Lee, Robert E.

Confederate monument, 66, 72, 92, 106, 111, 118–19

Confederate States of America, 46, 51

Conrad’s Ferry, 61

Cooling, Frank, 53, 138, 192

cooperating associations, 153, 156–158, 159, 160, 177, 179, 181

Cox, Elbert, 129

Cresap, Thomas, 12

Crist, Jacob, 43

Crook, George, 23

Crum’s Ford, 27, 55, 84, 86–87, 119

Crutchley, Elias, 22

CSX Rail Line, 5, 124, 141. See also Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (B&O)

cultural landscape, 11, 44, 126, 145, 150–51, 195; inventories and reports, 149, 167, 171, 173, 176, 177, 182, 184, 216–17

cultural resources: preservation and rehabilitation of historic structures, 3, 5, 44, 131, 146, 149–150, 171–78, 216–217; research and preservation recommendations, 195; staffing, 143–44, 150, 191. See also archeology, construction

cultural resources, planning documents: Best Farm: Archeological Investigation of L’Hermitage

and Worthington Farms: Cultural Landscape Report (2013), 149, 217;
Worthington Farm: Cultural Landscape Inventory (2013), 149, 173, 216;
Gambrill Mill Site Evaluation and Brief Special History Study (1984), 172;

Cupino, James F., Jr., 134

Dankmeyer, Brian, 147
Davis, Jefferson, 46
Decker, Harry L., 134. 135
deer management, 121, 150, 168–69
Delaplaine, Edward S., 109, 134
Delaplaine, George M. and Margaret, 29
Demeray, Arthur E., 76–77, 80, 86–88
distilleries, 22–23, 26–28, 30, 33
Doran, Patrick, 9
Douglas, Lewis W., 72, 76
Dugas, Frederick L. E., 38
Dulany, Daniel, 7, 12, 14–16, 18, 37
Dulany, Rebecca, 37
Dulany’s Mill, 9
Early, Jubal A., 52–54, 61–62
easements, 86, 107, 109, 11516, 122–23
Eastern National, 159, 213
Eckenrode, George A. and Mary, 113
Edelin, Chris, 11
Edgewood, 24–25 See also Gambrill House/Mansion
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 91
election of 1860, 45
election of 1864, 63
Ellicott’s Mills, MD, 58–59
Emancipation Proclamation, 49
Emerson, Rae, 143, 212
English (Tidewater) settlers, 7, 185
enslaved blacks, 5, 19, 23, 32, 34–42, 176, 184, 193; Anthony, 39; Ben, 38;
Black Emmos, 38; Daniel, 38; David, 42; Felix, 39; Fillile, 35; François
Arajon, 35; Henry, 42; Indianna, 38; Isaac, 42; Jane, 38; Janvier, 35;
Jean Sans-nom, 35; Jenny, 37; John, 38; Kitty, 38; Lambert, 35; Louisa,
38; Magdalene, 38; Manuel, 39; Marsoline, 39; Martha, 43; Mary, 38;
Maurice, 35; Molly, 39; Nicholas, 38; Phil, 37; Pierre Louis/Lewis
(“French Loui”), 37; Polly, 39; Priscilla, 39; Ramond, 38; Saint Louis, 35;
Savilla, 42; Shadrack, 37; Sucky, 38; Vernon, 42; Veronique, 35; William
Henry, 43; perspectives of, 181. See also slavery
environmental conservation, 74, 75, 165–66, 167. See also General
Management Documents: General Management Plan – Environmental
Impact Statement and Land Protection Plan
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 132–33
Ervin, William T., 43
Evans, Tracy, 147
events, 191; 150th Anniversary of Battle of Monocacy (2014), 144, 193;
Civil War Sesquicentennial (2014), 144, 183, 193, 202; National Park
Service Centennial (2016), 183, 193; park opening (1991), 138, 139,
187, 200; rededication of Fourteenth New Jersey Monument (2007),
192; visitor center dedication (2007), 142, 184, 192
Evergreen Point, 8, 17, 57, 90, 150, 177
Expressway Act, 89
farming, 20, 21, 34, 86, 121–22, 169; dairy, 12, 20, 176, 183; grains, 7, 12, 36,
41; tobacco, 7–8, 12, 36
Federal Aid Highway Act, 89, 91
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 127
flooding, 120, 125, 152, 170, 171, 182, 189, 190
Fort Stevens, 60–61
Francis Scott Key Mall, 6, 107, 165
Frederick Airport, 119
Frederick Chamber of Commerce, 69, 198
Frederick Community College, 160
Frederick County, early history of, 5–13, 16–20, 23–24, 26, 31–34, 36–37, 40–43; invasion of (1862), 46–47; residential, commercial, and industrial development of, 117, 165, 169

Frederick Country Civil War Centennial Commission, 92, 134, 199
Frederick County Board of County Commissioners, 95–96, 126, 199
Frederick County Court, 8, 10, 11, 19, 36, 37
Frederick County feeder road/freeway, 96, 100–102, 103, 115, 199
Frederick County Highway Plan, 96, 199
Frederick County Historical Society, 134, 191
Frederick County Metropolitan Commission, 133
Frederick County wastewater treatment plant. See Ballenger-McKinney Wastewater Treatment

Frederick Town, MD, 7–9
Frederick Junction, 6, 27, 29, 30, 86, 97
French and Indian War, 10, 11
French Revolution, 7, 38, 44
French settlers, 5, 7, 18, 34–35, 36, 44, 175. See also Vincendiere, Victoire
Friends of Monocacy Battlefield (FOMB), 144, 154, 179, 213

Gambrill, James H., 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 172
Gambrill, James H., Jr., 79, 93
Gambrill properties, 24, 96, 105, 106, 136, 140, 146
Gambrill Distillery, 22–23, 27, 28, 33, 113, 200
Gambrill House/Mansion, 24, 25, 106, 140, 142, 149, 155, 172. See also Boscobel; Edgewood
Gambrill Mill, 1, 11, 28, 112 125, 172, 174, 181–82; book store, 157; field hospital, 58; office space, 139, 140, 142, 146, 151, 152, 188, 191; visitor center, 138, 142, 147, 148, 179, 184, 189, 191. See also flooding; Gambrill, James. H.; trails
Garrett, John, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59
Geisbert, Betty B., 25, 113, 121
Geisbert, Charles C., 27, 32, 90,
Geisbert, Earle, 121
Geisbert property, 31, 105, 115, 121, 200. See also Baker Farm; Lewis Farm

General Management Documents: Assessment of the Alternatives – General Management Plan (1979), 105–6, 107, 110, 130, 133, 116, 163, 164;

Georgetown, MD/DC, 9–10, 16, 17, 26

Georgetown Pike, 17, 27, 32–33, 47, 55, 57, 68, 89, 118–19. See also Araby Church Road; Washington Turnpike

Georgetown Road, 11, 13, 14–15, 16, 25, 26, 39, 68

German settlers, 7, 12

Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GMBA), 64–67

Gettysburg, Battle of, 23, 50, 53, 64,

Gettysburg National Military Park, 75, 76–77, 129, 143. See also McConaghie, James R.

Giddings Family (Caroline, Hanson, John, and Mary), 42

Gillman, John A., 70

Glassford, John, & Company, 12

Gordon, George, 8–9

Gordon, John B., 57–58, 68

Graham, Ruth, 77–78, 80, 81

Grant, Ulysses S., 51–52, 53, 54, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 182

Great Depression, 70–72, 73–74, 75

Grewe, Phil, 152
Griffith, William, 10
Grove, W. Jarboe, 79

Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering . . . Historic Battlefields, 66

Hagerstown, MD, 47, 81
Hagerstown Civil War Round Table, 107
Haitian Revolution, 7, 15, 36. See also Saint-Domingue
Halleck, Henry W., 50, 53–54, 59
Hammit/Hammet, Robert, tavern, 14
Hancock, Winfield Scott, 23, 50
Harding, Eleanor (Marshall), 21, 30–31, 33
Harding, James M., 30–31
Harding, John L., 21, 22, 25–26, 30–31
Harding’s Run, 178
Harding, Sarah, 31
Harpers Ferry, VA/WV, 5, 45–48, 50–54, 63
Harpers Ferry Center, NPS, 184
Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, 134, 160
Harrisburg, PA, 50
Hayward, Gregory J., 134
Henry tract, 6, 9
L’Hermitage, 15, 19, 34, 117; Archeological Investigation of L’Hermitage Slave Village, 149, 176, 180, 184, 217. See also Best/Trail Farm
Herrin, Dean, 160
Heth, Henry, 67
Hilgenberg, C. Edward and Anne J., 24, 90
Hinde, Moses, 41
Historic American Building Survey (HABS), 24, 149, 172, 177, 213
Historic Preservation Act, 103, 126, 132–33
Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC), 140, 142, 155–56, 172, 176–77, 178, 189, 213
Historic Sites Consortium of Frederick County, 147, 188
Historical Society of Frederick County, 134, 191
incinerator project. See Waste-to-Energy
interpretation and visitor services: auto tours, 193–194, 226; battle
history, 5, 148; book and gift shop, 157, 158; children’s programs, 193;
community outreach, 145, 147, 148, 152–55; interpreters, 143, 147–48;
lectures, 193; living history events, 193; museum exhibits, 155, 167, 193;
picnic facilities, 106, 164, 166–67, 171, 183; planning documents, 172,
182–85; publications, 183; staffing, 147–48, 181; tours, 181–82, 191, 193;
wayside exhibits, 137, 168, 182, 183, 184; website, 183, 184. See also
events; trails; visitor center
Interstate Highway System, 89–91
Interstate 70S/270, 91, 98, 108, 108, 198; environmental impact of, 118, 125,
166; pedestrian deck, 146
Jackson, Thomas J. “Stonewall,” 47
Jenkins Food Corporation, 107, 112, 200, 251
Jenkins, J. O’Neil, 107
Johnson, Bradley T., 52, 61
Johnson, George K., 59–60
Johnson, Thomas, 21, 25
Johnson, Worthington R., 22, 39
Joynes, J. William, 92
Jug Bridge/stone bridge, 86, 97, 119, 145
Justice, Barbara, 147
Keefer, Michael, 32, 33
Keifer, Joseph Warren, 67
Keister, Dana, 134
Kennedy, Daniel, 10–11
King, Clara, 40
King, James, 34
Kingsbury, Gilbert L., 134
Kirkwood, Al, 190–91
Koontz, Godfrey, 22, 33
Kopczyck, Tom, 139, 152, 181, 188
Kreps, Michael, 22

Ladson, Francis H. and Barbara M., 113
Ladson tract, 113, 115, 122, 200
land acquisition, 103–4, 153, 163, 168, 173; Baker Farm, 1, 32, 111, 113, 120, 178; Best Farm, 1, 111, 113, 114, 138; Brooks Hill, 111, 113, 200; condemnation, 1, 66, 69, 71, 76, 89, 95, 115–16, 121; donation, 1, 73–74, 86, 95, 111, 114, 175; funding, 110, 127, 166; Gambrill Mill, 1, 112, 200; Graham map (1935), 78; Ladson tract, 113, 115, 122, 200; Lewis Farm, 25, 99, 113, 123; Lee map (1937), 80; life estates, 1, 113, 115, 120–21; MNB boundary map (1976), 224; MNB boundary map (1978), 220; overlooks, 99; Parcel Map, Land Protect Plan (1983), 222, 225; Porter-Langley-Little map (1940), 85; rental permits, 121, 169; right-of-ways, 24, 29, 124, 165; scenic easements, 83, 85–86, 95, 97–99, 108, 111, 112, 113, 115–16, 119–20, 122–23, 124; Thomas Farm, 113, 120, 147; Wallace HQ site, 113, 200; Worthington Farm, 107, 112, 200. See also boundaries
land tracts: 101–01 (Eckenrode), 28, 225; 101–02 (distillery lot, Eckenrode), 28–29; 101–03 (deleted), 225; 101–04 (Vivino, Gambrill), 225; 101–05 (deleted), 225; 101–06 (Vermont monument), 225; 101–07 (Jenkins Food Corp.), 225; 101–08 (deleted), 225; 101–09 (Clapp, Thomas Farm), 225; 101–10 (Ausherman), 225; 101–11 (deleted), 225; 101–12 (Mathias, Best Farm), 114, 225; 101–13 (McGrew), 225; 101–14 (Wright), 225; 101–15 (Meiklejohn), 225; 101–16 (B&O RR), 225; 101–17 (United Daughters of the Confederacy), 225; 101–18, 19, and 20 (MD State Road Commission), 225; 101–21 (unknown), 225; 101–22 (Jenkins Food Corps), 225; 101–23 (Tobery), 122, 225; 101–24 (Baker Valley Syndicate, Baker Farm), 225; 101–25 (deleted), 123, 225; 101–26 (Geisbert, Lewis Farm), 25, 225; 101–27 and 28 (Ladson), 225; 101–29 (Ladson), 28–29, 225; 101–30 (deleted), 225; 101–31 (Geisbert, Lewis Farm), 122–23, 225; 101–32 (PA monument), 225; 101–33 (NJ
Monocacy national Battlefield: an administrative History

monument), 225; 101–34 and 35 (Littoral), 122, 225; 101–36 and 37 (Geisbert, Lewis Farm), 225; 101–40 and 41 (Best Farm), 114; 101–42 (Best Farm), 114, 122; 101–50, 123

Landers, H. L., 70, 71
Landstreet, William T., 55
Lane, Kenneth, 74
Lane, William Preston, Jr., 89
Layman, Henry and Lydia, 26
Layman, Lydia, 26, 42
Lee, Ronald F., 80
Leimer, Virgil, 107, 136, 212
Lewis, David J., 72, 76, 80
Lewis Farm, 1, 25–27, 98–99, 113, 115, 121, 174–75; house and barn rehabilitation, 149,
Lewis, Hobart and Elizabeth, 26–27
Lewis, Jacob, 26, 42, 43,
Lewis, Rebecca, 26
Lincoln, Abraham, 45, 49, 51, 63, 64
Litteral, Kelley, 107–8
Locus Level, 7, 14–16, 17–18
Longstreet, James, 47
“Lost Order,” 47–48
Lowe, Adelaid (Vincendiere). See Vincendiere, Adelaide
Lowe, Enoch Louis, 47
Lufborough, Nathan, 17
Lujan, Manuel, 138
Lyeth, Eleonora, 29
Lyeth, John McF, 29
Lynchburg, VA, 51
Lynn, David, 11

Mackintosh, Barry, 96
Magnan, Marie-Françoise Sterlin de, 35
Magruder, Alexander R., 25

maintenance facilities, 106, 139, 146, 151–52, 188, 189; staffing, 76, 143. See also Wolfe, Gene.
Mantz, Francis, 57
Markell Farm, 29, 55, 98
Markell, John, 29
Markell, John Usher, 29
Markey, D. John, 69
Marshall, Chloe, 21, 30
Marshall, Claud, 13
Marshall, Eleanor. See Harding, Eleanor (Marshall)
Marshall, James, 11–16, 18–19, 21–22, 30–32, 36, 37–38, 117, 175
Marshall’s Branch, 13
Marshall’s Ferry, 11, 13–14, 16–17. See also Monocacy Ferry
Marshall, William, 21
Martinsburg, VA/WV, 47, 51
Maryland campaign, 46–49
Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission, 92, 119
Maryland, divided loyalties, 46
Maryland General Assembly, 16
Maryland Heights, 52, 53
Maryland, invasion of (1862), 46–49; (1863), 49–51; (1864), 51–57. See also Monocacy, Battle of
Maryland Public Service Commission, 127
Maryland Route 355, 5, 110, 124, 165, 166; Best Farm and, 114, 182;
   Evergreen Point and, 150; Fourteenth New Jersey Monument and, 146;
   signage, 108; Thomas Farm and, 97, 106, 118; toll house and, 172. See also US Route 240
Maryland State Highways/Roads Commission, 24, 89, 90, 124, 127
Maryland State Historic Preservation Office. See State Historic Preservation Office
Maryland Transit Authority, 141
“Maryland’s Lost Battlefield,” 92
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr., 93–94
Mathias, Charles McC., Sr., 76, 77–79, 83–88, 90, 93
Mathias, Theresa Trail, 113, 175
McClellan, George B., 47–49, 63
McConaghi, James R., 73, 76–77, 83, 212
McCook, Alexander, 60–61
McElfresh, Ariana. See Trail, Ariana (McElfresh)
McElfresh, John H., 19–20, 113
McElfresh, Theresia, 20, 41, 113
McKinney Industrial Park, 126, 200
McLaughlin, Gary, 154
McPherson, Fannie R., 26
McPherson, Horatio, 28
McPherson, John Brien, 19, 21–22, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 39
McPherson, John (Col.), 19, 21–22, 28
McPherson, John, Jr., 19, 21–22
McPherson’s Hill Farm, 25–26. See also Lewis Farm
Meade, George C., 50, 51
Meiklejohn, John R.,
Mercer, Carroll and Minnie Leigh, 25
Michel, Theresa Mathias, 87
Middle Ford, 6, 8–10; tavern site, 181
Mission 66, 74–76, 91–92, 129
Moler, William M., 28
Monocacy, Battle of, 1, 5–6, 12, 54–57, 57–60, 198; anniversaries, 65–66, 72, 92–93, 119, 144, 191, 193, 199, 202; battle maps, 56, 221; casualties, 60
Monocacy Battlefield Association (MBA), 69–70, 74, 76–79, 80, 84, 90, 129, 152, 198
Monocacy Ferry, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13–14 11, 16–17
Monocacy Junction, 6, 27, 51, 54–55, 57, 59, 96, 124, 181; US Colored Troops recruiting station, 148, 193
Monocacy Monument Association, 65, 198
Monocacy National Battlefield Advisory Commission, 104–5, 133, 134–36, 153
Monocacy National Battlefield Foundation, 144–45, 154–55, 213
Monocacy River, 5–6, 150, 167, 171; Conservation Zone, 165–66; designation as Scenic and Wild River, 169; flooding, 125; fords, 7–11; railroad bridge, 27, 50, 54–55, 181–82; stone bridge (Jug Bridge), 86, 97, 119, 145
Monocacy Road, 8–9
Monocacy Scenic River Citizen’s Advisory Board, 153
Monrovia, MD, 57, 58
monuments and markers: 5, 6, 64–66, 70–72, 73, 81, 96, 146; Confederate monument, 72, 92, 106, 111, 118–19, 178, 198, 200; Fourteenth New Jersey monument, 92, 95, 111, 118–19, 146, 178, 184, 192, 193, 198; Maryland monument, 72, 95, 106, 111, 118–19, 178, 199; Pennsylvania monument, 66, 92, 95, 106, 111, 118–19, 149, 172, 178, 198, 200; “The Private Soldier” (“Old Simon”), 65; Vermont monument, 66, 95, 106, 111, 118–19, 149, 172, 178, 198
Moore, Susan, 138, 139–40, 147, 156, 181, 187–88, 212
Moskey, George E., 77, 80
Mt. Ephraim, 41
Murphy, Jeremy, 143, 152

National Capital Parks/Regional Office, 97, 132, 199
National Historic Landmark: designation, 95–97, 100, 102–3, 108, 132, 163, 199; boundary map, 219; update, 119–20, 145, 149, 156, 201; wastewater treatment plant and, 124, 133
National Register of Historic Places, 1, 95–97, 108, 109, 132, 133, 199; boundary maps, 98, 99;
Edgewood/Boscobel, 25, 172
National Road, 16, 27. See also Baltimore Pike
natural resources, 150–51, 168–70; staffing, 143, 144; trails, 106, 179, 125, 141, 142, 146, 150, 164, 166; wildlife, 121, 150, 168–69


Nelson, Madison, 30
New Bremen tract, 25, 31
New Market District, 33
New Market, MD, 51, 58, 127

Olson, Gordon, 136–37
Order No. 191. See “Lost Order”

Parks and History Association, 157
Parsons, John, G., 96–97, 107, 114, 116, 121, 132–35, 153, 183
Pennsylvania, invasion of, 47, 50, 53
Peter, Robert, 11
Petersburg, VA, 51–52, 54, 61–62
Piscataway, MD, 8
Pleasant View, MD, 41
Point Lookout POW camp, 52
Point of Rocks, MD, 54
Pope, E. D., 68
Port Tobacco, MD, 8
Porter, Charles W., 84, 85, 90
Posey, John H., 34
Potomac Appalachian Transmission Highline (PATH), 126–27
Potomac River, 7–8, 45, 46, 48–49, 50–52, 54, 169
Price, Thomas, 8
Prince George’s County, MD, 8, 11, 12

Quasi War with France, 38

Radford, John, survey, 6
Rambur, Richard J., 138–40, 187, 212
Reagan, Ronald, 109
Reel’s Mill Road, 79
reenactment groups, 138
Richardson, Richard, 9–10, 13
Richmond, VA, 46, 47, 51, 54, 62
Ricketts, James B., 23, 32, 55–56, 57–58
roads, early, 8–9
Rock Creek, 8–9
Rogers, Clarence R., 77
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 72, 73–75, 76, 80, 88, 89
Ross, William J., 22, 26, 29, 30

Saint-Domingue, 7, 15, 19, 34–38, 44, 175
Sanner, Patricia, 133
Sarbanes, Paul, 138
scenic easements, 115–16; land acquisition and, 2, 83, 85, 86, 108, 111–13, 122–24, 198; proposals for, 95, 97–99
Schaefer, William Donald, 138
Scharf, J. Thomas: History of Western Maryland (1882), 23, 27, 67
Scheetz, William C., Jr., 76
Schenck, Robert, 50
Schofield, Arnold W., 134
Scottish settlers, 5, 7, 11–12, 13, 185
secession, 46
Shaaff, Arthur, 16
Sharpsburg, Battle of, 48–49
Sheely, Horace J., Jr., 96
Sheffield, Walter H., 83
Shenandoah Valley Campaign (1864), 51–52, 61–62
Sheridan, Philip, 23
Sherman, William T., 51, 182
Shiloh National Military Park, 66
Shultz, Daniel, 11
Sigel, Franz, 51, 53
Sinn, John, T., 41–42
Slade, Rick, 143–46, 158–59, 190–91, 193, 201, 212
slavery, 35, 37–40, 42–43, 45, 117, 168, 176, 193, 217; Emancipation
Proclamation, 49; interpretation of, 181–82; slave housing,
39, 180. See also African Americans; enslaved blacks; Haitian
Revolution; Saint-Domingue
Smith, Ai B. and Fannie, 24–25
Snowden, Miranda, 34
South Mountain, battle of, 47–48, 50, 62, 65
Spalding, Branch, 80
Spaulding, Brett, 147, 183
Speaks, John C., 69
Sponseller, Eugene and Amanda, 23–24
staffing, 184, 195; coordinating superintendents, 77, 83, 129, 131–33,
138, 212; cultural resource program managers, 143; curators, 147;
facilities managers, 190; law enforcement, 139, 143, 152, 181, 187–88;
maintenance, 140, 151–52; natural resource program managers,
143, 150; park rangers (interpretive), 138, 139, 140, 147–48, 152,
181, 187, 191; resource education and visitor services, 143, 147;
resource management, 139, 144; seasonal, 139, 140, 147, 152, 191; site
managers, 115, 125, 139–41, 142, 146–47, 187–89, 212; superintendents,
77, 95, 115, 129, 131, 142–46, 212; volunteers, 145, 147–48, 153–
54, 158–59, 187–88
Staler, Cornelius, 41
Stanton, Robert, 138, 160
Stanton, Todd, 143, 152
State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), 100, 133
Stauffer, Alvin P., 80
Steeler, Larry, 107
Stephens, Gail, 148, 157–59
Story, Isabelle, 80
Stubbs, Christopher J., 143, 146, 155, 201, 212
Summers, Thomas, 134
Sunnyside, MD, 41
Swift, Gloria, 147, 148

Target Shopping Center, 140
Tasker, Benjamin, 12
Tawes, J. Millard, 93
Taylor, Griffin, 22–23, 30, 32–33, 39–40
Thomas, Christian Keefer, 21, 23, 26, 42, 50
Thomas, Evelina, 42
Archeological Overview and Assessment (2010), 149, 177, 179–81, 184;
Civil War and, 58; Cultural Landscape Inventory and Report, 149, 177;
Frederick County feeder road and, 96, 199; General Management Plan and, 106–7; Historic Structures Report, 177–78, 217; history of, 20–24; stone tenant house, 146, 183, 193; structural rehabilitation, 118, 177; Thomas House, 117, 182; trails and, 179; US 240 and, 90; visitor access, 142, 181, 193. See also Araby tract; Araby Farm; Araby mills; Wiles, Keith
Thomas, Joseph, 41
Thomas, Mary, 42
Thomas, Samuel S., 23, 42
Thompson, Harry T., 81, 83, 84
toll house, 17, 118, 149–50, 172, 177
Trail, Ariana (McElfresh), 20
Trail, Arthur, 27
Trail, Charles B., 21
Trail, Charles, E., 20, 26–27, 47
trails, 141, 146, 150–52, 154, 168, 178–79, 182–84, 188, 189, 191; flooding and, 125, 170–71,
Monocacy National Battlefield: An Administrative History

190; Gambrill Mill, 139–40, 179; proposals for, 106, 118, 164, 166; Thomas Farm, 150, 179; Worthington Farm, 142, 150, 173, 179

Trail, Susan, 125–27, 139–43, 146, 157–59, 177, 189–90, 200, 212

Tydings, Millard E., 72, 76, 80

Tyler, Erastus B., 55

Union forces: Army of the Potomac, 51; Alexander’s battery, 58, 65; Clarendin’s command, 56; Eighth Corps (Middle Dep’t), 52; Gilpin’s command, 55; Hunter’s command, 23, 51, 52, 53, 54, 62; Illinois, Eighth Cavalry, 54; Indiana, Twenty-Seventh Regt, F Co, 47; Landstreet’s command, 55; McCook’s command, 60; Meade’s command, 51; Nineteenth Corps, 59; Rickett’s command, 23, 32, 55–56, 57–58; Sigel’s command, 51, 53; Sixth Corps, 32, 55, 58, 59, 61, 118; Tyler’s command, 55; Wallace’s command, 55, 57

Union forces, Maryland, 56

Union forces, Michigan, 60

Union forces, New Jersey, 55; Fourteenth Regiment monument, 66, 92, 95, 118–19, 146, 178, 184, 192, 198

Union forces, Ohio, 58, 60

Union forces, Pennsylvania, 58, 138; monument, 66, 92, 95, 106, 111, 118–19, 149, 172, 178, 198, 200

Union forces, Vermont, 58; monument, 66, 95, 106, 111, 118–19, 149, 172, 178, 198

United Daughters of the Confederacy: 72, 92, 106, 111, 118–19, 178, 198, 200

US Civil War Centennial Commission, 92

US Colored Troops (USCT), 148, 193

US Interior Department, 74, 109–10, 138; battlefield preservation and, 73, 95, 103, 129–30, 156; land acquisition and, 111–12; scenic easements and, 123

US Route 15, 90, 96

US Route 40, 96

US Route 40, 4, 9, 90–91

US Route 270, 25, 32, 96, 99, 106, 122, 124–25, 198; Best Farm and, 114, 175; expansion of, 127; Parcel 7 and, 107; pedestrian decks and overlooks and, 98, 106, 117, 118, 146; signage and, 108, 166; Worthington Farm and, 32, 100. See also US Route 240

US War Department, 70, 73, 80
University of Maryland, Department of Anthropology, 180, 181, 213
Urbana, MD, 6, 127, 166

Varlé map, 31
Vincendiere, Adelaide, 39, 47
Vincendiere, Cecile, 35
Vincendiere, Etienne Bellumeau, 35
Vincendiere, Etienne Paul Marie, 35
Vincendiere, Magnan, 35
Vincendiere, Souris, 35
Vincendiere, Victoire, 15–16, 18–19, 28, 34–39
visitation, 131, 145, 147–48, 157, 161, 166, 170, 183–84
Vivino, A. Earl and Jean J., 25, 112, 200
visitor center, 138, 181; construction and dedication of new, 106, 115, 142, 183–84, 191–92; flooding, 170, 171, 190; Gambrill Mill, 147, 179; staffing, 157, 187–88

Wallace, Lew, 52, 54, 65, 148
Wallace’s Headquarters site, 27, 29
Waltz property, 79
Washington, DC, defense of, 1, 5, 54, 60–64. See also Monocacy, Battle of
Washington County, MD, 36
Washington-Lincoln-Gettysburg Memorial Blvd., 77
Washington Turnpike, 6, 68, 89. See also Georgetown Pike
Washington Turnpike Company, 16, 17
Waste-to-Energy Facility (WTE), 126, 141, 144, 200–201
Watson, Captain, 36
Watt, James G., 109
Wernwag, Lewis, 17
West Virginia, 32, 51
Western Maryland Interpretive Association (WMIA), 145, 157–59, 213
Wett Work, 11, 13–14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 30, 31
Wheatley, John F. and Catherine, 22–23, 28–29, 33
Wheatley & Gambrill distillery, 23
White’s Ford, 61
Whitmore, Charlotte, Clinton, Frank, and Pearl, 27
Wild, Frederick W., 65
Wiles, Cortney, 20–21
Wiles, Keith, 121–22
Williams, Henry and Savilla, 42–43
Williams, T. J. C., 20, 29, 67,
Williamsport Preservation Training Center, 136, 155
Wilson, Nicholas, 38
Winchester, VA, 51
Wirth, Conrad, 75, 80, 84–85
Wirth, Theodore, 75
Wolfe, Gene, 140, 174
Wood, Nicholas W., 134
Woolfkill, Richard, 38
Works Progress Administration (WPA), 74
World War II, 74, 75, 88
Worthington, Clark, 34
Worthington Farm (Clifton): acquisition of, 1, 97–100, 107, 110, 112, 136, 200; Cultural Landscape Report, 149, 217; highways and, 90, 96, 115, 118, 199; HABS No. MD-1052, 149; Historic Structures Report, 149, 173, 216; history of, 11, 32–34, 67; park boundaries and, 103–7, 199; pedestrian deck and, 117; rehabilitation, 136, 139, 142, 149; trails, 141, 142, 150, 173, 179; water treatment facility and, 124, 132; Worthington Ford, 32, 57, 179, 182; Worthington House, 55, 146, 173, 181–82, 183, 193. See also Wiles, Keith
Worthington, Glenn H., 33, 57, 71, 79, 90, 93, 152, 182; The Battle of Monocacy, 67; Fighting for Time, 55, 198
Worthington, John T., 33
Worthington Lane, 140
Worthington, Mary, 33

Yaste, George E., 79
Youth Conservation Corps (YCC), 140

Zihlman, Frederick, 69