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Mr. Carrington Williams  
Chairman  
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields  
   National Historic District Commission  
P.O. Box 897  
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

I am pleased to inform you of my approval of the Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District, pursuant to Section 606 of Public Law 104-333.

The Commission has developed a plan that I believe will promote the protection and continued appreciation of the historic, cultural, and natural resources of an area that is not only important to citizens of the Shenandoah Valley, but to the Nation. I commend the Commission for its diligence and commitment to working with the public to create a plan that is suited to the Shenandoah Valley. You have successfully captured the enthusiasm and initiative of previous efforts and staked a bold future.

Please be assured of our desire to work closely with the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation to implement the plan. The important landscape of the Shenandoah Valley and the compelling Civil War stories it holds, deserve our continuing attention and we look forward to being part of this innovative partnership.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
LETTER FROM THE COMMISSION

The Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission is proud to present this Management Plan to the residents of the Shenandoah Valley, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the nation. The members of the Commission have been privileged to work with the residents and institutions of the Shenandoah Valley, along with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the federal government, to prepare this plan. Our thanks to those who unselfishly shared their time and comments.

The District contains some of the most remarkable and intact Civil War battlefields in the United States. The landscape of the Valley, its natural beauty, farms, small towns, and traditions make it one of the most characteristically American regions in the country—an area richly deserving preservation. The Management Plan outlines a vision for how the Civil War resources in this District can be preserved, interpreted, and made available for public education and enjoyment for centuries to come.

However, completing this plan, in less than the mandated time allotted to us, was the easy part. The real challenge lies ahead. The people of the District and the nation must develop the partnerships envisioned in this plan and work with one another to preserve these remarkable resources. We hope that they will be successful, led by our successor, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation, working in close association with the local governments, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the National Park Service. As a result of implementing this plan, we hope that a growing sense of "One Valley," united to preserve its tradition and enrich the lives of its residents and the people of the United States, will emerge.

Sincerely yours,

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND NEED

Virginia’s Shenandoah Valley was a key theater in the Civil War. As a natural geographic highway between North and South and as a richly productive agricultural region whose bounty fed the Confederate troops, the Valley was fiercely contested during the War, playing an integral role in almost every major campaign fought in Virginia. More than 325 armed conflicts took place here with Stonewall Jackson’s 1862 campaign perhaps the most famous of these. The eight counties comprising the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District (District) lay at the heart of the struggle, and, as the War dragged on, the area assumed increasing significance for the southern cause. Union forces responded by laying waste to this region, burning its fields and farms and towns in a devastating campaign of total warfare.

Today the District remains a vital yet vulnerable national historical resource, a place where the meaning of the Civil War comes to life through green battlefields and historic roadways and buildings. But development threatens the survival and integrity of these resources. This Management Plan outlines a program to preserve the District’s historical character, to protect and interpret the Civil War battlefields and related resources in the District, and to increase public awareness of the War’s legacy in the Valley.
ENABLING LEGISLATION

The 1996 Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Commission Act (P.L. 104-333) established both the District and the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission (Commission). The District is comprised of Augusta, Clarke, Frederick, Highland, Page, Rockingham, Shenandoah, and Warren counties, and the independent cities of Harrisonburg, Staunton, Winchester, and Waynesboro, as well as ten battlefields and a number of historically important transportation routes.

The purpose of the District and the Commission is to preserve, conserve, and interpret the Valley’s Civil War legacy—the places, the events, and the people (soldier and civilian) before, during, and after the War.

The Commission was charged with creating partnerships among federal, state, regional, and local governments and the private sector to develop a plan to manage and administer the District. The 19-member Commission represents landowners, local governments, preservation and history experts, and designees of the governor of Virginia and the director of the National Park Service (NPS). The legislation’s broad array of mandates, which must be addressed in the plan, have been grouped into four topics:

- battlefield and resource protection
- interpretation and education
- visitor services and tourism
- management and partnerships

In accordance with the legislation, a NPS Special Resource Study was prepared concurrently to determine “whether the District or components thereof meet the criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park Service.” An Environmental Impact Statement also was required and prepared for both plans.
PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The Commission’s legislation was enacted in response to public concerns about Civil War resource preservation. Designed to solicit and ultimately reflect the ideas, desires, and concerns of residents of the District and the nation, the planning process was divided into four phases:

- Phase I: Developing a vision/scoping (November 1998–March 1999)
- Phase II: Developing alternatives/data gathering (April 1999–October 1999)
- Phase III: Selecting a preferred alternative/drafting the plan (October 1999–May 2000)
- Phase IV: Developing the final plan/agency approvals (June 2000–November 2000)

Through many public meetings and presentations, extensive media coverage, Commission newsletters, and meetings with current and potential partners to the plan, the Commission sought guidance and input from the public, government, and all other interested parties, while keeping them informed of the Commission’s progress, plans, and conclusions.

The Commission ultimately identified one “no-action” and three “action” alternatives that might accomplish the legislation’s mandates, finally selecting what is termed the “Clusters” approach as its preferred alternative. Between mid-April and mid-June of 2000 the Commission presented this alternative to the public through a newsletter, public meetings and governmental briefings, and other means. Public response indicated overwhelming support for the Commission’s recommendations, which resulted in the plan outlined below.

THE PLAN

The plan structures the District according to geographic groupings—clusters—of battlefields, nearby towns, and other visitor sites (see Map S-1). The plan creates a
new non-profit organization, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation (Foundation), to foster partnerships within the District and create incentives for communities to collaborate on interpretive sites and other preservation-oriented development opportunities. Visitor service and interpretation will be focused at five Civil War orientation centers throughout the District. Visitors will move between or within clusters along historic routes.

The plan will generate a great degree of local participation and stewardship for preservation and interpretation of the Valley’s Civil War resources, while distributing valuable tourism benefits across the District. The major elements of the plan are described in the following sections.

**BATTLEFIELD AND RESOURCE PROTECTION**

Ten Civil War battlefields were identified for study in the legislation. Figure S-1 lists the battlefields, their sizes, the amount of land currently protected, and the amount of core battlefield retaining integrity. This plan includes recommendations for their protection.

In addition, resources beyond the battlefields are important to the Valley’s history and culture. Farmlands protect battlefields and reflect the area’s historically agrarian character. Historic sites tell different aspects of the District’s story, and historic/scenic roads link many of the battlefields. The District also contains a wealth of natural resources and recreational opportunities.

The plan supports voluntary protection of battlefield lands; the Foundation will not seek condemnation authority. Instead, the Foundation will encourage both public and private ownership of battlefield lands, thus maintaining the historically agricultural character of these lands, reducing negative impacts on local tax revenues, and maximizing preservation opportunities.

The Foundation will work with District partners to develop individual battlefield plans that will identify protection strategies and priorities, and maintain a list of
Map S-1
Clusters Concept
Map S-1
Clusters Concept
properties to be protected. The Foundation’s preservation and protection efforts within the District will be directed according to the following priorities:

- Priority 1: “core” battlefield lands where fighting occurred
- Priority 2: “study areas” surrounding the core fighting areas
- Priority 3: resources related to the battlefields

### FIGURE S-1
**BATTLEFIELD SIZE, INTEGRITY, AND PROTECTION, 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battlefield</th>
<th>Core Area Acreage</th>
<th>Study Area Acreage</th>
<th>Core Areas Retaining Integrity</th>
<th>Core Acreage Protected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Republic</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom’s Brook</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Hill</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>15,607</td>
<td>5,475</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>22,274</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Kernstown</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opequon (Third Winch)</td>
<td>4,914</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,068</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,096 (70%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,133 (7%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Study Area acreage includes Core Area acreage.
To succeed in the enormous task of protecting these battlefields and other resources, the Foundation and other partners will employ a variety of tools, listed in Figure S-2.

INTERPRETATION

The Foundation, in collaboration with District partners, will develop and implement a coordinated, District-wide interpretive plan that includes visitor education and appropriate living-history demonstrations and battlefield reenactments, unified through a District wayfinding system and promoted through a shared marketing program. The interpretive program will be built upon three primary themes:

**The Valley:** Geography, history, economy, and culture focused the attention of both North and South during the War.

**The campaigns:** Though with different objectives, different leaders, and different results, each played an important role in determining the War's outcome.

**The battles:** Ten different battles provide unique perspectives on Civil War combat.

Interpretive programs will be designed to appeal to audiences of all ages and levels of interest, and will be offered in a range of formats: indoor exhibits; outdoor interpretive displays along historic routes, at battlefields, and at related sites; written guides (books, maps, brochures); and audio, video, and interactive technologies.

Visitors will be encouraged to travel throughout the District. Interpretation will be provided at Civil War orientation centers, battlefields, existing sites, along historic routes, at related Civil War resources, and in towns and cities. Living-history demonstrations and battle reenactments will provide additional visitor interest as well as fund-raising opportunities.

Finally, the Foundation and District partners will stress education by developing curriculum for the battlefields and supporting a range of educational and research programs.

VISITOR SERVICES

The plan groups the District into five clusters associated with the District's ten designated battlefields: McDowell; Port Republic/Cross Keys; New Market; Tom's
Each cluster will feature a Civil War orientation center, developed by the appropriate District partners in cooperation with the Foundation. These centers will serve as interpretive focal points, introducing visitors to the themes, stories, resources, and attractions in the District as a whole but particularly those specific to each cluster’s immediate community. The Foundation will work with partners to provide limited amenities at each battlefield, including parking, trails, outdoor interpretation, exhibit shelters, and directional signs.

The design of the orientation centers will serve to direct visitors towards the battlefields themselves, while also encouraging visits to the surrounding communities and nearby related sites and resources. A clearly identifiable District-wide wayfinding system—developed by the Foundation and its partners and built upon the existing

---

**FIGURE S-2**
**SUMMARY OF TECHNIQUES FOR BATTLEFIELD AND RESOURCE PROTECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase at full value</td>
<td>Agricultural and Forestal Districts program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase at bargain value</td>
<td>Regulations for environmentally sensitive areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of land via donation or bequest</td>
<td>Land use planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of charitable remainder trusts</td>
<td>Cluster zoning / planned unit development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of options or rights of first refusal</td>
<td>Density bonuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of undivided interests or remainder interests</td>
<td>Conservation subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land exchange</td>
<td>Agricultural zoning (25-40 acre, large lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easements</td>
<td>Historic district zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of development rights</td>
<td>Historic district approach corridor overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants</td>
<td>Service area limits (sewer, water, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary dedication or “cash in lieu”</td>
<td>Overlay zoning / design review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease with option to buy</td>
<td>Recognition and certification programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases and management agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Virginia Civil War Trails program—will guide visitors to, between, and within each cluster. The Foundation and District partners will work as well with existing welcome centers and tourism promotion organizations to provide visitor information on other District attractions.

**MANAGEMENT**

The Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation will oversee the District as the “lead managing partner.” Its diverse board will include state and NPS representatives, District officials, leaders from outside the region, subject experts, and representatives from each cluster area. Figure S-3 illustrates this management structure.

The Foundation will manage the District according to the Management Plan, with legal power to receive and disburse funds for preparing and implementing the management plan, acquire lands or interests in lands, and make reasonable and necessary modifications to the plan. The Foundation will also have the authority to enter into agreements with government agencies and nonprofit organizations and disburse federal funds to further the goals of the Management Plan. Other roles and responsibilities of the Foundation will include:

**Land protection:** The Foundation will work with and support public-trust groups acquiring and protecting battlefields. In appropriate and necessary circumstances, the Foundation itself could protect battlefields directly through purchase or other means.

**Information and support:** The Foundation will offer a range of resources—including information, training, technical assistance, grants, and other encouragements—to partners, private and public-trust property owners, and local jurisdictions for protecting land and encouraging long-term stewardship by individuals, groups, and communities. The Foundation also will help develop and maintain a geographic information system to aid informed decision-making about District lands and resources.

**Advocacy:** The Foundation will advocate for improved land use planning tools and decisions where public policy decisions place important resources at stake or may set precedents.

**Interpretation:** The Foundation will lead development of a collaborative, District-wide interpretive plan; participate in the development of District-partner plans for
clusters, individual battlefields, and other resources; oversee design of a unified District graphic image and wayfinding system; and monitor and maintain agreed-upon standards for the interpretive system.

The Foundation will rely on a wide range of District partners to plan, implement, and maintain stewardship, interpretation, and visitor services. These partners will include: operators of Civil War orientation centers, local governments, tourism and economic development interests, citizens groups, historic preservation organizations, state and federal agencies, landowners, universities, and historic sites in the District.

As principal partners, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the NPS are expected to support the Foundation’s operating costs and provide matching funds for protecting and interpreting battlefields. The Commonwealth will be expected to continue to support the Virginia Military Institute’s stewardship of New Market Battlefield State Historical Park and adapt public policies and grant funding to support and protect
District resources. The NPS will be expected to seek to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek battlefield and provide technical assistance throughout the District.

**FUNDING AND COSTS**

**Battlefield and resource protection:** The enabling legislation authorizes up to $2 million per year in federal matching funds for grants, technical assistance, and land protection. The legislation also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior up to $2 million per year in federal funds for direct support of battlefield preservation in the District. Other possible funding sources include the Land and Water Conservation Fund, agricultural conservation easement programs, TEA-21, Virginia Land Conservation Fund, and other state environmental programs. The Foundation will collaborate with private Civil War and lands conservancies to help fund battlefield and resource protection programs.

**Interpretation:** Additional state, federal, and private sources will be pursued to complement the $2 million in federal matching funds authorized for grants, technical assistance, and land acquisition.

**Visitor services:** The Civil War orientation centers will be developed by partners per the standards of the District-wide interpretive plan. Between $2.9 and $5.2 million will need to be secured in addition to money already planned to implement visitor services projects.

**Management:** The Foundation and partners operating the Civil War orientation centers will share operational expenses. It is expected to cost between $600,000 and $1.2 million per year to operate the Civil War orientation centers and between $1.5 and $2.3 million to support the Foundation’s staff, core programs, special projects, and administrative expenses. The Foundation will be authorized up to $500,000 annually in federal operating funds, which will be supplemented by funds from state and local sources. Contributions for special programs will be solicited from local sources and from private foundations, organizations, and corporations.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

It may take 20 years to fully implement the proposal. However, a seven-year time frame is projected for the Foundation and its partners to plan, develop, and implement
a significant portion of the Management Plan's protection, interpretation, and visitor services components, including:

**Years One to Three:**

**Battlefield and Resource Protection**

- Implement voluntary battlefield protection measures as opportunities arise, working with property owners, local governments, and public-trust battlefield owners.
- Undertake battlefield planning by cluster, including protection, access, and interpretation; coordinate with District-wide interpretive plan.
- Develop partner-support programs for resource protection, working with non-profit and government agencies (e.g., county planning departments).
- Pursue designation of scenic routes, rivers, and trails; historic structures; and historic districts.
- Continue Demonstration Projects Program begun by the Commission.

**Interpretation**

- Develop and begin implementation of District-wide interpretive plan. Coordinate with battlefield plans.
- Develop partner-support programs for interpretation and institute matching-grant program for existing and new sites.
- Implement interpretive plans for specific battlefields, identify funds for first round of construction, and contract for blueprints for public access and interpretive installations where land is already available.

**Visitor Services**

- Develop graphic identity; develop signage and wayfinding component of interpretive plan (in collaboration with the Virginia Civil War Trails program, tourism advisors, and the Virginia Department of Transportation [VDOT] representatives); begin installation of regional directional sign system.
• Assemble tourism advisors and develop marketing plan.
• Identify and begin to address (primarily through funds from partners) needs of the District’s existing visitor reception system.
• Initiate hospitality training and develop reference materials to help front-desk staff of area attractions answer questions about the District.

Years Four to Seven:

**Battlefield and Resource Protection**

• Continue battlefield protection through partners and through direct action by the Foundation.
• Substantially complete battlefield facilities.

**Interpretation**

• Develop up to 30 percent of new interpretive sites identified through the District-wide interpretive plan.

**Visitor Services**

• Complete Civil War orientation centers.
• Implement community development program for visitor reception, recreation, and additional interpretive sites.
• Implement full-scale marketing plan once critical mass of facilities is ready.
• Complete installation of regional directional sign system in cooperation with the Virginia Civil War Trails program and the VDOT.
• Initiate support for regional recreation plan to develop bicycling and plan long-term development of walking trail linking battlefields.
• Create broadly collaborative community development plans by cluster. Assemble economic development advisors and develop partner-support program. Undertake one round of modest economic development matching grants for plans and technical assistance.
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PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Along the now green and peaceful Shenandoah Valley once raged some of the most bitterly contested battles of the Civil War. Today the Valley's battlefields and related resources remain essential to understanding that defining moment in the nation's history. Unfortunately, these resources are in trouble. Encroaching development threatens the historical integrity of the battlefields. The Civil War history of this region—the people, the landscapes, and the events—remains too little known beyond the Valley. Action is needed to protect both the resources and the stories they hold.
This Management Plan offers a comprehensive effort to address these and related issues.

The history of Civil War preservation initiatives in the Shenandoah Valley begins with years of grass-roots efforts, supported by Congress with passage of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Commission Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-333, section 606, “the legislation.”) (See Appendix A.) The act established both the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District (District) and the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission (Commission). The Commission was given a three-year mandate for developing a grass-roots-based management plan for the District that would comply with all applicable federal regulations. The act called as well for the National Park Service (NPS) to assist the Commission in developing this plan.

The result of the joint efforts of these two parties, the Management Plan presents a foundation for decisions and actions to be made over the next ten to twenty years. It builds on the findings of the Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia (1992) which documents Civil War resources in the Valley. This Management Plan presents strategies for preserving battlefields and related resources, interpreting those resources, providing points of contact and information for visitors, and creating a structure for the management of the District and implementation of the plan.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared as part of this planning process in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (N. EPA) and regulations of the Council of Environmental Quality (40CFR1500-1508). The EIS is a programmatic evaluation of the plan described in Chapter Three. The plan was evaluated along with three other alternatives. An overview of the alternatives is included as Appendix B.

The EIS process was also used to consult with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. These parties agreed to a Programmatic Agreement that defines review responsibilities for future actions that result from the plan, involve federal funds, and may have an impact on historic properties. This agreement is included as Appendix C.
Public Law 104-333 also charged the NPS with submitting “to Congress a report recommending whether the District or components thereof meet the criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park Service.” That study—a Special Resource Study—was prepared concurrently by the NPS in consultation with the Commission.

**ENABLING LEGISLATION**

The Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Commission Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-333), states these Congressional findings:

1. there are situated in the Shenandoah Valley in the Commonwealth of Virginia the sites of several key Civil War battles;
2. certain sites, battlefields, structures, and districts in the Shenandoah Valley are collectively of national significance in the history of the Civil War;
3. in 1992, the Secretary of the Interior issued a comprehensive study of significant sites and structures associated with Civil War battles in the Shenandoah Valley, and found that many of the sites within the Shenandoah Valley possess national significance and retain a high degree of historical integrity;
4. the preservation and interpretation of these sites will make a vital contribution to the understanding of the heritage of the United States;
5. the preservation of Civil War sites within a regional framework requires cooperation among local property owners and federal, state, and local government entities; and
6. partnerships between federal, state, and local governments, the regional entities of such governments, and the private sector offer the most effective opportunities for the enhancement and management of the Civil War battlefields and related sites in the Shenandoah Valley.\(^1\)

---

As described in the legislation, the District is comprised of eight counties and four independent cities in northwestern Virginia: Augusta, Clarke, Frederick, Highland, Page, Rockingham, Shenandoah, and Warren counties and their political subdivisions, and the independent cities of Harrisonburg, Staunton, Waynesboro, and Winchester.

The legislation also identifies ten Civil War battlefields that the Commission must specifically address in the plan: McDowell, Cross Keys, Port Republic, New Market, Tom’s Brook, Fisher’s Hill, Cedar Creek, Second Winchester, Second Kernstown, and Opequon (Third Winchester). (See Map 1.)

The legislation states that the purpose of the designation of the District and the creation of the Commission is to:
1. preserve, conserve, and interpret the legacy of the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley;
2. recognize and interpret important events and geographic locations representing key Civil War battles in the Shenandoah Valley, including those battlefields associated with the Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson campaign of 1862 and the decisive campaigns of 1864;
3. recognize and interpret the effect of the Civil War on the civilian population of the Shenandoah Valley during the War and postwar reconstruction period; and
4. create partnerships among federal, state, and local governments, the regional entities of such governments, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, enhance, and interpret the nationally significant battlefields and related sites associated with the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley.²

The legislation charges the Commission with: (1) developing a management plan for the District; (2) assisting the Commonwealth of Virginia and any political entity in the management, protection, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historic resources within the District; and (3) taking appropriate action to encourage protection of the resources within the District by landowners, local governments, organizations, and businesses. However, the legislation directs that the Commission “shall in no way infringe upon the authorities and policies of

² Ibid., c.1-4.
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the Commonwealth of Virginia or any political subdivision.\textsuperscript{3} The legislation states that the Management Plan must include:

A. an inventory which includes any property in the District which should be preserved, restored, managed, maintained, or acquired because of its national historic significance;

B. provisions for the protection and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historic resources of the District consistent with the purposes of this section;

C. provisions for the establishment of a management entity which shall be a unit of government or a private nonprofit organization that administers and manages the District consistent with the plan;

D. recommendations to the Commonwealth of Virginia (and political subdivisions thereof) for the management, protection, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historical resources of the District;

E. identification of appropriate partnerships between the federal, state, and local governments and regional entities, and the private sector, in furtherance of the purposes of this section;

F. locations for visitor contact and major interpretive facilities;

G. provisions for implementing a continuing program of interpretation and visitor education concerning the resources and values of the District;

H. provisions for a uniform historical marker and wayside exhibit program in the District, including a provision for marking, with the consent of the owner, historic structures and properties that are contained within the historic core areas [of the battlefields] and contribute to the understanding of the District;

I. recommendations for means of ensuring continued local involvement and participation in the management, protection, and development of the District; and

J. provisions for appropriate living-history demonstrations and battlefield reenactments.\textsuperscript{4}

As directed by the legislation, the Commission is composed of nineteen members appointed by the United States Secretary of the Interior. Five members represent local governments and the communities of the District, ten members represent District

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., i.1.C.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., f.2.A-J.
property owners associated with the battlefields, one member is an expert in historic preservation, and one is a recognized Civil War historian. The Governor of Virginia or a designee and the Director of the NPS or a designee both serve ex officio. Members serve without compensation, and are appointed for the three-year life of the Commission. The legislation also authorizes operational funding for the Commission’s three-year life.

As authorized in the legislation, upon completion of the Management Plan and its acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission’s successor—the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation (Foundation)—will become eligible to receive $500,000 annually from the federal government for operations. The successor will also become eligible for appropriations of up to $2,000,000 annually for grants, technical assistance, and land acquisition (requires a dollar-for-dollar match of non-federal money). In addition, the Secretary may receive up to $2,000,000 per year to support battlefield preservation in the District. (See Appendix A for the full language of P.L. 104-333.)

**PAST STUDIES**

There is a substantial history of public concern for the preservation of the Shenandoah Valley’s Civil War history. The groundwork of the current plan and its recommendations was laid out in a number of earlier preservation studies of the Valley’s Civil War resources.

The earliest efforts to preserve the Shenandoah Valley’s Civil War history began in the late-19th century with the creation of commemorative monuments to soldiers, regiments, and events. In more recent years, interest has shifted to battlefield preservation, commemoration, and interpretation. To this end, acreage has been purchased for preservation at nine of the ten battlefields here under study, but in no instance has the majority of any one battlefield been preserved.
CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED STUDIES

Growing concern for the future of these battlefields resulted, in 1990, in Congressional passage of Public Law 101-638, charging the NPS with studying the Civil War sites and battlefields in the Valley. A multi-year effort on the part of local governments, planning district commissions, private preservation and commemoration groups, historians, and other interested parties resulted in the Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia (1992). This study identified fifteen main battlefields in the Valley and analyzed the feasibility of adding them to the National Park System.5

In late 1990 federal legislation also created the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission to study Civil War sites throughout the country; its findings were reported in the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields (1993). Later in 1993 the NPS published the Draft Shenandoah Valley Civil War Battlefields Assessment, which explored battlefield management issues in greater detail. This report recommended creating a Shenandoah Valley Heritage Area, proposed the development of a partnership preservation plan, and laid the foundation for creating the District and Commission. Many of the goals outlined by this previous study are reflected in recommendations contained in this Management Plan, with a comprehensive agenda for the conservation, interpretation, promotion, and management of the Valley’s resources.

LOCALLY SPONSORED BATTLEFIELD STUDIES

Some battlefields within the District have been the subject of additional study. The Civil War Preservation Trust, Inc. (CWPT)6 sponsored the Survey and Mapping of Fisher's Hill Battlefield Earthworks, Shenandoah County, Virginia (1994). This study identified strategies for future research, planning, and preservation for the 208 acres owned by the CWPT. The battlefield’s modest interpretive program is a model for

5 Of these fifteen, ten were ultimately identified for study in the 1996 legislation. Those not included in the legislation were Cool Springs, First Kernstown, First Winchester, Front Royal, and Piedmont.

6 The CWPT is the successor to the merged Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites, Inc. and the Civil War Trust, Inc.
some of the ideas for battlefield development expressed in Chapter Three. The CWPT also prepared the Master Plan for Port Republic Battlefield Site in Rockingham County, Virginia (1994). This report addresses the design, budget, and development of access, parking, and an interpretive trail at a ten-acre property at The Coaling owned by the CWPT.

The Frederick County Department of Planning and Development prepared the Frederick County-Winchester Civil War Site Inventory in 1994, followed in 1997 by the Battlefield Network Plan, Frederick County. This latter report set forth goals and strategies for establishing a network of battlefield parks, and was a model for basic cluster planning for battlefields as described in Chapter Three of this Management Plan.

Frederick County also commissioned specific management plans for two battlefields. Recommendations for access, interpretation, and management were laid out in the Kernstown Battlefield Management Plan (1996), prepared in partnership with the City of Winchester. Third Winchester (Opequon) Battlefield Preservation Plan (1999) identified ways to carry out the Network Plan at this significant site. Both are models for individual battlefield plans.

In 1996 the Valley Conservation Council published the McDowell Battlefield/Staunton to Parkersburg Plan, and subsequently has created a voluntary preservation program along the Staunton-to-Parkersburg Pike in Augusta and Highland Counties, areas associated with the Battle of McDowell. Work is now underway to obtain conservation easements in the corridor and interpret and conserve places along the route. During this same period, the McDowell Battlefield Master Plan (1995) was prepared for the land owned by the CWPT.

Finally, in 1998 the Lord Fairfax Planning District Commission published A Study of Alternative Management Approaches for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. An analysis of management structures used in National Heritage Areas and other regional heritage preservation programs, this study would help provide the Battlefields Commission with direction as it began its three-year assignment.
PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The development of the Management Plan (and the EIS) has been organized into four phases:

- **Phase I:** Developing a vision/scoping (November 1998–March 1999)
- **Phase II:** Developing alternatives/data gathering (April 1999–October 1999)
- **Phase III:** Selecting a preferred alternative/drafting the plan (October 1999–May 2000)
- **Phase IV:** Developing the final plan/agency approvals (June 2000–November 2000)

During each of the first three phases, specific research tasks and decisions laid the groundwork for subsequent inquiry and decisions in the succeeding phases, resulting in the recommended course of action outlined in this plan.

To assure that the Commission’s findings and recommendations would reflect what the people of the Valley wanted for their communities, the Commission created a wide-reaching program for soliciting public involvement in the planning process. Each phase of the process began with a facilitated Commission workshop where Commissioners and members of the public established the direction for research in that phase. Each concluded with a series of public meetings at which the findings from that phase were presented for review and comment. Through these public meetings the Commission could verify that its work reflected the concerns and interests of the governments and residents within the District.

In addition to holding these public meetings, the Commission published at least one newsletter during each of the phases. Additional meetings held during each phase brought together public-trust battlefield owners as well as heritage conservation, tourism, and economic development interests to review and comment on the Commission’s work. Commissioners and staff also made numerous presentations to
local governments, state and federal agencies, and community organizations throughout the four phases. Further public awareness was assured through extensive local and statewide print, television, and radio media coverage of the Commission’s monthly business meetings, public meetings, and other activities.

Throughout the planning process, public suggestions led to often significant adjustments and changes in proposed alternatives. At the same time, the Commission’s public outreach program served to raise public awareness of the fragile nature of the Valley’s Civil War resources and the need for action to preserve them.

Ultimately, the Commission developed and then studied four alternatives for its Management Plan. One, the “no action” alternative, is required for any federally funded project and served as a baseline for analyzing the other alternatives. The other three were termed “action” alternatives and proposed varying levels of activity to fulfill the mandates of the Commission’s legislation. (A summary of the four alternatives is provided in Appendix B while an in-depth description can be found in the Draft Management Plan/Special Resource Study/Environmental Impact Statement.) All four alternatives were organized around four principal topics:

- Battlefield and resource protection
- Interpretation
- Visitor services and tourism
- Management and partnerships

In developing each of the three action alternatives, the Commission determined that only one approach to battlefield and resource protection, interpretation, and management components would satisfy both the requirements of the legislation and the interests of the residents in the District. Therefore, the principal distinctions between the three action alternatives lay within the “visitor service” component. The plan of action is detailed in Chapter Three of this document.

In addition to preparing the Management Plan and EIS, the Commission initiated a Demonstration Projects Program in the spring of 1999. This program helped fund some 20 projects, including the restoration of several Civil War-related structures; installation of interpretive signage, a pedestrian walkway, and trails at Opequon (Third Winchester) and Tom’s Brook battlefields; computer-based interpretive programs at the Hall of Valor in New Market; and preservation guides for owners of historic properties. A complete listing of these projects is included in the draft plan.
Created to stimulate “early action” activities while the Management Plan was under development, the Demonstration Projects Program also served as a means for testing different methods and projects for implementing the plan.

**GOALS**

The Commission adopted goals in November 1998 that have been used to help chart a future for the District and guide development of the plan. The goals are:

- **Preserving Civil War battlefields:** Protect Civil War battlefields in the Valley and interpret them in a consistent and meaningful way. A uniform approach to telling the story of the battlefields will create a cohesive District.

- **Celebrating our heritage:** Tell the full story of the Valley around the time of the Civil War by linking a wide range of public and private sites throughout the District.

- **Supporting economic development:** Stimulate the Valley’s economy by expanding heritage tourism, protecting productive farmland, and enhancing the quality of life in the Valley. The District will strive to balance preservation and economic development in the Valley.

- **Forging strong working partnerships:** Successful management of the District depends on the creation of strong working partnerships. Management of the District will focus on cooperation, consensus building, resource leveraging, and partnerships to preserve and interpret the region’s unique resources.

- **Inspiring community pride:** Increased awareness of the special role played by the Shenandoah Valley in our nation’s history will inspire local pride, creating excitement and interest. The District will encourage residents to get involved in telling the Valley’s story.

- **Creating a permanent management structure:** Develop an effective management structure with strong ties to local, state, and federal governments to ensure permanence and long-term funding for preservation and interpretation efforts.

- **Serving as a national model:** Become a national model for regional resource preservation.
PLANNING ISSUES

During public workshops and meetings and through consultation with local, state, and federal agencies, a number of important issues emerged that must be addressed in order to achieve the intentions of the federal legislation and the goals of the Commission. The task of addressing these issues is described in Chapter Three of this plan. The issues are grouped into four organizational topics.

- Battlefield and resource protection issues
- Interpretation issues
- Tourism and visitor services issues
- Management and partnership issues

BATTLEFIELD AND RESOURCE PROTECTION ISSUES

A recent analysis performed by the Commission concluded that, despite public and private preservation efforts, some 7,500 acres of core battlefield lands have lost their integrity due to non-compatible development. They can no longer convey their historical significance. Battlefield protection in particular as well as protection of the District as a whole have been issues of primary concern for the Commission and will continue to be for the Commission’s successor, the Foundation. Key issues and concerns identified in this regard are outlined below.

- **Extent of Battlefields**: Core areas occupy more than 30,000 acres of the District; core and study areas together, more than 92,000 acres, accounting for approximately three percent of the District’s overall land area. The aggregate size of the battlefields makes their protection a considerable challenge.

  To date only 2,163 acres of core battlefield lands have been protected, a mere seven percent of the battlefields’ aggregate core areas (see Figure 3 on page 39). The rest remain unprotected and under potential threat of loss.

  The extent of these lands poses significant challenges to preservation efforts. Most are, and will remain, in the hands of private owners. While it makes sense to concentrate on core land for purchase by public-trust owners, preserving only
these areas and excluding the surrounding “study areas” would ultimately result in the loss of an important sense of scale and context. Protection of privately held lands will demand extensive owner outreach, encouraging private stewardship with a variety of incentive-based and technical assistance programs.

- **Growth Pressures**: Most of the battlefields, located on predominantly level ground near major transportation routes, are vulnerable to development, with those located in or around cities and towns facing the greatest threats. The problem is most acute in those areas closest to metropolitan Washington, D.C. Both Front Royal and First Winchester battlefields have already suffered such severe loss of integrity that neither was included in the legislation; of the battlefields included, Opequon (Third Winchester) was identified in the 1992 NPS study as being at greatest risk of losing its integrity. Even rural areas, however, are not immune from threat; incremental, low-density residential development here erodes the character of historic open space.

  No consensus exists among preservationists, landowners, and individual jurisdictions within the District as to the most appropriate way to preserve battlefields and resources. These opinions and preferences must be respected. Simply determining what to protect, and how, remains a substantial challenge.

- **Limited Local Protection Policies**: Despite the growing interest in preservation, battlefield lands and related resources are perched precariously between public appreciation for the Civil War and demand for growth and development. Local governments often lack the tools—and in some cases, the will—to protect battlefields. Of the sixteen local governments that have comprehensive plans, only six plans currently mention the battlefields as a resource, and only one of these six lists specific preservation strategies.\(^7\)

\(^7\) The town of Strasburg, and Frederick, Shenandoah, Page, and Augusta counties have growth management plans in place. Warren County has made growth management a goal of its community plan, and Frederick County has developed battlefield preservation goals as part of its comprehensive plan.
Local governments are unable to effectively prohibit growth on battlefields due to concerns about limiting the ability of property owners to use their land as the market dictates. Only Cross Keys and Port Republic battlefields are zoned solely for agriculture. The other eight are a mixture of commercial, residential, and agricultural zoning. Even agricultural zoning, as it is generally practiced in the District, allows residential and other development on farmland. Cross Keys, for example, has recently seen the development of large-lot residential subdivisions.

- **Loss of Agricultural Lands:** Agriculture has been the defining feature of the Valley’s culture for over three centuries, and was one of the reasons the Valley was so fiercely contested during the Civil War. The mostly agricultural use of the lands has serendipitously protected many of the Valley’s Civil War battlefields from other development, and allowed them to survive into the 21st century substantially intact.

  However, while still robust, the Valley’s farming economy—and thus its agricultural lands—is threatened. Low-density residential, light industry, and highway-oriented commercial development raise the value of farmland and hence property taxes. The nationwide decline in family-farm ownership, driven by a range of cultural and economic factors, is mirrored here in the Valley. As the number and economic strength of farmers wane, so too does their voice in local, state, and national politics. It becomes more difficult to assure that government policies support farming and the preservation of agricultural lands.

  Though Virginia has no comprehensive program for purchase of agricultural conservation easements (or “development rights”), the state’s Agricultural and Forestal Districts program to protect farmlands is widely used in the District. Tens of thousands of acres of agricultural land, including thousands of acres in and around District battlefields, now are protected voluntarily through this program. These represent only a small portion of all the agricultural lands in the District, however, and none of the counties within the District have developed agricultural preservation or development plans.
• **Interstate 81 Expansion:** The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is proposing to widen I-81 to a minimum of six lanes, with eight-lane sections in some urban areas. I-81 travels the length of the District and bisects the Third Winchester, Cedar Creek, Fisher’s Hill, Tom’s Brook, and New Market battlefields. Proposed changes to this interstate threaten potential harm to these battlefields in particular, and to the District as a whole. Impacts will be especially acute around interchanges, where additional land for ramps will be required and access roads and businesses may have to be relocated. Efforts to limit the extent of land condemnation by keeping the widened roadway within the existing right-of-way may mean the loss of the road’s wide median and scenic, rural character.\(^8\)

• **Other Major Road Improvements:** Growing traffic demands in the region have led to proposals for a number of road improvements that will affect historic routes and battlefields. At least three major road improvements are currently under discussion or study. Virginia Route 37 bypasses Winchester to the west, cutting through Second Winchester and Second (and First) Kernstown battlefields. Plans are now underway to extend the bypass around the east side of the city. The proposed extension would bisect the Third Winchester battlefield as well as damage other Civil War-era resources. In Harrisonburg, a circumferential bypass of the city has been proposed that could affect Cross Keys and Port Republic battlefields. Finally, improvements are under study for U.S. 340 which could significantly alter the landscape of the Page Valley corridor much used during the War for troop movements.

  Secondary development stemming from road improvements is a concern throughout the District. Greater access to the lands along these routes will result in increased development pressure.

• **Threats to Historic Roads and Corridors:** Although they have been updated, widened, and covered with asphalt, many of the District’s historical roads still

---

\(^8\) Present and future traffic volumes—especially heavy truck traffic on I-81—remain a major issue throughout the Shenandoah Valley. On September 7, 2000, the VDOT released the Virginia Intermodal Feasibility Study pursuant to House Joint Resolution 704 that considers the use of intermodal transfer of heavy truck traffic to rail. Additional studies of this concept are now proposed.
follow their original alignments, and many retain a level of integrity that makes it possible to interpret troop movements and 19th-century landscapes. All these roads are threatened by incremental residential, commercial, and industrial development. Few have any protections to retain their scenic or historic qualities and no state or county road maintenance policies are in place to maintain the rural character of these roads. The loss of character of the District's historic routes would affect visitors' ability to understand the linkages and landscape between the battlefields.

Protection of these routes is encouraged by P.L. 104-333. Some would likely qualify for state scenic byway designation and others might qualify under the federal program.

**Use and Modernization of Rail Routes:** During the Civil War the Virginia Central and B&O railroad lines in the Shenandoah Valley were of major strategic importance to both the Union and Confederate armies. Today, contemporary lines extend the length of the Valley, serving freight traffic but offering no passenger service. Two proposals exist to reintroduce passenger rail and transport tourists through the Valley. One line would run only in Shenandoah County, while the other would extend from at least Winchester to Staunton.9 These proposals are appealing but likely to face challenges. Ownership of lines is fragmented throughout the Valley, and freight lines generally consider passenger use to be disruptive to their operations and discourage re-establishment of passenger operations.

Although scenic issues are less of a concern with rail lines, increasing pressure for freight use may lead to replacement of historic overpass bridges to accommodate the additional height demanded by modern freight trains. Heavier, longer, and more frequent freight trains may also disrupt communities and the many at-grade crossings along their routes.

---

9 An agreement has been reached for Valley Trains and Tours, Inc. to purchase the Norfolk Southern corporation rail line between Strasburg Junction and Shenandoah Caverns on which to run excursion trains.
• **Loss of Historic Resources:** While private owners, community groups and institutions, and public agencies have preserved a number of the District's historic resources—its structures, sites, and cultural landscapes—the future of others is threatened by changing cultural and economic forces. The cultural landscape is particularly fragile and difficult to define.

  Preservation tools are employed unevenly in the District, and only rarely outside settled areas. A small number of battlefields or cultural landscapes are protected by local preservation initiatives. In addition, a number of battlefield-related historic resources are listed in the National Register of Historic Places or designated National Historic Landmarks, providing a recognition of significance but affording little direct protection for the resources. Because most of the lands within the District are privately owned, actions affecting them are generally not subject to state or federal historic preservation protections. However, local controls and incentives are generally more effective anyway in promoting respectful treatment and preservation of resources. The Shenandoah Preservation League was created in 1999 to provide Valley-wide preservation leadership in addition to community-based preservation organizations.

• **Threats to Archaeological Resources:** There are nearly 500 known archaeological sites on the District's ten battlefields alone, and hundreds more throughout the Valley. A number of federal laws (see Appendix D) protect these resources when a federal project or funds are involved in alterations to a site. However, no local ordinances in the District require private developers to include archaeological testing or address issues of protection or recovery. Development throughout the District poses a threat to many documented archaeological sites.

  Tourists, residents, workers, and reenactors all can degrade the historical value of archaeological sites by leaving behind trash and other modern-day objects. Reenactors may pose a special threat in this regard because of their use of replica and actual relics on the battlefields.

---

10 Changes to resources within designated historic districts are subject to architectural review in Berryville, Front Royal, Monterey, Staunton, Strasburg, Winchester, and Clarke County. Page and Frederick counties use local advisory boards, while Warren County uses, and Augusta County suggests use of, preservation overlay zoning. The Luray comprehensive plan recommends designation of historic districts.
Relic hunters who excavate and remove archaeological artifacts can cause the loss not only of the objects themselves, but also of important information about the location and context of these objects—information that could enhance the accuracy of the historical record. Although illegal on most public-trust-owned land, relic hunting is difficult to police even on these properties; the Valley’s many non-publicly held battlefield lands are even more vulnerable to this damage.

• **Threats to Community Character:** The pace and scale of modern development are eroding the distinctive regional character of the District’s many towns and villages, replacing neighborhood shops and quiet, tree-lined streets with an anonymous parade of national chain stores, strip malls, and multi-lane, high-speed roadways. In New Market, for example, visitors traveling U.S. Route 211 to the town’s National Register-listed Historic District must negotiate a sprawl of modern services, power lines, and towering signs visible from I-81, which line the entrance to the historic district and obscure its historic character.

  Communities throughout the Valley now face the difficult challenge of balancing preservation with growth. Modern development is inevitable and necessary; the challenge facing the District is how to balance development with preservation of the Valley’s traditional character.

• **Threats to Natural Resources:** The same forces threatening cultural resources also threaten open space, wildlife habitat, rivers, and other natural resources. The Valley’s natural heritage is an essential element of the District’s character, and played an important role in its history.

**INTERPRETATION ISSUES**

More than 30 museums, preservation organizations, heritage societies, and tourism organizations provide interpretation of the Valley’s Civil War history. These interpretive sites range in size from small commemorative exhibits and volunteer organizations to large, well-funded and staffed facilities. Operating largely independently of each other, they present a variety of challenges and opportunities.

• **Uneven and Limited Battlefield Interpretation:** Efforts to interpret Civil War battlefields are unevenly scattered throughout the District, and available
interpretation is limited.\textsuperscript{11} There is no general organization of battlefield interpretation among the Valley battlefields, nor is there a regional group coordinating interpretation of all the battlefields or even all of one campaign. The quality of interpretation ranges from simple historical markers and wayside signs to the staffed visitor centers at Cedar Creek and New Market. Guided tours are available for special groups, but little to no self-guided tour information is available, and most existing brochures do not cover the battles broadly or deeply. Finally, because public battlefield access is limited, visitors have too few opportunities to experience stories of the War on the actual ground where they took place.

- **Narrow Interpretation of Civil War History:** Most Civil War museums in the District contain private or small publicly owned collections, consisting largely of military artifacts and providing information limited almost entirely to three aspects of Civil War history: (a) military leaders (Jackson, Sheridan, Early, Ashby, Mosby, and others); (b) Jackson's 1862 Campaign; and (c) "soldier's life" artifacts.

  Except for the Virginia Civil War Trails driving tour, which has significantly enhanced Civil War interpretation in the Valley, there is no comprehensive interpretation demonstrating the relationship between the different battlefields nor the significance or strategic importance of individual battles in relation to the larger War. Also needed is information concerning the impact of topography, timing, and climatic conditions, comprehensive coverage of campaigns other than Jackson's, and interpretation of civilian life before, during, and after the War.

- **Limited Museum Operations:** Many of the District's museums and interpretive sites operate on very small budgets, with limited hours and staffing. Some depend entirely on volunteer support. Under such constraints there are considerable challenges to effective marketing and to coordinating hours and interpretation with other sites. As a result, most of these sites suffer low visitation rates.

\textsuperscript{11} Only Cedar Creek and New Market have staffed visitor centers. Other battlefields are interpreted mainly through wayside signs. The Virginia Civil War Trails' "Avenue of Invasion" tour links some battlefields and other sites and provides basic interpretive information.
- **Overlooked Commemorative Sites**: Commemorative markers and Civil War cemeteries throughout the Valley vary considerably in terms of accessibility, visibility, and quality of interpretive information. There are no policies regulating new or existing markers or monuments, and in some cases several may be found at the same site commemorating the same individual or event, leading to interpretive and visual confusion.

- **Unrealized Educational Opportunities**: Today, only New Market among the District’s battlefields is regularly visited by school groups. Few of the ten battlefields offer age-appropriate interpretation for school children. Furthermore, existing interpretive information does not provide students with a comprehensive picture of the War, its relevance to the nation’s history, the Valley’s strategic significance within the War, or the relationship between the Valley’s battlefields.12

---

**TOURISM AND VISITOR SERVICES ISSUES**

Protecting the District’s battlefields and related resources is vital. Making them available to the public is equally important. Moreover, support for preservation efforts is built upon a continued and growing public interest in these sites and the history they tell.

- **Coordinating Visitor Services**: Among the District’s wide variety of public, private, and non-profit attractions, hospitality providers, tourism representatives, and regional destination-marketing organizations (DMOs), there is little coordination of visitor services to meet the demands of an increasingly

12 Several District colleges and universities, including the McCormick Civil War Institute at Shenandoah University, the Virginia Military Institute, and James Madison University, offer undergraduate and/or graduate programs in Civil War research and education. Blue Ridge Community College, Bridgewater College, and Lord Fairfax Community College could offer similar programs. During the 1999-2000 academic year a senior information technology class at Lord Fairfax used the Commission as a case study, developing recommendations for the use of electronic technology to connect battlefields and sites and provide basic visitor information.
sophisticated traveling public. There is also a need for an increased level of hospitality training throughout the District, especially as it relates to Civil War sites and resources.

- **Encouraging Government Commitment and Support:** The District lacks significant government support for systematic development of both public and private visitor services. Because it is difficult to compare the economic benefits of heritage tourism with other development proposals, many area governments have not yet recognized the economic development value of historic preservation. While many of the counties promote tourism, only the Winchester-Frederick County Economic Development Commission and the Page County Department of Economic Development provide direct support to tourist sites.

- **Balancing Tourism with Preservation:** While some tourism is desirable, too much can be detrimental, and finding the proper balance will be important for the District’s future. Increased tourism may lead to more traffic, greater wear and tear on fragile historic resources, and more pressure for development of facilities and services—such as hotels and fast-food restaurants—that encroach upon the region’s character and sense of community. Several communities in the District have already expressed concern over these possibilities.

- **Protecting Battlefields from Recreational Development:** As the population in the District grows and demand increases for recreational facilities, preserved battlefield lands may come under greater pressure for use as parks, threatening these lands with loss of integrity through inappropriate recreational development.

---

13 The Shenandoah Valley Travel Association (SVTA) promotes the Valley and its individual member sites, but does not coordinate actions between them. The SVTA and other DMOs generally provide regional marketing and promotion, not coordination or tourism planning and development. The “Visit the Valley” Coalition, an informal network of organizations in the northern end of the District, coordinates schedules and activities and shares a web page.
A cooperative relationship between many public, private, non-profit, and government entities throughout the Valley will be necessary for the successful protection and stewardship of battlefield lands. The number of groups involved and a general tradition of independent operation means significant challenges face any effort to build such a relationship.

- **Limited Experience in Regional Cooperation**: The District is a new regional concept in an area where currently there is little actual regional cooperation. While some individual areas of the District have shown recent interest in increased collaboration, cooperation across the entire eight counties has been extremely limited. The District's communities include both one of Virginia's fastest-growing counties as well as its least populous one, with widely disparate priorities, challenges, economies, and interests to be considered. Successful fulfillment of the vision of the legislation and the Commission requires that the new Foundation find ways to forge successful working partnerships between the Valley's communities, governments, and organizations.

- **Limited Experience with Cross-Disciplinary Cooperation**: The Commission represented the first-ever effort to bring together a coalition of the area's many specific interest groups to act on behalf of the entire Valley region. Distinct and sometimes conflicting agendas, concerns, priorities, philosophies, means of operating, and even professional jargon make cross-disciplinary collaboration between these many groups a significant challenge, yet afford the opportunity for new perspectives and unique approaches.

- **Local Resistance to State and Federal Involvement**: In the Shenandoah Valley, the familiar American populist tradition of distrust for outside government agencies is compounded by a lingering resentment over the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park and a feeling of long-standing neglect at the hands of state government. Yet successful implementation of the Management Plan will require the assistance and expertise of state and federal agencies. Building trust between local communities and state and federal representatives will be essential if the new Foundation is to fulfill its mission.
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INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

The Shenandoah Valley was a key theater in the Civil War, and the counties comprising the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District (District) together lay at the heart of the most significant campaigns and battles waged in the Valley: Stonewall Jackson’s successful 1862 campaign, the Gettysburg Campaign of 1863, and the decisive 1864 campaigns. The first of these demonstrated the effectiveness of an offensive tied to strategic use of geography, diverted Union troops from critical battles pending around Richmond, and raised Confederate morale throughout the South. Winchester’s strategic value was demonstrated in the 1863 campaign—control of the town meant control of the region and its vital rail lines, and opened the door for the Confederate march to Gettysburg. 1864 began with a Confederate success at New Market followed by General Jubal Early’s famous march to Washington, D.C. The longest in the Valley, Sheridan’s 1864 campaign involved the largest number of troops and the greatest loss of men and material, and played the most significant role in the War’s outcome. “The Burning,” evidence of which can still be seen today throughout the Valley, marked the climax of this campaign, as Union troops laid waste to the region in their ultimately successful strategy of total war.

Collectively, the battles waged within the District played a significant role in this defining moment in United States history. Nearly 150 years after the last shot was fired, echoes of the Civil War can still be heard in some of the nation’s most pressing social, cultural, and economic issues. Thus, preservation of the Valley’s historic resources is essential not only to our understanding of the past but also to our ability to shape the future.

Although the District has not been considered by the Secretary of the Interior for designation as a National Historic Landmark (NHL)—recognition given to the nation’s most important historic sites—it likely meets the standards, which are listed below and are more stringent than those necessary for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
• **The area is an outstanding example of a particular type of resource.** The District is an important example of a large cultural landscape, with an intact geography of the same ridges, roads, farms, towns, and rail lines that made the Valley strategically important during the War. Providing the Confederacy with food and supplies as well as a concealed route by which to threaten the North and distract Union forces, the landscape also defined campaigns in the Valley, shaped battle strategy, dictated troop movements, and determined battle locations.

• **The area possesses exceptional value in illustrating or interpreting the cultural themes of our nation’s heritage.** The District offers a unique context for understanding the Civil War. The stories of individual battles and campaigns, as well as those of many of the most decisive moments of the War, can be told through the Valley’s natural and human landscapes. Historic farms, towns, roads, and railroads help illustrate the strategic importance of the Valley and provide an understanding of civilian life during the War.

• **The area offers superlative opportunities for recreation, for public use and enjoyment, or for scientific study.** Within the District visitors can travel the roads and walk the ground where campaigns were waged and soldiers once marched and fought. They can visit the historic towns, homes, and farms of the District to understand the area’s agricultural heritage and gain perspective on civilian life during the War. In addition, they can enjoy the many recreational opportunities, including hiking, biking, canoeing, fishing, and hunting, afforded by the District’s natural resources.

• **The area retains a high degree of integrity.** Protected by federal parks and forests and by relatively unintrusive agricultural use, the District’s lands today retain much of their historical character and integrity. They have the capacity still to tell the stories both of individual elements in the Valley’s history as well as those of whole campaigns, battles, and communities.

Nationally significant cultural resources include districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects that possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting our heritage. They must possess a high degree of integrity of location, design, setting,
materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The District is an example of a significant cultural resource because it:

- is associated with events that illustrate the broad national patterns of United States history. Key components of the Civil War can be interpreted through the District, offering visitors an opportunity to deepen their understanding of this pivotal event in American history.

- is substantively associated with the lives of people important to the history of the United States. By their actions in the Shenandoah Valley, Robert E. Lee, Thomas (Stonewall) Jackson, Jubal Early, and Philip Sheridan helped shape the course of the nation’s history.

- as a whole represents a significant, distinctive, and exceptional landscape. It presents an opportunity to interpret a theater of war showing campaigns, troop movements, engagements, and civilian involvement.

**GEOGRAPHY**

The District is located in northwestern Virginia and includes eight Shenandoah Valley counties: Augusta, Clarke, Frederick, Highland, Page, Rockingham, Shenandoah, and Warren; and the independent cities of Harrisonburg, Staunton, Waynesboro, and Winchester (see Map 2).

The District stretches roughly 130 miles, from its northern end about 75 miles west of Washington, D.C., to the southern end approximately 100 miles northwest of Richmond, the capital of the Commonwealth and former capital of the Confederacy. The Appalachian range’s Little North Mountain, Great North Mountain, and Shenandoah Mountain form the western margin of the District and the Blue Ridge Mountains lie to the east. Elevations along the ridges frequently exceed 3,000 feet above sea level.

Settlers were attracted to the Valley mainly for its rich agricultural lands, and today most of the land within the District is still used for agricultural purposes, the mainstay of the region’s economy. Northern areas of the District are principally
The District is mostly rural—farmlands crossed by historic roads and dotted with small towns and villages. In 1998 the population of the District was approximately 384,800 residents, or 5.7 percent of the total state population. Of these residents, just over one-third lived in the few urbanized communities, mainly Harrisonburg, Staunton, Waynesboro, and Winchester. Although many young residents are leaving the area, new arrivals are moving here from other parts of the state and from the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Expanded interstate and commuter rail systems have enabled many of these new residents to commute to work in the Washington, D.C., and Richmond areas. Population trends in the District are identified in Figure 1.

Employment in the Valley is based on a combination of agriculture, manufacturing, services, retail trade, and government. Major agricultural production includes poultry, cattle, and orchards. Major nonagricultural employment is focused on manufacturing, services, and retail trade. Personal income is generated principally from manufacturing, services, government, and construction.

SOCIAL HISTORY

Some 12,000 years ago, the District’s first inhabitants arrived, Native American hunters and gatherers, who remained primarily in the Valley, venturing into the mountains for short periods of time. Seasonal hunting camps have been discovered in the Blue Ridge Mountains dating as early as 8000 B.C. By A.D. 1000, farming had been introduced into the Valley and settlements became more permanent. During the 17th century, Iroquois tribes—Manahoac, Monacan, Chickacoan—inhabited the area, although constant raids from tribes at the northern and southern ends of the Valley minimized Native American settlement in the area.

The first Europeans to explore the Shenandoah Valley are thought to have come here in 1650. In 1716, Governor Spottswood from Williamsburg led an expedition across the Blue Ridge Mountains to encourage settlement in the Piedmont Plateau.
and Shenandoah Valley. Starting in 1726, Germans and Scotch-Irish began to settle the Valley and by 1754, Native American settlements had disappeared. But the Valley settled differently from the rest of the state. The Blue Ridge separated its German and Scotch-Irish settlers from the English settlements in the rest of Virginia. Unlike the large plantations in the Piedmont and Tidewater areas, much of the Valley was made up of small farms, whose prosperity and productivity did not rely on slave labor.
By the 1860s, the Shenandoah Valley area was well settled and trade routes provided direct access between the North and the South. The Valley was the richest agricultural area of a wealthy state. The Valley's fields grew large amounts of grain and two railroads carried the surplus away. The granary of Virginia became the “breadbasket of the Confederacy” and a prime military target.

After the Civil War, settlement patterns were relatively stable. Farms and rural industries slowly recovered. Roadways were later constructed to connect the Piedmont and the Valley, establishing solid transportation routes, expanding trade patterns, and providing cultural ties between the Scotch-Irish and German settlements on the west side of the Valley and the English settlements on the east.

**DISTRICT RESOURCES**

The legislation that created the District also recognized the importance of ten Civil War battlefields in the District. Map 2 shows the distribution of battlefields in the District and the core and study areas for each battlefield. Figure 2 displays the acreage of each battlefield.

Each battlefield occupies a distinct landscape, one that affected battle strategies, troop movements, and the outcome of the engagement. The following section briefly describes the landscape of each battlefield. Individual maps of each battlefield and of key landscape features are included in Appendix E. (An in-depth description and history of the battles can be found in the Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia [1992].)
McDowell Battlefield: McDowell Battlefield and Highland County. Lying upon the mountains and valleys of Highland County, McDowell battlefield includes the town of McDowell, the floodplain of the Bullpasture River, and, primarily, Sitlington's Hill, a rise on Bullpasture Mountain. Most of the decisive action in the battle took place on the hill, but skirmishes and minor engagements occurred at the pass on Shenandoah Mountain and in an area north of Monterey, the county seat. Today, most of the hills and mountains are covered with forests, and the bottomland along the Bullpasture River is mainly cleared for agricultural uses.
**Cross Keys Battlefield:** Port Republic and Rockingham County. Most of the decisive action on the Cross Keys battlefield took place on the rolling fields of southern Rockingham County. This area is mostly farmland divided by shallow stream valleys. Important action took place within Port Republic, a small village lying at the confluence of the North River and the South River. The road (modern Virginia Route 659) connecting the town with the core fighting areas of the battlefield is included in the study area because of its importance to troop movements and communications. Massanutten Mountain is clearly visible from the battlefield.

**Port Republic Battlefield:** Port Republic and Rockingham County. The village of Port Republic, at the confluence of the North River and the South River, saw early action in the Battle of Port Republic. The battle then moved northeast into the broad floodplain of the South River. Much of the floodplain was and continues to be used for agriculture. The rising Blue Ridge Mountains bound the battlefield on the southeast. The Coaling is a prominent feature on the eastern edge of the battlefield. Union guns were placed on this small knob and used by both sides to control action on the battlefield. Massanutten Mountain is clearly visible from most of the battlefield.

**New Market Battlefield:** New Market and Shenandoah County. The Battle of New Market took place along the Valley Pike (modern U.S. Route 11) around the town of New Market in southern Shenandoah County. Long and open, this area undulates over low rises and shallow swales, but the core fighting took place on the high ground west of the pike. Today, I-81 cuts through the battlefield, and some lands have been developed with the expansion of New Market. Other lands like the New Market Battlefield State Historical Park are protected for commemoration.

**Tom’s Brook Battlefield:** Shenandoah County. Tom’s Brook, one of the smaller battlefields, occupies rolling hills around the town of Tom’s Brook and to the west. Round Hill punctuates the area with a prominent rise. A large part of the action took place along the Back Road (Virginia Route 623), other secondary roads, and the Valley Pike. As during the battle, much of this landscape remains in agricultural use, with scattered houses and outbuildings and stands of trees between fields. Some newer development has occurred along I-81 and U.S. Route 11.

**Fisher’s Hill Battlefield:** Strasburg and Shenandoah County. West of the town of Strasburg, occupying the bottomlands and flanking hillsides of Tumbling Run, Fisher’s Hill battlefield is defined by hills upon which the opposing armies engaged each other. Confederate entrenchments south of Tumbling Run cut lines through the fields, and prominent hilltops were used for signaling and coordination of troop movements.
The battlefield is bound by the wildly curving North Fork Shenandoah River on the east and Little North Mountain to the west. I-81 runs through the center of the battlefield.

**Cedar Creek Battlefield:** Strasburg and Middletown, and Frederick, Warren, and Shenandoah counties. The Cedar Creek battlefield marks an irregular shape across the landscape, including the rolling farmland west of Middletown upon which Belle Grove mansion presides, Middletown, the sloping lands down to the North Fork of the Shenandoah River, the south slope of Massanutten Mountain, the Valley Pike down to and through Strasburg and Cedar Creek, and the Fisher’s Hill and Tumbling Run areas. The battlefield is bisected by I-81.

**Second Kernstown Battlefield:** Winchester and Frederick County. Second Kernstown battlefield occupies the open, relatively flat farmlands south and southwest of Winchester along with the southern portion of Old Town Winchester. Much of the battlefield has been built upon since the battle, but portions significant to the battle remain intact as farmland.

**Second Winchester Battlefield:** Winchester and Frederick County. Second Winchester battlefield encompasses most of the city of Winchester along with some outlying streambeds and road corridors found largely to the west of Old Town Winchester. The city lies upon a low undulating plain between North Mountain to the west and the curving valleys of Opequon Creek to the east. Much of the historic core of the city is intact and now ringed by more recent residential, commercial, and industrial development. The rolling terrain outside the city contains both scattered agricultural areas—including orchards—and contemporary development.

**Opequon (Third Winchester) Battlefield:** Winchester and Frederick County. The large Opequon (Third Winchester) battlefield occupies most of present-day Winchester, including Old Town, plus the rolling topography east of town—especially the lands along present-day Virginia Route 7 and the “Berryville Canyon”—and lands northeast of town along Opequon Creek. Outside the city most of this landscape is open farmland with low rises punctuating the landscape. Today much of the area has been built upon, but most of the eastern stretches retain their integrity as farmland and orchards.
HISTORIC RESOURCES

The District is rich with Civil War and other historic resources in addition to the battlefields. It is still very rural with fields and forests dominating the landscape. Visitors can find historic farms that armies fought over and buildings that doubled as hospitals and headquarters. Some barns and outbuildings still show scars from “The Burning.” Some towns have taken steps to protect and promote their historic buildings and main streets and many modern roads follow historic routes that led troops to battle. Historic roads that may be eligible for scenic byway designation are described in the section on Scenic Resources.

The National Park Service (NPS) has determined two resources in the District to be nationally significant and has designated them as NHLs: Belle Grove and Cedar Creek battlefield (a combined listing), and Thomas (Stonewall) Jackson’s Headquarters in Winchester.

New Market battlefield and Belle Grove and Cedar Creek battlefield are listed in the National Register of Historic Places and the Virginia Landmark Register. Second Kernstown, McDowell, Second Winchester, and Opequon (Third Winchester) battlefields have been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining battlefields have not been analyzed but would likely be eligible for listing in the register. In addition to the battlefields, four historic districts and 17 individual resources that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places are found near the battlefields. A list of surveyed historic and architectural resources is included in Appendix F.

The Commonwealth of Virginia also designates rural historic districts for listing on the Virginia Landmark Register using National Register criteria. A rural historic landscape is defined as a “geographic area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features.” This designation focuses on the overall rural historic landscape rather than on individual features. In Virginia, there are twelve rural historic districts listed in the National Register of Historic Places or the Virginia Landmark Register, or both. Within the District, Long Marsh Run Rural Historic District and Greenway Rural Historic District are listed.
in the Virginia Landmark Register. The Long Marsh Run District has also been granted scenic byway and Virginia scenic river designations. Greenway District is also designated as a scenic byway.\textsuperscript{14}

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The oldest archaeological artifacts found in the Valley date back approximately 12,000 years. Tools made of jasper, found along the western slope of the Blue Ridge, suggest that indigenous peoples inhabited the Valley from as early as 10,000 to 8000 B.C. Evidence of archaic period (8000 B.C. to 1200 B.C.) habitation is revealed in a differentiation of tool types and uses that reflects changes in technology and diet. Woodland-period (1200 B.C. to A.D. 1600) artifacts reveal the evolution of the indigenous cultures into the peoples encountered by the earliest European pioneers.

The Civil War battlefields are, of course, one of the Valley’s most important archaeological resources. Many battlefields offer artifacts, soil strata, structural remains, or other features and combinations of features that enable archaeologists to recover information and answer important historical questions. Patterns of military debris have been used at some sites to corroborate known information regarding the location and movements of troops. Shell fragments and clusters of spent or dropped bullets can be used to identify the locations of battle lines and the types of artillery engaged.

Many artifacts have been recovered from the Civil War campaigns and encampments, but much still remains undiscovered. Experience has shown that significant archaeological evidence remains in the ground even though these lands have been farmed during the intervening 135 years.

Human remains are also an important part of the Civil War’s archaeological record. More than 2,900 soldiers perished on the ten battlefields included in this study. The dead were typically buried hastily, often where they had fallen, and many graves were poorly marked. In 1865-1866, local residents and the federal government disinterred many remains and reinterred them in national cemeteries. Often, however, only portions of the remains were recovered.

\textsuperscript{14} Virginia’s Rural Historic Districts, Making the Case.
The Virginia Department of Historic Resources and institutions such as James Madison University continue to investigate the archaeological record of the battlefields and other areas of the District. The Virginia Department of Historic Resources maintains a database of archaeological resources in the Commonwealth.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The District’s varied natural environment supports diverse biological communities, from mountain ecosystems to pasturelands and floodplains. The richness and integrity of the District’s natural resources, however, have been fragmented over time by population growth, development, and agriculture. Eight federally protected wildlife species and four federally protected plant species are known to be found within the District. The District also includes numerous state-listed plant and wildlife species in addition to 30 listed by federal and state authorities as being of “Special Concern.”

The District’s natural features include a karst topography riddled by sinkholes and cave openings. Much of the Shenandoah Valley is underlain by limestone and dolomite, and over millions of years, slightly acidic rainwater seeped through the earth’s subsurface and dissolved the rock, creating caves that now support distinct biological communities. Several caves have also been turned into tourist attractions.

The Shenandoah River, including the North Fork and South Fork, is not only one of the District’s most scenic resources but also the major domestic and industrial water source for many counties, and a power and water source for recreation and agriculture. Current water supplies barely meet the needs of District residents and farmers, however, and development continues to increase demand.

Currently, no river segments within the District are designated under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. However, the North Fork and South Fork of the Shenandoah River and two segments of Passage Creek are eligible for study for National Wild and Scenic River designation. Segments of the Bullpasture, Cowpasture, Jackson, North, and St. Mary’s rivers, as well as Back Creek, have also been determined eligible for federal Wild and Scenic River designation in the George Washington National Forest’s Revised Land and Resource Management Plan. The eligible portions of these rivers and the one-quarter-mile-wide corridors on each side are

---

managed by the USDA Forest Service in the George Washington National Forest to meet the requirements of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.16

Virginia’s Scenic Rivers Act of 197017 protects and preserves certain rivers or sections of rivers possessing natural or pastoral beauty. Requirements and management options for state scenic river designation are different from those required for national designation. Legislatively designated components of the Virginia Scenic Rivers program are:

- Shenandoah River from the Warren-Clarke county line to the West Virginia line
- St. Mary’s River from headwaters to George Washington National Forest boundary in Augusta County

Desirable components that were evaluated and found worthy of designation include two sections of the North Fork Shenandoah River from the Burnshire Bridge to Strasburg (Seven Bends) and from Strasburg to Front Royal. The potential components that were identified as being worthy of future evaluation are:

- Cedar Creek from the headwaters to the North Fork Shenandoah River
- North Fork of the Shenandoah River from New Market to Riverton
- South Fork of the Shenandoah River from Port Republic to Goods Mill and overall to Front Royal
- Laurel Fork from headwaters to West Virginia line

The Virginia Outdoors Plan 1996 recommends that the following river segments be evaluated to determine their suitability as Virginia Scenic Rivers:

- Calfpasture River in Rockbridge and Augusta counties from Marble Valley to Goshen Pass
- Cowpasture River in Highland and Bath counties from Panta to Virginia Route 42
- South Fork of the Shenandoah River in Rockingham County
- All of Laurel Fork in Highland County

---

16 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 USC 1271-1287 (P.L. 90-542, as amended).
17 Code of Virginia §10.401-407.
SCENIC RESOURCES

The District’s exceptional beauty is one of its greatest resources. The Valley floor provides views of farmland, rolling hills, dales, and glens, the Blue Ridge Mountains, Massanutten Mountain, and the highlands. On most days, clear, unspoiled views can be enjoyed throughout the District. On hazy days, low-level ozone, pollen, and air pollution hinder long-range views. This haze helps give the ridge of mountains along the eastern boundary of the District its famous bluish hue.

The Commonwealth values scenic resources for many reasons, especially their economic value. The 1992 Virginia Economic Development policy directly and indirectly refers to the visual environment and scenic resources for promoting economic growth in Virginia. These resources include outstanding scenic and recreational attractions.

The 1992 Virginia Economic Development policy states that:

- Economic benefits of recreation can be related to scenic quality
- Tourism is linked to visual resources
- Landscapes form a sense of place and provide a common point of reference for many generations
- Natural beauty is considered the first criterion in selecting outdoor places to recreate
- Visual resources relate to the presence of natural resources and open space protection
- Driving for pleasure is enjoyed by 60 percent of all Virginians

As stated in the “Natural Resources” section of this chapter, several rivers and creeks are eligible for designation as “wild and scenic” rivers or as state scenic rivers. The District also has many scenic roads, and a recent AAA survey named I-81 the nation’s most scenic interstate. The following state roads are eligible for Virginia scenic byway status:

- Routes 600, 622, and 628 (Frederick County)
- Routes 624, 658, and 661 (Warren County)
RESO URCE PRO T ECTIO N AN D CON SERVATION

The Battlefields

The analysis conducted during the 1992 Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia concluded that development pressures threaten the preservation of all the battlefields under study. The battlefields near Winchester face the greatest threat whereas McDowell, Port Republic, and Cross Keys are, for the moment, at lower risk from development. The status of all ten battlefields is listed below in order of highest to lowest risk.

1. Opequon (Third Winchester)
2. Second Kernstown
3. Second Winchester
4. New Market
5. Tom’s Brook
6. Fisher’s Hill
7. Cedar Creek
8. Cross Keys
9. Port Republic
10. McDowell

Most of these battlefields lie within now privately owned land and are largely unprotected by any formal designation or commitment. As outlined in Figure 3, slightly more than 2,100 of the District’s more than 30,000 core battlefield acres are held and protected by public-trust ownership. At New Market, approximately 238 core acres are included in the New Market Battlefield State Historical Park owned and interpreted by the Virginia Military Institute. Approximately 582 acres of the Belle Grove Plantation and the Cedar Creek battlefield core are owned and
administered by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Belle Grove Inc., and the Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation.

Sections of reconstructed and original earthworks at the Cedar Creek battlefield are protected and open to the public on the property of the Stonewall Jackson Museum at Hupp’s Hill. The Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT), a private, non-profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battlefield</th>
<th>Core Area (acres)</th>
<th>Study Area (acres)</th>
<th>Core Area Retaining Integrity</th>
<th>Core Area Acreage Protected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Republic</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom’s Brook</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Hill</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>15,607</td>
<td>5,475</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>22,274</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Kernstown</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opequon (Third Winchester)</td>
<td>4,914</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>30,068</td>
<td>92,236*</td>
<td>21,096 (70%)</td>
<td>2,133 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, NPS 1992; updated by Commission and OCULUS, 2000
* Study Area acreage includes Core Area acreage
preservation organization, holds in fee simple 229 acres at Opequon (Third Winchester), 195 acres at Fisher's Hill, seven acres at Port Republic, 126 acres at McDowell, and seven acres at Tom's Brook. In addition, the CWPT also holds conservation easements on land at the McDowell, Cross Keys, Port Republic, Tom's Brook, and Fisher's Hill battlefields. The private, non-profit Lee-Jackson Foundation owns 100 acres at Cross Keys and an additional 100 acres at McDowell. The Highland Historical Society owns 26 acres at McDowell, and a private Civil War reenactment group owns seven acres surrounding the Civil War fortification, Star Fort, at Second Winchester.

Publicly owned battlefield lands are limited to about 19 acres of the Tom's Brook battlefield core area within a Shenandoah County recreational park, and portions of Cedar Creek and Fisher's Hill battlefields that fall within the boundaries of the George Washington National Forest. Figure 4 identifies the ownership, holding group, and public accessibility of the ten battlefields.

The District

Most of the District's lands remain either forested (particularly within the George Washington National Forest) or dedicated to agricultural use, and thus retain much of their rural and scenic qualities. Map 3 illustrates the overall land cover for the District and Figure 5 identifies land use/land cover by acreage and percent of land type for each battlefield.

The Commonwealth of Virginia's Agricultural and Forestal Districts Program encourages local governments to establish agricultural districts in which voluntarily participating farm owners receive special land use tax assessments in exchange for maintaining their properties for agricultural uses. Participating properties can be subdivided only for use by family members, and new non-farm construction is prohibited except to house farm workers and family members. This program places limits on extension of public utility lines through these areas, assures that localities cannot enforce noxious-use ordinances that restrict farming and forestry unreasonably, and allows agriculture district ordinances to take precedence over other local land use regulation. Currently, 113,908 acres of farmland lie within established agricultural districts throughout the District.
## FIGURE 4
### BATTLEFIELD ACCESS, OWNERSHIP, AND PROTECTION, 2000

**Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battlefield</th>
<th>Public Access</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Core Acreage Protected (Ownership / Holding Groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>Yes, unmarked</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>261 ac. (CWPT; Lee-Jackson Foundation and Highland Historical Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>Limited, unmarked</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>191 ac. (Lee-Jackson Foundation; Conservation Fund easement and CWPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Republic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10 ac. (CWPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>238 ac. (Virginia Military Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom's Brook</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>61 ac. (CWPT; Shenandoah County Recreational Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Hill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>239 ac. (CWPT; Conservation Fund easement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>582 ac. (Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation; the National Trust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester</td>
<td>Yes, Limited</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7 ac. (Middlesex Artillery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Kernstown</td>
<td>None, overlook</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>315 ac. (Kernstown Battlefield Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opequon (Third Winchester)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>229 ac. (CWPT; Middlesex Artillery)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by John Milner Associates, Inc., 1999
### FIGURE 5
LAND USE-LAND COVER FOR CORE BATTLEFIELD AREA BY ACREAGE AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CORE BATTLEFIELD AREA, 1992

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battlefield Core Area</th>
<th>Developed Land</th>
<th>Agricultural Land</th>
<th>Forest Land</th>
<th>Barren / Unknown Use</th>
<th>Total Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres / %</td>
<td>Acres / %</td>
<td>Acres / %</td>
<td>Acres / %</td>
<td>Acres / %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>164.85 / 7.30</td>
<td>494.53 / 21.90</td>
<td>1,598.77 / 70.80</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2,258.15 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>120.56 / 5.60</td>
<td>2,032.25 / 94.40</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2,152.81 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Republic</td>
<td>90.80 / 4.20</td>
<td>1,574.18 / 73.40</td>
<td>480.40 / 22.40</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2,145.38 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>931.80 / 41.22</td>
<td>1,528.66 / 49.10</td>
<td>207.07 / 9.16</td>
<td>45.21 / 2.00</td>
<td>2,260.58 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom's Brook</td>
<td>336.87 / 16.69</td>
<td>1,314.80 / 65.14</td>
<td>349.19 / 17.30</td>
<td>17.56 / 0.87*</td>
<td>2,018.42 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Hill</td>
<td>327.61 / 11.91</td>
<td>1,373.46 / 49.93</td>
<td>980.66 / 35.65</td>
<td>69.04 / 2.51</td>
<td>2,750.77 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>662.43 / 10.56</td>
<td>4,158.95 / 66.30</td>
<td>1,407.02 / 22.43</td>
<td>44.54 / 0.71</td>
<td>6,272.94 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester</td>
<td>1,037.99 / 33.34</td>
<td>1,528.66 / 49.10</td>
<td>7.16 / 0.23</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2,573.81 / 82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Kernstown</td>
<td>1,105.30 / 50.17</td>
<td>1,090.54 / 49.50</td>
<td>7.27 / 0.33</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2,203.12 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opequon (Third Winchester)</td>
<td>2,382.65 / 45.05</td>
<td>2,011.90 / 38.04</td>
<td>484.46 / 9.16</td>
<td>409.89 / 7.75*</td>
<td>5,288.90 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, September 1992, Tables 12 and 15.
*Unidentified Land Use/Land Cover.
Significant District lands are included in federal, state, and regional parks and preserves. The District is home to the Shenandoah National Park and the George Washington National Forest, and also contains several state parks and numerous local parks. Figure 6 identifies the major public lands within the District by county and Map 4 illustrates the location of most of these lands.

CIVIL WAR INTERPRETATION IN THE DISTRICT

As outlined in Chapter One of this document, Civil War interpretation within the District is currently quite limited, with little or none of it coordinated among sites.

Of the District’s Civil War sites and resources, the well-staffed Hall of Valor at New Market and Cedar Creek Battlefield Visitors Center receive by far the greatest number of visitors. A much smaller number visit Port Republic’s local history museum. There is parking, a trail, and modest interpretation at Fisher’s Hill battlefield. The Stonewall Jackson Museum at Hupp’s Hill, though not a subject of the legislation, is a battle site open to visitors. The Kurtz Cultural Center, in Old Town Winchester, interprets Civil War events along with other city history. However, access to the battlefields that ring the city is limited. Other Civil War sites open to the public in Winchester include Jackson’s Headquarters, Old Town Winchester, the National Cemetery, and the Stonewall Cemetery. A Civil War museum, now being established in the old Frederick County courthouse, will house a large private collection of artifacts and also interpret some aspects of the conflict. It is likely that both McDowell and Edinburg also will develop local history museums featuring Civil War interpretation, and that preservation of Rose Hill by the Glass-Glen Burnie Museum, Inc. will present interpretation opportunities.

A wide range of interpretive markers as well as miscellaneous commemorative markers and memorials are scattered throughout the Valley, installed at various times by various organizations. These include roadside markers placed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Civil War Centennial markers, and markers installed by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. While explaining or commemorating particular events and individuals, these markers, signs, and memorials offer little larger contextual interpretation.
**FIGURE 6**
MAJOR FEDERAL, STATE, AND REGIONAL LANDS BY COUNTY, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>Natural Chimneys Regional Park</td>
<td>UVRPA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folly Mills Creek Fen Natural Area Preserve</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cowbake Prairie</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shenandoah National Park</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Caverns Regional Park &amp; National Natural Landmark</td>
<td>UVRPA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little North Mountain Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Sky Meadows State Park</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Clearbrook Park</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherando Park</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Shenandoah National Park</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luray Caverns National Natural Landmark</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>Shenandoah National Park</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shenandoah County Recreation Park</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren**</td>
<td>Shenandoah River “Andy Guest” State Park</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shenandoah National Park</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurel Fork Highlands Preserve</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*UVRPA is the Upper Valley Regional Park Authority

**Other federal lands include the Smithsonian Conservation Research Center and the U.S. Customs Training Facility in Warren County
Guidebooks and brochures available to visitors include several histories of the Civil War in the Valley. The Shenandoah Valley Travel Association offers a brochure outlining Valley campaigns and listing Civil War sites open to the public. Other county or quasi-governmental organizations produce brochures and guides to Civil War sites in their immediate jurisdictions; however, few of these publications place individual sites within their greater contexts. No single guide or history has yet been developed for the specific purpose of linking the District’s Civil War sites and battlefields into a unified whole. The most comprehensive interpretive experience now available in the District is provided by the integrated brochure and modest wayside interpretive signs of the Virginia Civil War Trails’ “Avenue of Invasion” tour route. Self-guided visitors find their way along this route through a combination of Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) directional signs and the Virginia Civil War Trails “trailblazer” signs.

The largest and most popular events, lasting several days each, take place annually at New Market and Cedar Creek battlefields, while a smaller reenactment is held every other year at McDowell battlefield.

Guided group tours, often led by local experts, are one of the best ways for visitors to learn about the District’s Civil War history. Unfortunately, most casual visitors to the Valley do not have the opportunity to take advantage of these usually prearranged tours.

**PRIMARY CIVIL WAR SITES**

Today, visitors to the Valley find not only scattered and widely varied interpretation of the District’s Civil War history but also fairly limited access to battlefield lands. Only New Market and Cedar Creek battlefields offer both public access and significant interpretive facilities.

The CWPT provides some access to its several hundred acres of battlefield lands. At Fisher’s Hill, the limited interpretation and access serve as a model of a volunteer-driven program. The seven CWPT-owned acres at Tom’s Brook will soon have improved public access to the heart of the battlefield, including a possible parking
area. A small portion of the Port Republic battlefield is owned by the CWPT and open to the public, and access is soon to be provided on CWPT lands at Opequon (Third Winchester) and McDowell battlefields. The CWPT recently purchased an easement at Cross Keys that provides for limited public access to parts of that battlefield. Figure 7 summarizes interpretation and access at the battlefields.

**RELATED CIVIL WAR SITES**

There are 32 Civil War-related interpretive sites within the District not directly tied to any specific battlefield. Generally volunteer-run, often with limited hours, most of these currently do not place themselves in context with other sites in the District or the larger Civil War.

The exception is Belle Grove, a National Trust property at Cedar Creek battlefield, where visitors can tour both the 18th-century mansion and a modest portion of the battlefield itself, learning about the battle, its context within the War, and its effects on civilian life in the area.

Individual groups are considering new interpretive sites at McDowell, Edinburg, Stephens City, and the Old Courthouse in Winchester, and as indicated previously, Rose Hill at First Kernstown is now being restored.

**VISITING THE DISTRICT**

Tourism generates billions of dollars for the Virginia economy, and the District includes some of the state's leading tourist attractions. A 1990 U.S. Department of Commerce survey ranked the Blue Ridge Mountains first among twenty identified statewide tourist destinations, followed by the Shenandoah Valley in sixth place and Luray Caverns in seventeenth. In addition to its historic towns and scenic byways,
FIGURE 7
BATTLEFIELD INTERPRETATION AND ACCESS, 2000
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battlefield</th>
<th>Visitor Center</th>
<th>Trails</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Interpretive Signs</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Yes, additional</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Republic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>Yes, fully-developed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, extensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom's Brook</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, additional planned</td>
<td>Yes, additional planned</td>
<td>Yes, additional planned</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Hill</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Yes, additional planned</td>
<td>Yes, additional planned</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Kernstown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Pull-off</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opequon (Third</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by John Milner Associates, Inc.
the Shenandoah Valley area’s Skyline Drive, nationally known golf and ski resorts, the annual Winchester Apple Blossom Festival, and smaller attractions such as caverns, vineyards, and folk festivals all draw visitors to the District. Figure 8 lists some of the District’s largest and most popular recreation and tourism destinations.

A 1992 Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation Demand-Supply-Needs Analysis for the Shenandoah Valley showed a surplus of park and open space lands, attributable largely to the substantial federal and state landholdings. Nevertheless, there remains a shortage of land and recreation facilities for local resident activities. The District’s tourism services include several visitor centers. The VDOT operates a Virginia Welcome Center on I-81 north of Winchester near the West Virginia border and four additional rest areas. The Virginia Tourism Corporation has certified six other visitor centers in the District:

- Front Royal - Warren County Visitor Center
- Harrisonburg - Rockingham County Visitor Center
- New Market - Shenandoah Valley Travel Center
- Staunton - Augusta County Travel Information Center
- Waynesboro - Rockfish Gap Regional Visitor Center
- Winchester - Frederick County Visitor Center

As ever more people turn to the Web for travel research and information, the Internet will become an increasingly important part of the Valley’s visitor services. The newly created www.travelshenandoah.com offers up-to-the-minute travel alerts, and information about road and traffic conditions, food and lodging, travel services, and tourist attractions.

---

19 A cooperative venture of the Shenandoah Telecommunications Company, the Virginia Tech Transportation Institute, the VDOT, and the Virginia Tourism Corporation.
MANAGING THE DISTRICT

Civil War preservation, interpretation, and promotion within the District today is scattered among a wide range of agencies, groups, and organizations. While dedicated, they tend to work largely independently of each other, with little coordination of information or efforts. Only the Valley Conservation Council, the Shenandoah Valley Travel Association, and the Shenandoah Preservation League have thus far taken a District-wide approach to addressing some of the issues outlined in this Management Plan. Through strategy, advocacy, and the use of specific conservation tools, they are trying to protect the character and resources of the region.

The Commission has attempted to foster greater collective awareness and initiative by bringing together District “stakeholders.” These interests include battlefield owners, interpretive and preservation groups, and tourism and economic development interests. In addition, the Commission’s Demonstration Project Program provided grants for 20 projects throughout the District, increasing collaboration among these groups and supporting the effort to protect, interpret, and promote the Civil War heritage of the District.
## FIGURE 8
RECREATION AND TOURISM ATTRACTIONS, 2000
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Attraction</th>
<th>Ownership / Management</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Washington National Forest</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>Augusta, Frederick, Highland, Page, Rockingham, Shenandoah, and Warren counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah National Park, including Skyline Drive</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Augusta, Page, Rockingham, and Warren counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian National Scenic Trail</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Augusta, Clarke, Page, Rockingham, and Warren counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscarora Trail</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service, NPS, Private, Public Roads</td>
<td>Frederick, Shenandoah and Warren counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Conservation and Research Center</td>
<td>Smithsonian Institution's National Zoological Park</td>
<td>Warren County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek Battlefield</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Frederick, Shenandoah, and Warren counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blandy Farm and State Arboretum</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Clarke County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia 4-H Center</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Warren County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market Battlefield Historical Park</td>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Chimneys Regional Park</td>
<td>Upper Valley Regional Park Authority</td>
<td>Augusta County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Caverns Regional Park and National Natural Landmark</td>
<td>Upper Valley Regional Park Authority</td>
<td>Augusta County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 8 (Continued)
**Recreation and Tourism Attractions, 2000**
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Attraction</th>
<th>Ownership/Management</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Resort</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luray Caverns and National Natural Landmark</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Page County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massanutten Resort</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Rockingham County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah Caverns</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Caverns</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Warren County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Grove Plantation</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Frederick County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus McCormick Farm and Workshop Museum</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Augusta County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass-Glen Burnie Museum</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>City of Winchester, Frederick County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Birthplace and Museum</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>City of Staunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of American Frontier Culture</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>City of Staunton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall Jackson Museum at Hupp's Hill</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of American Presidents</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalry Museum</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market Battlefield Military Museum</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shenandoah County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

During the process of developing this plan, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission (Commission) studied options for protecting battlefields and other resources, interpreting the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District (District), providing for visitors, and managing the District. Ultimately the Commission studied four alternatives and in the process rejected a number of other ideas. A summary of the alternatives and the ideas that were considered but not carried forward is included in Appendix B.

The plan structures the District according to geographic groupings—clusters—of battlefields, nearby towns, and other visitor sites (see Map 5). This community-based approach emphasizes Valley hospitality and showcases the personalities, stories, and attractions of five different areas centered on the battlefields: McDowell in Highland County; Port Republic and Cross Keys in Rockingham County; New Market in Shenandoah County; Tom’s Brook and Fisher’s Hill in Shenandoah County, plus Cedar Creek in Shenandoah, Frederick, and Warren counties; and Second Winchester, Second Kernstown, and Opequon (Third Winchester) in Winchester and Frederick County.

A new non-profit organization, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation (Foundation), will be created to carry on the Commission’s work and lead implementation of the plan. The Foundation will coordinate activities in the District and represent the major partners. The Foundation’s board will include District officials, representatives from each cluster as well as from the Commonwealth of Virginia and the National Park Service (NPS), leaders from beyond the region, and representatives of preservation, historic, conservation, agricultural, and tourism interests.

Each cluster within the District will include a Civil War orientation center. These centers will explain to visitors what Civil War sites and other resources and attractions are offered in that cluster and in the District as a whole, while interpreting the stories of that particular cluster within the context of the larger District. The clusters and other sites within the District will be linked through brochures, interpretive displays,
Map 5
Clusters Concept Design
the existing Virginia Civil War Trails program, and a wayfinding system emphasizing historic routes.

One or more local organizations—either public agencies or non-profits—will independently operate each primary Civil War orientation center. The Foundation will set standards for the operation of the centers and provide the organizations with technical and financial assistance as appropriate. The system of centers and standards itself will be determined through the District-wide interpretive plan described in the Interpretation section of this chapter. The interpretive plan calls for developing additional interpretive facilities at battlefields within each cluster as appropriate. The NPS is encouraged to establish a national park at Cedar Creek battlefield and to operate one facility within that cluster. The Commonwealth of Virginia is expected to continue its role at New Market.

The District-wide interpretive plan will assist in defining cluster relationships for those area sites and communities in proximity to each orientation center; some may share affiliations with more than one cluster. Communities associated with each cluster will be encouraged to work together to create or improve interpretive sites and undertake community or economic development projects that promote and protect the District's Civil War resources. In addition, individual preservation plans will be developed for the battlefields in each cluster.

Brochures available throughout the District will encourage visitors to spread out and explore by following the historic routes linking the clusters. The routes themselves will be marked by interpretive and wayfinding signs.

**BATTLEFIELD AND RESOURCE PROTECTION**

The enabling legislation calls for the Management Plan to include “provisions for the protection and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historic resources of the District.” These provisions are required to include recommendations to the Commonwealth of Virginia and its cities, towns, and counties for implementing such protection and interpretation.
The Foundation will be guided by the following priorities when protecting battlefields and other lands in the District:

- First priority: protecting battlefield lands identified as “core areas”
- Second priority: protecting surrounding “study areas”
- Third priority: protecting resources related to the Civil War

**BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION**

Preliminary analysis of core and study areas for the battlefields reveals that they contain 92,236 acres, of which approximately 30,068 acres are core areas and 21,096 are considered to retain their integrity. To date 2,133 acres have been protected (refer to Figure 3 on page 41).

It would be practically impossible as well as politically unfeasible to place all or even simply core battlefield lands under public or public-trust protection. Thus, only key parcels that best support visitation, interpretation, and commemoration will be targeted by the Foundation for such protection. As condemnation authority was not included in the legislation and will not be sought by the Foundation, the success of the Management Plan will depend upon the voluntary protection of privately owned lands. Private land ownership also accurately reflects the Valley’s character both today and at the time of the Civil War. In addition, private lands remain on the local tax rolls, and their productivity helps to sustain the local economy.

However, private owners who maintain battlefield land in the face of growth pressures and economic inducements deserve recognition of their efforts through some assistance from the public. The Foundation will pursue policies to aid private owners in maintaining their lands in rural use. All still-undeveloped battlefield lands within the District have historical value; protecting as much of this land as possible will require a long-term commitment to working with willing landowners.
Battlefield Plans

The Foundation will bring together property owners, local political representatives, and other appropriate interested parties to develop a detailed and specific protection plan for each battlefield. The plans—along with the criteria that are explained later in this section—will help identify land protection priorities and ensure local involvement in the decision-making. The Foundation will advocate voluntary protection of the battlefields and increased awareness of the need for protection. (See Figure 9 for more information.)

Techniques for Battlefield Lands Protection

The Foundation will avail itself of the full array of tools available to public agencies and qualified non-profit organizations for land protection. These tools include acquisition and donation of land and easements, establishment of charitable trusts, leases and management agreements, dedication of land or cash in lieu of land dedication requirements, establishment of recognition/certification programs, land use planning, historic district creation, and overlay zoning. These techniques are summarized in Figure 10 and explained in greater detail in Appendix G.

Criteria for Acquisition of Battlefield Lands and Interests in Land

The extent of the battlefield lands makes it difficult to predict with any degree of accuracy just how much land might be protected over any given period of time. Such predictions are complicated by the Foundation’s commitment to achieving its goals through voluntary support and cooperation from private property owners. However, this Management Plan prescribes criteria to guide the Foundation, or others involved in battlefield protection, in determining whether a particular parcel should be protected. These criteria are outlined in Appendix H. As battlefield plans are developed over time, the Foundation may need to revise these criteria to respond to current needs.
FIGURE 9
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Documentation and Study
- Battle notes and other historical documentation
- Graphics: maps, photos, drawings
- Statement of integrity, surviving resources
- Detailed maps of battlefields showing: priority protection areas; historic, natural, and cultural resources; parcels currently protected; etc.
- Maps of important views
- Summary of public and stakeholder involvement in developing the plans

Interpretation and Public Access
- Specific stories related to themes
- Specific battlefield resources and other resources to be used to interpret stories
- Interpretive media or techniques (e.g., signs, indoor exhibits, tour guides)
- Lands needed for: interpretation, scene restoration, access and parking, and trail design

Land Protection
- Goals for public-trust ownership of land in the battlefield
- Appropriate adjustments of general acquisition criteria set by the Commission for acquisition specific to the battlefield or battlefields addressed by each plan
- Candidate lands identified for protection
- Land ownership and land protection issues, including a system to monitor threats and opportunities in battlefield core and study areas
- Current and potential public protection (specific zoning, coverage through the Agricultural and Forestal Districts program, special designations such as National Register or local historic district status, etc.)
- Available voluntary protection mechanisms and applicability to specific parcels (some of this information would need to be confidential and perhaps carried out by non-profit land trust partners)
- Available regulatory protections for environmentally sensitive areas such as floodplains, wetlands, and steep slopes

Operations
- Facilities, staffing, budget for operations
- Potential sources of funds to protect battlefield land and pay the cost of maintaining land under public-trust ownership
- Roles of partners and owners in working together to maintain the appearance and security of the battlefield
## FIGURE 10
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- Land purchase at full or bargain value
- Acquisition of land via donation or bequest
- Receipt of charitable remainder trusts
- Acquisition of options or rights of first refusal
- Acquisition of undivided interests or remainder interests
- Land exchange
- Conservation easements (donated to or purchased by any organization allowed to hold easements, including local governments)
- Purchase of development rights: easements purchased by local government
- Covenants (can be used where the covenanted land is adjacent to land owned by the protector; for a non-profit or local government, this approach is similar to a conservation easement)
- Voluntary dedication or “cash in lieu” (dedication of land or payment of cash by land owner as encouragement for subdivision approval from local government)
- Lease with option to buy
- Leases and management agreements
- Agricultural and Forestal Districts
- Exercise of state and federal regulations for ecologically sensitive areas
- Land use planning
- Cluster zoning/Planned Unit Development
- Density bonuses
- Conservation subdivisions
- Agricultural zoning (large-lot zoning: minimum acreage required for viable agricultural production, typically 25-40 acres)
- Historic district zoning (creation of historic district with or without architectural review)
- Overlay zoning for corridors approaching historic districts
- Service limits: limiting infrastructure supporting development to specified geographic areas
- Overlay zoning for trails, rivers, scenic byways, etc., involving additional scrutiny of the impacts of proposed changes in the vicinity of special resources beyond the review ordinarily done under zoning
- Recognition and certification program to recognize owners who voluntarily protect battlefield land
Funding for Battlefield Protection

Funding administered by the Foundation is expected to be used principally to support battlefield protection through a combination of acquisition and conservation easements. To best protect the character of the battlefields and support the regional interpretive program, the Foundation will prioritize acquisitions according to the ranking outlined in the introduction to this section: (1) core areas, (2) study areas, (3) Civil War-related resources.

Funding will come from a combination of federal, state, and local sources. Possible sources include the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, federal funds for acquisition of agricultural conservation easements, and TEA-21 (Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century) funding for enhancing transportation routes or facilities and planning of scenic byways; other states have used these funding sources to protect battlefields. In general, these programs require matching funds, the sources of which vary but often involve local and state funding.

At the state level, the Commonwealth in 1998 created the Virginia Land Conservation Foundation. Funded by state appropriations, this foundation provides financial support to state and local governments for open space preservation and to private (public-trust) organizations for land conservation activities. The Battlefields Foundation also could join with its partners to create a state-level program for purchasing agricultural easements on battlefield lands.

Upon approval of this Management Plan by the Secretary of the Interior, the Foundation will become eligible for appropriations of up to $2,000,000 annually for grants, technical assistance, and land acquisition. It will seek matching commitments from the Commonwealth. Local governments and preservation organizations, although limited in their resources, have been and will continue to be important partners in the protection of specific parcels of land. In addition, the Secretary may receive up to $2,000,000 annually to support battlefield preservation in the District. (See Appendix A for the full language of P.L. 104-333.)
Guidelines for Future Development Projects

In order to provide public access and interpretation, certain visitor facilities and interpretive displays will be needed at each battlefield. The exact level of development will be determined through the battlefield plans and the District-wide interpretive plan. In pursuing such development, the Foundation will follow the guidelines for site selection, design, development, environmental impacts, and other considerations identified in Appendix I.

RESOURCE PROTECTION THROUGHOUT THE NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

The Foundation will encourage local jurisdictions and private owners to protect the special character of the District and its natural, cultural, and historic resources. Resource protection and interpretation are closely related; landscapes and other sites preserved with their historical character intact give powerful meaning and immediacy to the stories they tell. Visitors feel the presence of history.

The Foundation will pay particular attention to the District's agricultural lands, its historic resources (including historic transportation routes), the character and charm of the District's small towns and communities, and its rivers, trails, and other natural recreational resources.

Agricultural Lands

The Foundation will encourage the District's jurisdictions, in cooperation with local farmers, farm advisors, and economic development officials, to prepare agricultural development plans identifying local programs supporting the business of agriculture and the preservation of farmland. These plans will be the key first step in exploring all possible options for local support of the farm economy and farmland preservation.

The Foundation also will encourage the enrollment of land in Virginia's Agricultural and Forestal Districts program. It should pursue as well the establishment of a new state policy to enable the public purchase of conservation easements on such land.
Historic Resources

The Foundation will encourage local jurisdictions to undertake the following policies and actions:

- develop detailed historic preservation plans, which provide guidance for all other undertakings within the jurisdiction affecting historic resources
- prepare National Register listings
- designate local historic districts to protect the character of those historic resources retaining a high level of integrity
- protect corridors leading to historic districts from potentially negative effects of new development

The legislation establishing the District specifically names historic transportation routes for protection. The Foundation will encourage local jurisdictions’ use of state and federal programs as well as local guidelines and regulations for protection of these routes. The Foundation will stress protecting and enhancing battlefield linkages and driving tour routes, starting with the Virginia Civil War Trails route already in the District. The Foundation should also help local jurisdictions to pursue transportation mitigation funding—for example, funding available due to the impact of reconstructing I-81 through the District—and encourage use of these funds for projects related to historic transportation routes. In addition, the Foundation should pursue the establishment of special TEA-21 funding to be devoted to National Historic District enhancement projects.

When using federal funds for District projects, the Foundation will abide by the terms of the Programmatic Agreement with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the NPS (see Appendix C). The agreement outlines review responsibilities for projects that may affect historic properties and ensures the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, are met.

Community Design

In addition to protecting the historic character of the District’s small towns and special landscapes, the Foundation will provide planning and technical assistance, on an “as-requested” basis, to aid in community design issues. This assistance might include guidance for new construction, streetscapes, signage, circulation, and other
design decisions affecting public domain areas within these communities. The Foundation will work as well with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to assure continued maintenance and to ensure that new construction respects the District’s historic qualities. In addition, the Foundation and partners should advocate for a redesign of I-81 that complements the District’s character while addressing its traffic demands and safety.

Rivers, Trails, and Other Natural and Recreational Resources

Area organizations such as the River Network, the Friends of the North Fork, the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, and the NPS’s Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program lend technical assistance and support to help protect rivers, establish trails, and provide access to both. The Foundation should encourage jurisdictions to take advantage of these services and advocate for adequate funds to support this work. The Foundation should coordinate efforts also with the Virginia Department of Forestry and the Commonwealth’s Riparian Buffer Implementation Program to address the problem of degraded streams within the District.

The Foundation should specifically investigate—through planning and possibly funding assistance as well—establishing a “Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Walking Trail.” Linking battlefields and small towns, the trail would be developed through the voluntary cooperation of local jurisdictions and landowners. It would serve as one element within a comprehensive regional recreational plan created to provide for the recreational needs of local residents and visitors while protecting battlefield lands and other resources from inappropriate recreational development. For example, the Tuscarora Trail provides hiking opportunities for local residents and links sites of the Tom’s Brook battle. The plan might also promote complementary bicycling routes; bicycling brings desirable tourism without bringing undesirable sound and air pollution, traffic congestion, or demand for additional parking.

20 The Commission was a co-sponsor of the Living Towns program that brings together towns in the Shenandoah Valley to “consider how they can use historic resources and traditional identities to remain viable centers of human interaction and economic activity.”
INTERPRETATION

Interpretation is the cornerstone of protection, building public understanding of the educational, cultural, and economic value of historic resources and thus support—political as well as financial—for their protection and preservation. The legislation forming the Commission and requiring it to prepare a management plan states that “the preservation and interpretation of [sites of several key Civil War battles] would make a vital contribution to the understanding of the heritage of the United States.” The legislation makes clear that the Commission’s plan is required to include “provisions for implementing a continuing program of interpretation and visitor education concerning the resources and values of the District.”

INTERPRETIVE THEMES

Themes are the essence of a story. Freeman Tilden, who set the standard of NPS interpretation, described interpretive themes as the hook that encourages more learning. Themes provoke, reveal meanings behind the facts, and establish relationships between the past and contemporary life. Interpretation within the District will be built upon key themes and will address the entire Shenandoah Valley while focusing on the specific sites and stories found within the District.

The three primary narrative themes upon which interpretation will be built are:

- The Valley: where geography, history, economy, and culture drew the attention of both North and South during the War
- The Campaigns: which varied in objectives, leadership, and results, yet all played an important role in determining the outcome of the War
- The Battles: each of which provides its own unique perspectives on Civil War combat and its effects on civilian life
These three primary themes are amplified and supported with secondary themes. Some sites within the District will provide interpretation touching on all or many of these themes. Others will focus on themes and stories specific only to their own resources.

**The Shenandoah Valley:**
**Stories of its Places and People**

When the Civil War came to the Shenandoah Valley, its battles and strategies, losses and victories were shaped by a landscape of hills and forests, farmlands and towns, rail lines and roadways, and rivers. Understanding the War in the Valley means understanding the history of an abundantly productive agrarian community blackened and crushed by bloody conflict yet persevering in spirit.

**The blessing and curse of geography:** Geography and terrain have long defined Valley life and culture. The Valley forms a natural highway flanked by mountains. Immigrants in the 18th and early-19th centuries followed the lead of American Indians and used this north-south corridor extensively, many settling to farm the land and bringing not only their families but also their ethnic traditions and religious ideas.

When the War came, the Valley’s blessings made it a magnet for conflict. It was “the granary of Virginia,” prosperous in peacetime and filling the stomachs of Confederate forces in war. It was also an ideal route of invasion into the North and played a critical role in the strategies of both armies—in particular, Confederate activity in the Valley occupied Union troops, drawing them away from their real objective, Richmond. Successive conflicts raged along the length of the Valley until Union forces executed a systematic campaign of destruction that devastated the region and its economy not only for the remainder of the War but for decades thereafter.

**The scope of fighting:** War records indicate that the Valley saw six battles, 21 engagements, 21 actions, and 278 skirmishes—or a total of 326 military incidents over the course of the War. Fighting occurred somewhere in the Valley, on average,
once every four or five days. There were thousands of casualties. Towns and cities changed hands time and again.

**Destruction and the resilience of the human spirit:** In the wake of every battle and skirmish remained a civilian population struggling to pick up the pieces of shattered lives. By Union count, Valley civilians lost 71 flour mills, 1,200 barns, 435,000 bushels of wheat, 75,000 bushels of corn, 25,000 cattle and sheep, and 4,000 horses and mules in “The Burning” of 1864 alone.

Personal accounts document the War’s widespread impact on civilians; oral histories from this time remain a vital part of the lives of many Valley families to this day. Divided loyalties and suspicion shattered the personal relationships among neighbors. The Valley was a hotbed of spies, including women like Belle Boyd. Both slave and free African-Americans supplied information—and planted disinformation—for both Union and Confederate armies. Even religion played its part; some members of pacifist sects who tried to stay neutral ultimately had to flee. And despite their neutrality, their property, too, was put to the Union torch.

---

**The Campaigns: Strategies and Personalities**

The Valley served as a stage on which were seen some of the decisive events and significant leaders of the War. Campaigns staged or fought in the Valley affected the course of the War and in some cases established or lost the military reputations of their commanders.

**Jackson’s Valley Campaign, 1862:** This Stonewall Jackson campaign siphoned off troops from Union assaults against Richmond and southwest Virginia, buying time for effective Confederate defense and counterattack in those conflicts and injecting hope and enthusiasm into the Confederate cause. Widely admired and studied, Jackson’s tactics in the Valley demonstrated how a numerically inferior army can defeat stronger opponents with speed, surprise, deception, intelligent use of terrain, and a willingness to take risks.

**Lee’s invasion of the North, 1863:** The Valley served as the highway to Lee’s Confederate victory at Second Winchester and opened the way north for invasion and south for retreat from Gettysburg.
The War engulfs the Valley, 1864-65: As Union Generals Sigel and Hunter entered the Valley in the spring of 1864, the War stood at a crossroads, with desperate attacks and counterattacks increasingly affecting Valley civilians. In 1864 conflict in the Valley took an ominous turn toward total warfare as the North recognized the need to finally take the Valley out of the War and the South lost its ability to defend farm and field.

Following Confederate General Jubal Early’s daring attack on Washington, D.C., Union General Philip Sheridan launched a successful campaign against Early’s army and then moved on to destroy Valley crops, livestock, mills, and barns, damaging Confederate morale and influencing the fighting along the siege lines surrounding Petersburg in eastern Virginia. Coupled with William Tecumseh Sherman’s success in Georgia, victory in the Valley revitalized Lincoln’s 1864 presidential campaign against his peace candidate opponent.

Nature of the fighting: Warfare in the Valley provided a preview of tactics that would be employed effectively in 20th-century warfare—rapid movement of troops, guerrilla raids, wholesale destruction of private property, and disruption of civilian life.

The War’s resonance: Today the Valley still evokes the landscape of the 1860s. Bounded by mountains and still used as a major transportation corridor, its fields still grazed by livestock or planted and harvested, its towns still with structures that witnessed Civil War strife, its families that trace their ancestors beyond the Valley campaigns and, of course, its battlefields that have escaped development—these Valley features accommodate storytelling from multiple points of view.

The Battles: Parts of the Whole

Each battlefield within the District possesses its own significance within the greater War, and each has a different story to tell about combat, combatants, and victims.

McDowell (8 May 1862): Here, Confederate Stonewall Jackson used the terrain effectively to concentrate his forces against the numerically inferior Union forces while denying the opposing army any opportunity to concentrate against him.

Cross Keys (8 June 1862) and Port Republic (9 June 1862): In these decisive victories Stonewall Jackson defeated separated armies, freeing himself to join Robert E. Lee in a successful defense of Richmond.
Second Winchester (13-15 June 1863): Confederate Major General Richard Ewell’s early victory at Second Winchester opened the way for Lee’s invasion of the North. Tactically, the battle demonstrated the inadequacy of entrenchments against a mobile attacker.

New Market (15 May 1864): Union Major General Franz Sigel’s advance up the Valley was blocked by Major General John C. Breckinridge, former senator and vice president of the United States, aided by a battalion of cadets from the Virginia Military Institute.

Second Kernstown (24 July 1864): Confederate General Jubal Early’s initial success in the Valley in 1864, including his victory at Second Kernstown, attracted the attention of Grant, prompting the diversion of the Union forces into the Valley and appointment of Philip Sheridan to command a newly unified Middle Military District.

Opequon (Third Winchester; 19 September 1864): The Union victory at Opequon, the largest battle in the Shenandoah, was a turning point in the War for the Valley.

Fisher’s Hill (21-22 September 1864): Confederate defeat at Fisher’s Hill, “the Gibraltar of the Valley,” allowed the Union to begin denying the Confederacy much-needed supplies and livestock from the Valley.

Tom’s Brook (9 October 1864): Confederate cavalry failed to halt the destruction of Valley barns and mills, instead suffering a demoralizing rout at the hands of Union cavalry.

Cedar Creek (19 October 1864): Cedar Creek dealt the crushing blow to the Confederacy in the Shenandoah Valley and buoyed Lincoln’s presidential campaign. The Confederate surprise attack in the early morning hours ranks as one of the most daring and initially successful maneuvers of the War. General Sheridan’s arrival on the field of battle to rally Union troops provides an excellent example of charismatic leadership.

Audiences vary; so do their responses to different interpretive approaches. As indicated previously in this document, current interpretive resources in the Valley are generally both limited and fragmented. The Foundation’s interpretive program will seek to
expand these resources to appeal to a range of ages and interests, to build a larger national audience and constituency, and to include local residents as well—an often overlooked but critically important audience in terms of the success of preservation and interpretation efforts.

**INTERPRETIVE TECHNIQUES**

Broad in scope, rich in detail, and varied in approach, interpretive techniques—the means by which themes, stories, and facts are communicated—employed throughout the Valley may include indoor exhibits; extensive outdoor interpretation along historic routes, at battlefields, and at related sites; written guides (books, maps, brochures); and interior and exterior audio, video, and interactive technologies.

Effective interpretation programs will be built upon an understanding of anticipated audiences, from the casual drop-in passing through the Valley, to tour groups with limited time and crowded itineraries, to school groups that may require advance materials and post-visit learning reinforcement, to serious students of Civil War history. In addition, of course, audiences will vary by demographics of age, race, nationality, and many other factors. An effective interpretive program must offer something for all these individuals; in developing the program, questions must be answered such as: How will visitors visit the battlefields and other sites? Will visits be passive or active? If active, how will visitors participate? What will a visitor remember and what interpretive tools can be used to build those memories?

**VISITOR EXPERIENCES**

The visitor experience is shaped not only by what is learned but also by how that learning is accomplished. In order to create positive memories—for visitors and residents alike—that reinforce interpretive themes, planning will provide for a range of formats and experiences, including:
- **Wayfinding:** Visitors will be provided with a clear, easily followed guide to attractions, resources, and activities throughout the District. This guide will be available both within and outside of the immediate District.

- **Interpretation:** Interpretation will place the Valley into geographic and historical context and explore all themes. Both military and civilian aspects of the Valley story will be told.

- **Interpretive techniques:** Interpretive media will be designed to acknowledge different learning styles, with a variety of techniques and flexibility in scheduling. Visitors will be encouraged to experience the Valley through all their senses.

- **Immediacy:** The personal stories of soldier and civilian will be told through a variety of forums, from media to reenactors. Through these stories visitors will experience the personal toll of war.

- **Points of view:** Visitors will be offered multiple perspectives—soldier and civilian, Union and Confederate, commander and conscript—in order to understand the true human scope of the War.

- **Impact:** Visitors will leave understanding, and able to explain to others, the Valley’s historical significance and the importance of protecting the lands and resources found here.

- **Quality:** Visitors will expect and receive high-quality interpretation at District sites. The Foundation will work with partners to define and meet guidelines in offerings at orientation centers; design, install, and maintain a centralized sign program; and provide interpretive media that address context or fill interpretive gaps.

- **Geography:** Visitors will see (and visit) landscapes that affected military tactics and contributed to pre- and post-war wealth and prosperity. They will travel the same routes once marched by armies, see the Valley’s value as a natural highway protected by mountain passes, and understand the military objectives sought at the ends of this highway (Washington, D.C., and the east-west railroads of the North and South) and over the mountains (Richmond). They will be encouraged to visit military and civilian sites and will see some portions of the Valley (both battlefield and civilian resources) as they appeared during the War. They will see
the connection between the Valley's infrastructure (roads, towns, fields, barns, etc.) and the military struggle.

- **Commemoration**: Visitors will be offered multiple opportunities to contemplate the meaning of the Valley campaigns and of the larger Civil War itself. Where it is not possible to recreate settings, visitors will find respectful commemoration.

- **Opportunities to express support**: Visitors will be invited to contribute to the preservation effort through financial support, membership in protection and preservation groups, and so forth.

- **Variety**: Visitors will be encouraged to enjoy the Valley's many present-day attractions as well as its historical resources. Good food, quaint inns, scenic rivers and trails—all will help foster a positive experience that in turn leads to continued support for preservation, commemoration, and interpretation.

### INTERPRETATION OF SPECIFIC RESOURCES

In general, interpretation in the District will be provided by a combination of Civil War orientation centers, on-site battlefield interpretation, and approximately 32 other Civil War interpretive sites with existing programs. Interpretation established over time by individual towns and at additional sites will add to this initial program. Below, each of these resources is discussed in terms of its relationship to the larger interpretive program.

#### Battlefields

Battlefields will be promoted as an essential visitor experience. Area guides will direct visitors first to the District's Civil War orientation centers, and then on to the battlefields themselves. Unobtrusive interpretation available on the battlefields will amplify information gained at the orientation centers, without detracting from the integrity of these lands.
Historic Routes

Historic routes link the ten battlefields. These routes will be marked and when possible will follow historic troop movement corridors. Because conflicts moved up and down throughout the Valley over the course of the War, rather than following a single linear path, interpretation along these routes presents special challenges. For this reason, present-day battlefield linkages will follow historic routes but not require the battlefields to be visited in any specific order (see Map 6). Creative interpretation will be needed to help visitors understand the campaigns and the challenges faced by Union and Confederate troops as they moved around the Valley.

Related Civil War Resources

Beyond the ten battlefields listed in the legislation are numerous historic and natural resources. From the First Kernstown battlefield at the Rose Hill Farm in Frederick County, to the Civil War-era earthworks at Fort Johnson atop Shenandoah Mountain, these sites offer glimpses into other aspects of the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley. These resources are scattered across the District. Some lie in close proximity to the ten battlefields, but others require travel well beyond. Interpretation here, accomplished through brochures, trails, signs, and other media, builds upon the existing Virginia Civil War Trails program by demonstrating the relationships between the battlefields and these other resources.

The Foundation will encourage groups and organizations to interpret battlefield sites and other resources and make them available to the public. As previously indicated in this document, Rose Hill, owned by the Glass-Glen Burnie Museum, is currently undergoing master planning for restoration and interpretation. Likewise, studies are underway to provide access to Fort Johnson in the George Washington National Forest. Other proposed interpretive sites include a museum at the Edinburg Mill, interpretation of three new properties in Stephens City, a museum in the Old Frederick County Courthouse, and construction of additional outdoor interpretive wayside exhibits by the Virginia Civil War Trails program.

Development of the District-wide interpretive plan may reveal other sites. Such sites will be identified by determining the resource's relationship with one or more of the interpretive themes outlined above, investigating the feasibility of interpretation, analyzing costs and benefits, and identifying or creating sustainable managing entities.
Map 6

Battlefield Linkages
**Towns and Cities**

The battlefields tell one kind of story; the towns, cities, and related interpretive sites within the Valley tell the different yet equally important story of the civilian perspective on the toll exacted by the War. And for today’s visitor, they offer opportunities to mix learning and leisure together in a pleasant and enjoyable balance. Towns should develop walking tours that feature historic sites that were present during the War. Existing interpretive sites will continue to provide their own perspectives, and the Foundation will support efforts to develop additional sites where appropriate. At the same time, visitors should be made aware of area businesses—lodging, dining, shopping—available for their enjoyment. The success of the plan depends upon conveying to visitors the full variety of attractions available in proximity to each cluster and throughout the District.

**REENACTMENTS AND LIVING HISTORY**

Popular and well-attended, battlefield reenactments are expected to continue and should be considered to offer unique interpretive and fund-raising opportunities. Sponsors of these reenactments should be encouraged to contribute to development of the District-wide interpretive plan, in particular with specific ideas for battlefield protection during reenactments—particularly how to avoid confusing the archaeological record with mimic artifacts left behind after these events.

**EDUCATION AND RESEARCH**

The Foundation will place a high priority on elementary and secondary curriculum development as a way to attract and engage school groups of all ages and extend the learning experience beyond the physical confines of the Valley itself. The Foundation is also expected to assist in identifying resources to support college and university programs and research that in turn support the District’s long-term interpretive needs.
DISTRICT-WIDE INTERPRETIVE PLAN

The District-wide interpretive plan, prepared through the collaborative effort of partners and the Foundation, will provide more detailed guidance for interpretation within the District. The interpretive plan is one of the Foundation's highest priorities for its first year. (For a listing of the anticipated elements of this plan, see Figure 11.)

At a minimum, the District-wide interpretive plan is expected to result in the following:

- **Pooling knowledge and expertise**: By sharing information, new and existing sites and resources will be better able to place themselves accurately within the Valley's larger historical context, thus improving the quality and scope of interpretation throughout the District.

- **Improved linkages among the District's battlefields, communities, attractions, and leisure resources**: A carefully planned wayfinding system of signs, maps, brochures, and other aids will direct visitors smoothly from major highways through existing or newly developed Civil War orientation centers and into the greater District. Existing wayfinding aids will be evaluated for effectiveness, and whenever possible, the new aids will supplement rather than compete with these.

- **New marketing and orientation materials**: Web sites, exhibits/displays in welcome centers, maps, brochures, and other materials will orient visitors to the District while promoting the area's visitor services, amenities, and attractions. These new materials (to be specified through marketing and interpretive planning) should encourage visitors to plan and enjoy longer, more meaningful stays.

- **New interpretive materials**: Welcome center exhibits, audiovisual programs, maps, brochures, and related materials will introduce visitors to the District's primary themes and explain the District's critical role in the larger history of the Civil War. These materials will encourage visitors to explore the District's stories from multiple perspectives. Cooperative efforts with other Civil War sites such as Antietam, Gettysburg, Richmond, and Petersburg will help lead visitors to learn more about related battles and campaigns.
### FIGURE 11
**CONTENTS OF DISTRICT-WIDE INTERPRETIVE PLAN**

**Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation and resources</th>
<th>• Develop ideas for collaborative regional marketing, promotion, and packaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review and refine themes and sub-themes suggested in the Management Plan</td>
<td>• Establish goals and principles for setting priorities in meeting those goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Match themes and stories to resources</td>
<td>• Set site-by-site goals and objectives to address staffing, hours of operation, accreditation, and other issues faced by small museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify gaps in currently available interpretation and methods for addressing those gaps at staffed and unstaffed, developed and undeveloped sites</td>
<td>• Develop interpretive standards for sites wishing to participate in a District interpretation network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outline comprehensive approach for Civil War orientation centers: locations, thematic emphasis, facilities, etc.</td>
<td>• Define roles of various partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive techniques</th>
<th>• Enhance community outreach and participation; recruit volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Select appropriate interpretive media</td>
<td>• Review financial needs of existing and planned interpretive sites, their growth potential, and their requirements for sustainability and growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop educational programming for K-12, college, and continuing education programs (the interpretive plan would set guidelines for later development of a specific education plan)</td>
<td>• Create ideas for a system of shared personnel services and training for staff, docents, and guides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wayfinding</th>
<th>• Assess training and leadership development needs of partners and create a plan for addressing them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a graphic identity package (logos, signs, etc.)</td>
<td>• Design a program to be operated by the Foundation that would provide support to interpretive partners in a number of forms, including technical assistance, training, and matching grants (potentially for planning, fund-raising, site improvements, exhibit design, endowment development, operations, and special projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design comprehensive system of signage (interpretive, directional, gateway)</td>
<td>• Integrate signage with other wayfinding materials (brochures, guidebooks, Web sites, specialized cell phones)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>• Review existing audiences and markets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review existing audiences and markets</td>
<td>• Develop ideas for collaborative regional marketing, promotion, and packaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Enhanced Internet presence:** Web sites will provide visitor information and disseminate educational and interpretive materials, particularly items that establish historical context and introduce District themes.

• **Comprehensive educational materials:** Lesson plans for all grade levels, college and high school internships, senior and life-long learning programs—all will help tell the stories of individual battles and towns while stressing primary themes and helping students understand the Valley’s stories within their larger Civil War context.

• **Shared personnel services system:** A hospitality training program will be developed for visitor reception staff, orientation center staff, guides, and living-history interpreters and make them available to travelers or individual sites within the District.

• **Improved interpretation of civilian stories:** Additional museums, walking tours, guided tours, wayside exhibits, maps, brochures, audiovisual programs, living history, and so forth will further develop the focus on the civilian perspective on Civil War themes within the District.

• **Improved battlefield facilities:** Appropriate on-site facilities will protect and preserve the individual battlefields.

• **Respectful commemoration:** Commemorative features will be included to remind visitors of the human face of this War—courage and fear, triumph and loss, suffering and resilience.

---

**FUNDING FOR INTERPRETATION**

Funding for interpretation will be obtained through the Congressional authorization of up to $2 million in annual grants and technical assistance for the Commission’s successor—the Foundation. Other sources of federal funding for interpretation include, but are not limited to, the grant programs of the Institute of Library and Museum Services, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Department of Education. All these programs require matching funds. The NPS may also provide assistance with interpretation, publications, and installations. State sources are generally similar to federal ones. In addition, private
foundations and corporations should be approached for their support of such a highly visible part of the larger plan.

**VISITOR SERVICES**

Visitor services include Civil War orientation centers, visitor reception, wayfinding, and linkages. Visitors will be able to choose among five varied experiences offered by the clusters, differing by terrain, battles, associated towns and communities, and interpretive resources. Once within a cluster, interpretation at the Civil War orientation center will draw the visitor on to experience the associated battlefields. Nearby sites and towns will illustrate other aspects of District themes. For the wanderer, driving tours looping out from and returning to each cluster will add to the interpretive experience. Historic routes will link one cluster to another.

The plan invites a great deal of collaboration among battlefields, towns, and other sites within close proximity to each other. Beyond the battlefields, each cluster may showcase its own unique personality and traditional Valley hospitality through its towns and non-battlefield interpretive sites. Each town will be encouraged to create at least one combined interpretive and visitor reception site, perhaps in cooperation with local businesses. The Foundation and cluster partners, guided by the interpretive plan and working with local communities and tourism specialists, will identify where new interpretive or visitor reception sites are needed.

**CIVIL WAR ORIENTATION CENTERS AND BATTLEFIELDS**

Five Civil War orientation centers will exist as primary interpretive facilities. There will be one center in each cluster. Each will vary in size according to the needs and financial resources of the cluster and the operating entity, but the centers are expected to range between 3,500 and 6,500 square feet. The smaller size is more likely to permit use of existing buildings, but may not accommodate all potential functions of
these centers and may require additions or the use of ancillary buildings. Figure 12 summarizes the functions and major features of the Civil War orientation centers.

Located along major highway corridors within the Valley, these orientation centers will have identical goals (introducing visitors to the primary themes and facilitating visits to individual battlefields and towns) but should approach their task from different perspectives. Each center, for example, could introduce all themes but develop one theme, such as Valley geography, in greater detail. In another approach, one center could concentrate on the military story while another interprets the civilian perspective. A center at the northern end of the Valley might focus on the 1864 campaign and the leadership of General Sheridan while the center at the southern end could interpret Stonewall Jackson’s Valley Campaign of 1862. Such variations will be worked out in the District-wide interpretive plan and will encourage visitors to enjoy more than one center.

Concentrating District visitation through these centers will make it possible to have a staffed visitor contact station at each center and perhaps a modest sales area to generate revenues and provide take-away interpretive materials. In addition, each center will have space for interpretive displays and exhibits. Each might display the same large District-wide map, along with a smaller one specific to the sites within the particular cluster. Through graphics, text, and reproductions—but only a limited number of easily protected artifacts—each center will tell its stories and illustrate its chosen themes. The exhibit area’s media will humanize the story of the War in the Valley through contemporary accounts. A small space will also be available for a 15- to 20-minute audiovisual program that places each cluster within its larger historical context. This program can be shared by all of the centers. The centers will serve as staging sites where visitors can gather for guided tours (provided by area organizations and services) of the battlefields and other resources within the clusters.

Each center’s primary function is to promote visits to the actual battlefields and towns; displays and presentations will be designed to keep visitors at the centers for no more than 30 to 45 minutes. Brochures, maps, and other guides to area attractions will be provided along with official District wayfinding materials. Visitors will be encouraged to visit more than one center in order to experience the fullest possible range of the Valley’s stories, themes, battlefields, historic sites, and attractions. Figure 13, on pages 82 and 83, outlines visitor services proposed for each of the battlefields.
##FIGURE 12
SUMMARY OF CIVIL WAR ORIENTATION CENTER FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>3,500 to 6,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to District-wide interpretive plan</strong></td>
<td>The interpretive plan is expected to identify possible sites and functions and to set standards for development and operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretive space</strong></td>
<td>Space available for interpretation at any facility is estimated at up to 65% of square footage available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space for traveling exhibits</strong></td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexible space for school groups, etc.</strong></td>
<td>Yes, if necessary, plan ancillary space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfort facilities</strong></td>
<td>Restrooms, vending machines, and room outside to stretch legs, walk dogs, and sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Display of tourist information</strong></td>
<td>Yes—some availability of information would be a convenience for visitors who arrive directly at the orientation center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space for staff</strong></td>
<td>Yes, or ancillary facility for staff and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurant</strong></td>
<td>Possibly, in ancillary facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catering kitchen</strong></td>
<td>Possibly, in ancillary facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting rooms</strong></td>
<td>Yes, or ancillary facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditorium</strong></td>
<td>Yes, accommodating 1-2 tour-bus loads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FIGURE 13
### PLANNED VISITOR SERVICES AT BATTLEFIELDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster/Battlefield</th>
<th>Planned Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Center</td>
<td>Establish Civil War orientation center / local history museum in the village of McDowell for the cluster. Site and characteristics of this facility to be determined through collaborative development of the District-wide interpretive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>Create pull off, parking area, and Virginia Civil War Trails site. Long-term, develop public, pedestrian access to the battlefield and other hilltop sites; develop loop-walking trail from the village to battlefield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Center</td>
<td>Establish Civil War orientation center for the cluster. Site and characteristics should be determined through collaborative development of District-wide interpretive plan. If located near I-81, this center could also provide &quot;gateway&quot; function for the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>Create driving tour around battlefield. Develop bicycle tour of both Cross Keys and Port Republic with parking at both. Complete planned wayside. Install additional Civil War Trails interpretive markers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Republic</td>
<td>Create pedestrian path along river (if supported by owners and residents) and driving tour around battlefield. Install additional Civil War Trails interpretive markers around battlefield and in the village of Port Republic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Center</td>
<td>Establish Civil War orientation center for cluster. Site and characteristics to be determined through collaboration between cluster communities and the Virginia Military Institute as part of District-wide interpretive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market</td>
<td>Continue present roles of the Hall of Valor and the New Market Battlefield State Historical Park. Expand interpretation through District-wide interpretive plan. Encourage visitation to nearby Civil War sites and throughout the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster/ Battlefield</td>
<td>Planned Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Center</td>
<td>Establish Civil War orientation center within the cluster. Site and characteristics should be determined through collaboration of public-trust land owners, communities, and NPS as part of District-wide interpretive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom’s Brook</td>
<td>Develop parking, walking trails, and install additional Virginia Civil War Trails and other outdoor interpretive signs. Build display shelter(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Hill</td>
<td>Extend the walking trail and expand parking. Build display shelter(s) at the battlefield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>NPS potentially to create new park unit with visitor center. Build walking trails at current visitor facilities. Develop parking and walking trails at river fords and the cemetery with display shelter or Virginia Civil War Trails pull-off interpretive site. Consider bicycle tour of the entire battlefield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Center</td>
<td>Establish Civil War orientation center within the cluster. Site and characteristics should be determined through collaborative development of District-wide interpretive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester</td>
<td>Install Virginia Civil War Trails interpretive signs. Create hiking/biking links and battlefield trails. Improve road signs around the battlefield areas. Build display shelter(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Kernstown</td>
<td>Install Virginia Civil War Trails interpretive signs. Implement preservation/interpretive plan for Grim Farm tract including Prichard House. Create hiking/biking links and battlefield trails. Build display shelter(s) at battlefield. Improve road signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opequon (Third Winchester)</td>
<td>Install additional Virginia Civil War Trails interpretive signs and pull-offs. Implement interpretive portion of Third Winchester Preservation Plan. Create hiking/biking links and battlefield trails. Build display shelter(s) at battlefield. Improve road signs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITOR RECEPTION

As previously indicated, there is currently limited coordination of visitor reception and services at historic sites within the District. However, tourism promotion agencies throughout the Valley do have a strong record of cooperation. An advisory board of tourism specialists could be created to review the coverage provided by the proposed improved system of signs and visitor reception sites, then assist the Foundation in identifying ways to close any gaps. While the orientation centers’ primary purpose is interpretive, they could offer some general visitor information about the Valley. At the same time, existing and future visitor reception sites throughout the Valley should help direct visitors to the orientation centers.

The state’s existing welcome center on I-81, north of Winchester, now provides information about local, regional, and statewide attractions and accommodations. As part of the celebration of its 400th anniversary in 2007, the Commonwealth may construct several regional visitor centers around the state. A new center near Staunton at the intersection of I-81 and U.S. Route 250 would present an exceptional opportunity to coordinate efforts between the Foundation and the Commonwealth, directing visitors to the battlefields and related resources that are so vital a part of the state’s history and culture. Figure 14 summarizes hospitality and visitor reception actions that are part of this plan.

LINKAGES

Linkages within and between clusters will build upon historic, military, and geographic connections and follow marked and interpreted historic roads. A potential linkages system is illustrated in Map 6 following page 74. Most visitors will drive these routes, but bicyclists will find many of them inviting as well. The Foundation will coordinate efforts with the VDOT in developing these routes, to avoid adverse effects such as congestion or hazards to pedestrian traffic.

Visitors will be able to travel I-81 between clusters or choose to continue following historic routes. Within clusters and between clusters, linkages will trace troop movements, campaigns, and settlements while demonstrating how geography and terrain affected battle plans and the course of the War. The Staunton-to-Parkersburg Pike project of the Valley Conservation Council and Highland County can serve as a model for the development and protection of historic routes between clusters.
FIGURE 14
SUMMARY OF VISITOR SERVICES ACTIONS
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing visitor reception sites</td>
<td>All continue, reinforced by additional funding as available through supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members and local governments and, to a limited extent, the Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New visitor reception sites</td>
<td>Possible; each town would create at least one combined interpretive and visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reception site, perhaps in cooperation with local businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation advisory body</td>
<td>A body of tourism specialists would advise the Foundation on an improved tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and signage system and assist in identifying ways to close any further gaps not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addressed by the towns’ new sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia welcome center on I-81 north of Winchester</td>
<td>Continues as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new Commonwealth-supported regional visitor centers</td>
<td>A possible Valley site presents an opportunity to coordinate the efforts of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation with the Commonwealth. Any regional centers built in the District would</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAYFINDING

A hybrid signage program will be developed. The system will combine the recognizable Virginia Civil War Trails “trailblazer” directional signs with a National Historic District logo. The logo will denote battlefields and other sites supported by the Foundation that meet standards set by the District-wide interpretive plan. Close coordination with the VDOT will be important because most of the signs will be in the public right-of-way. Other wayfinding will be provided in a cluster brochure that focuses on the area and cluster theme. The brochure will also direct readers to additional information available through other printed materials, audio-tours, and the World-Wide Web.

MANAGEMENT

The Foundation will serve as the “lead managing partner” for the District. The Foundation’s broadly representative board will include state and NPS representatives, District officials, representatives from each of the individual clusters, leaders from beyond the region, and experts in the various issues to be addressed by the new organization. (The District’s management structure is illustrated in Figure 15.)

The Foundation will develop programs that encourage other partners to play a significant part in protecting and interpreting battlefields and serving the public. The provisions in Public Law 104-333 for establishing the Commission’s successor include:

[P]rovisions for the establishment of a management entity which shall be a unit of government or a private nonprofit organization that administers and manages the District consistent with the plan, and possesses the legal ability to —

(i) receive federal funds and funds from other units of government or other organizations for use in preparing and implementing the management plan;

(ii) disburse federal funds to other units of government or other nonprofit organizations for use in preparing and implementing the plan;
(iii) enter into agreements with the federal, state, or other units of government and non-profit organizations;

(iv) acquire lands or interests therein by gift or devise, or by purchase from a willing seller using donated or appropriated funds, or by donation and no lands or interests therein may be acquired by condemnation; and

(v) make such reasonable and necessary modifications to the plan which shall be approved by the Secretary.21

PARTNER ROLES

A partner is defined here as any organization or agency that enters into a relationship with the Foundation to participate in implementing this Management Plan. The many partners with whom the Foundation will work in achieving the extraordinary level of stewardship, interpretation, and visitor service envisioned in the Management Plan, include:

- Counties, cities, towns, and other public bodies as appropriate, including economic development and tourism agencies
- Citizens’ groups and civic organizations concerned with historic preservation, environmental protection, recreation, and land conservation
- State and federal agencies whose interests include forestry, wildlife, water quality, roads and highways, recreation, agriculture, historic and cultural preservation, tourism, education, the arts and humanities, and other aspects of maintaining a high-quality environment and educational experience in the District
- Non-profit and private owners of land and historic sites and buildings
- Others, such as universities and museums, with ownership and programmatic responsibilities that affect the course of stewardship and education in the District

Sharing information, collaborating among themselves as well as with the Foundation, and working toward the goals and vision of this Management Plan, these partners could undertake a wide variety of initiatives, with coordination of efforts assuring the maximum benefit for all concerned.

The expected roles of key partners are outlined below.

Commonwealth of Virginia

- Serve on the board of the Foundation, with the governor, or a designee, serving ex officio
- Support the cost of operation of the Foundation and provide a consistent level of annual matching funds to protect and interpret battlefields
• Possibly support one or two regional visitor reception centers
• Adapt public policies and grant funding to support and protect the District’s resources

National Park Service and the U.S. Department of the Interior

• Serve on the board of the Foundation, with the Director of the Service, or a designee, serving ex officio
• Provide financial and technical support to the Foundation as authorized in P.L. 104-333
• Provide a consistent level of funds on an annual basis for the purchase of land and interests in land to protect battlefields as authorized in P.L. 104-333
• Provide technical assistance throughout the District
• Collaborate with District partners to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek battlefield
• Develop facilities at that battlefield to support this Management Plan and the District-wide interpretive plan

Other Federal Agencies

Other federal agencies that may play a role in the implementation of the Management Plan include, but are not limited to: the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Department of Education, the Institute for Museum Library Services, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts. These agencies and others could provide funds and policy direction in support of interpretation and protection of the District’s resources. These agencies are not expected to serve on the board.
Orientation Center Operators

- Plan, fund, build, and operate their centers according to standards set by mutual agreement in the interpretive plan
- Support the development of interpretive sites and the protection and interpretation of battlefields within the clusters, through whatever resources they can provide

District Supporters

District supporters include local governments, civic groups, foundations, corporations, and individuals that can help implement the plan.

- Act as full partners in further planning, protection, development, and promotion of the District as their resources, capabilities, and agendas allow
- Contribute toward the operating budget of the Foundation
- Contribute to the cost of the battlefield protection program, supporting at least the programmatic costs involved

FOUNDATION ROLES

Battlefield and Resource Protection

The Foundation will undertake the direct protection of battlefields through purchase of land, land easements, or both. It will also continue to work with and support public-trust battlefield groups in acquiring and protecting battlefield lands. The Foundation may establish a revolving fund for the purchase of property and easements and the sale and exchange of property. The Foundation will use other financial instruments and transactions as appropriate in the preservation of battlefield land and interpretive sites.

For protection of District resources in general, the Foundation will work with local jurisdictions to provide technical assistance, training, planning grants, and other encouragement. The Foundation may also act independently to promote stewardship
through educational outreach programs with public and private property owners. Where the Management Plan’s goals for the District are at stake, the Foundation will take advocacy positions regarding the policy, permitting, and budget decisions of local jurisdictions and state agencies.

Jurisdictions within the District will be encouraged to maintain land-use policies that encourage preservation, permit interpretation, and allow for visitor enjoyment of battlefield lands. The Foundation will have no official role, such as oversight of zoning or permitting, in these public policies. The Foundation will, however, provide information, training, technical assistance, grants, and other encouragement to the jurisdictions to help them incorporate battlefield protection goals into their policies and plans. The Foundation will also act as an advocate for better land-use planning and decisions where it deems important resources or precedents are at stake.

**Technical assistance and outreach to partners and property owners:** The Foundation is expected to work both independently and with its partners to carry out and support public outreach and technical assistance for battlefield protection. The Foundation is expected to work with groups like the Valley Conservation Council and the Virginia Outdoors Foundation to expand outreach to battlefield owners. In addition, the Foundation will help local jurisdictions to protect and invest in battlefields through such means as the use of Agricultural and Forestal Districts and the designation of local historic districts. Figure 16 lists some assistance techniques.

**Mapping:** The Commission began to create—in partnership with the NPS and James Madison University, and with the assistance of the District’s two planning district commissions and eight counties—a geographic information system (GIS) which includes digital maps of features such as battlefield resources, political boundaries, topography, infrastructure, visitor attractions, and land-use patterns. Funding should continue to be devoted to maintaining and further developing the District’s GIS; the information and analysis it provides allows the Foundation to keep abreast of changing threats to, as well as new opportunities for, battlefield and resource protection. The GIS can also serve as an advocacy, decision-making, and educational tool.
Interpretation

With assistance from the NPS, the Foundation will take the lead in organizing a District-wide interpretive plan that involves all relevant partners. It will provide matching-grant support, technical assistance, and other aid for implementing the interpretive plan. The Foundation will also directly assist implementation through such measures as developing regional guidebooks and brochures and maintaining a website. The Foundation will bring the partners together to monitor development of the interpretive system—particularly its driving routes—and maintain the interpretive plan’s mutually agreed-upon standards.
Visitor Services

The Foundation will take the lead in designing a District-wide graphic identity package (logos, signs, and so forth) and wayfinding system, and installing directional signs in accordance with the interpretive plan and in cooperation with the VDOT and the Virginia Civil War Trails program. In the first phase of implementation, the Foundation may provide modest support for existing visitor reception sites within the District to allow for upgrading of space and facilities. The Foundation will also support and participate in the development of cluster plans for community development.

FUNDING FOR MANAGEMENT

Upon approval of this Management Plan by the Secretary of the Interior, the Foundation is eligible to receive up to $500,000 each year, under the authorization provided by Public Law 104-333. Although authorized, the funding must be appropriated annually by Congress. The base funding provided through authorized appropriations will be supplemented by contributions from the Commonwealth and local sources. Private foundations, organizations, and corporations will be tapped for special programs.

IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN

The Management Plan will be implemented through the cooperative efforts of the Foundation and its partners. Implementation will be phased in over many years. District partners will take the lead in the development of each Civil War orientation center and its associated cluster. An implementation timetable for initial tasks follows.
MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE

Years One to Three:

**Battlefield and Resource Protection**

- Implement voluntary battlefield protection measures as opportunities arise, working with property owners, local governments, and public-trust battlefield owners.

- Undertake battlefield planning by cluster, including protection, access, and interpretation; coordinate with District-wide interpretive plan.

- Develop partner-support programs for resource protection, working with non-profit and government agencies (e.g., county planning departments), and implement matching-grant program.

- Pursue designation of scenic routes, rivers, and trails; historic structures; and historic districts.

- Continue Demonstration Projects Program begun by the Commission.

**Interpretation**

- Develop and begin implementation of the collaborative District-wide interpretive plan. Coordinate with battlefield plans.

- Develop partner-support programs for interpretation and institute matching-grant program for existing and new sites.

- Implement interpretive plan for specific battlefields, identify funds for the first round of construction, and contract for blueprints for public access and interpretive installations where land is already available.

**Visitor Services**

- Develop graphic identity, signage, and wayfinding components of District-wide interpretive plan. In collaboration with the Virginia Civil War Trails program, tourism advisors, and the VDOT representatives, begin installation of the regional directional sign system.

- Assemble tourism advisors and develop marketing plan.
• Identify and begin to address (primarily through funds from partners) needs of the District’s existing visitor reception system.

• Initiate hospitality training and develop reference materials to help front-desk staff of area attractions answer questions about the District.

Years Four to Seven:

**Battlefield and Resource Protection**

• Continue battlefield protection through partners and through direct action by the Foundation.

• Substantially complete battlefield facilities.

**Interpretation**

• Develop up to 30 percent of new interpretive sites identified through District-wide interpretive plan.

**Visitor Services**

• Complete Civil War orientation centers and open to public as ready.

• Implement community development program for visitor reception, recreation, and additional interpretive sites.

• Implement full-scale marketing plan once critical mass of facilities is ready.

• Complete installation of regional directional sign system in cooperation with the Virginia Civil War Trails program and the VDOT.

• Initiate support for regional recreation plan to develop bicycling and plan long-term development of walking trail linking battlefields.

• Create broadly collaborative community development plans by cluster. Assemble economic development advisors and develop partner-support program. Undertake one round of modest economic development matching grants for plans and technical assistance.
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

The Foundation’s annual operating expenses are anticipated at $1.4 to $2.3 million. Once all Civil War orientation centers are open to the public, their annual collective operating costs are estimated at $600,000 to $1.2 million. The total cost of the capital development projects required for the successful implementation of this Management Plan is estimated (in present dollars) at $12.4 to $19.8 million. Approximately $2.9 million to $5.2 million will be needed over and above monies that local partners have already programmed. These expenses are further detailed in Figure 17 and Figure 18.

![Figure 17: Costs - Projected Annual Costs of Operations](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foundation operations</th>
<th>Civil War orientation center operations</th>
<th>Total—annual operations costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$247,000 - $442,000</td>
<td>$600,000 - $1,200,000</td>
<td>$2,077,000 - $3,536,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Programs</td>
<td>$38,000 - $68,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>$1,097,000 - $1,656,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expenses</td>
<td>$95,000 - $170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Foundation operations</td>
<td>$1,477,000 - $2,336,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FIGURE 18
**COSTS - PROJECTED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES**
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil War orientation centers: 4 new</td>
<td>$1,735,000 - $4,235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War orientation centers: existing Hall of Valor</td>
<td>$1,250,000 - $2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlefield orientation centers: 6</td>
<td>$1,125,000 - $1,950,000 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum battlefield development (total costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$303,000 - $398,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$675,000 - $783,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Interpretation</td>
<td>$156,000 - $567,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit Shelters</td>
<td>$112,000 - $151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Signs</td>
<td>$226,000 - $465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Civil War Trails pull-offs</td>
<td>$225,000 - $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive sites</td>
<td>$6,550,000 - $8,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Costs</strong></td>
<td>$12,357,000 - $19,814,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total—Net new costs without costs already programmed</strong></td>
<td>$2,906,000 - $5,217,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Cost estimates are low-to-high ranges for planning purposes. Actual construction or programmatic costs may vary.
- Does not include existing or proposed visitor reception sites, including the possibility of a Commonwealth-supported regional visitor center.
- Costs of battlefield protection are not included. Total costs are difficult to estimate due to the variety of techniques that may be employed and the many partners that may be involved. The Foundation will maintain a list—to be updated annually—of battlefield protection priorities and their costs.
PUBLIC ENDORSEMENT OF THE PLAN

The Commission unanimously approved the clusters approach to the District as the most effective means of accomplishing the mandates of the enabling legislation. In doing so, the Commission believed that this approach would:

- Create the greatest degree of local stewardship for battlefield and resource preservation,
- Generate the greatest degree of local interest and participation in the program,
- Allow each county and community involved to determine how it wants to see its battlefields preserved, and
- Distribute the economic benefits of tourism most evenly throughout the District.

Once the Commission selected its preferred alternative and prepared the draft Management Plan and EIS, it held a 60-day public review period to present its recommendations to the public. Between 14 April and 14 June 2000 the Commission published a newsletter containing a summary of the recommendation, held four public meetings throughout the District to present it (and the other alternatives) to the public, and made presentations to local governments, interested federal and state agencies, and community organizations. In addition, extensive print and electronic media coverage of the plan carried the plan into the majority of homes and offices in the District.

The public has overwhelmingly supported the Commission’s proposed approach to preserving, interpreting, visiting, and managing the District. Appendix J contains resolutions and letters of support the Commission received approving the clusters approach and of the work of the Commission. In these resolutions and many of the comments and letters the Commission received, the general public as well as jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations urged the Commission to begin implementing the plan and expressed their eagerness to participate in the program.

With this level of public support and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission is now prepared to launch the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation, develop the partnerships envisioned, and begin implementation of this ambitious project.
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*Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District*
APPENDIX A

PUBLIC LAW 104-333:
SHENANDOAH VALLEY BATTLEFIELDS
NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT
COMMISSION ACT OF 1996

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
(a) **Short title.**—This section may be cited as the “Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Commission Act of 1996.”

(b) **Congressional Findings.**—The Congress finds that—

1. there are situated in the Shenandoah Valley in the Commonwealth of Virginia the sites of several key Civil War battles;
2. certain sites, battlefields, structures, and districts in the Shenandoah Valley are collectively of national significance in the history of the Civil War;
3. in 1992, the Secretary of the Interior issued a comprehensive study of significant sites and structures associated with Civil War battles in the Shenandoah Valley, and found that many of the sites within the Shenandoah Valley possess national significance and retain a high degree of historical integrity;
4. the preservation and interpretation of these sites will make a vital contribution to the understanding of the heritage of the United States;
5. the preservation of Civil War sites within a regional framework requires cooperation among local property owners and Federal, State, and local government entities; and
6. partnerships between Federal, State, and local governments, the regional entities of such governments, and the private sector offer the most effective opportunities for the enhancement and management of the Civil War battlefields and related sites in the Shenandoah Valley.

(c) **Statement of Purpose.**—The purposes of this section are to—

1. preserve, conserve, and interpret the legacy of the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley;
2. recognize and interpret important events and geographic locations representing key Civil War battles in the Shenandoah Valley, including those battlefields associated with the Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson campaign of 1862 and the decisive campaigns of 1864;
3. recognize and interpret the effect of the Civil War on the civilian population of the Shenandoah Valley during the war and postwar reconstruction period; and
4. create partnerships among Federal, State, and local governments, the regional entities of such governments, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, enhance, and interpret the nationally significant battlefields and related sites associated with the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley.

(d) **Definitions.**—As used in this section:

1. The term “District” means the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District established by section 5.
2. The term “Commission” means the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission established by section 9.
3. The term “plan” means the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission plan approved by the Secretary under section 6.
(4) The term “management entity” means a unit of government or nonprofit organization designated by the plan to manage and administer the District.

(5) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) The term “Shenandoah Valley” means the Shenandoah Valley in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

(c) Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District.—

(1) **Establishment.**—To carry out the purposes of this section, there is hereby established the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

(2) **Boundaries.**—

(A) The corridor shall consist of lands and interests therein as generally depicted on the map entitled “Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields”, numbered SHVA/80,000, and dated April 1994.

(B) The District shall consist of historic transportation routes linking the units depicted on the map referred to in subparagraph (A).

(C) The map referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Commission, the management entity, and in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(f) Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Plan.—

(1) **In general.**—The District shall be managed and administered by the Commission and the management entity in accordance with the purposes of this Act and the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District plan developed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary, as provided in this subsection.

(2) **Specific provisions.**—The plan shall include—

(A) an inventory which includes any property in the District which should be preserved, restored, managed, maintained, or acquired because of its national historic significance;

(B) provisions for the protection and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historic resources of the District consistent with the purposes of this section;

(C) provisions for the establishment of a management entity which shall be a unit of government or a private nonprofit organization that administers and manages the District consistent with the plan, and possesses the legal ability to—

(i) receive Federal funds and funds from other units of government or other organizations for use in preparing and implementing the management plan;

(ii) disburse Federal funds to other units of government or other nonprofit organizations for use in preparing and implementing the plan;

(iii) enter into agreements with the Federal, State, or other units of government and nonprofit organizations;

(iv) acquire lands or interests therein by gift or devise, or by purchase from a willing seller using donated or appropriated funds, or by donation and no lands or interests therein may be acquired by condemnation; and

(v) make such reasonable and necessary modifications to the plan which shall be approved by the Secretary;
(D) recommendations to the Commonwealth of Virginia (and political subdivisions thereof) for the management, protection, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historical resources of the District;

(E) identification of appropriate partnerships between the Federal, State, and local governments and regional entities, and the private sector, in furtherance of the purposes of this section;

(F) locations for visitor contact and major interpretive facilities;

(G) provisions for implementing a continuing program of interpretation and visitor education concerning the resources and values of the District;

(H) provisions for a uniform historical marker and wayside exhibit program in the District, including a provision for marking, with the consent of the owner, historic structures and properties that are contained within the historic core areas and contribute to the understanding of the District;

(I) recommendations for means of ensuring continued local involvement and participation in the management, protection, and development of the District; and

(J) provisions for appropriate living history demonstrations and battlefield reenactments.

(3) Preparation of draft plan.—

(A) Not later than 3 years after the date on which the Commission conducts its first meeting, the Commission shall submit to the Secretary a draft plan that meets the requirements of paragraph (2).

(B) Prior to submitting the draft plan to the Secretary, the Commission shall ensure that—

(i) the Commonwealth of Virginia, and any political subdivision thereof that would be affected by the plan, receives a copy of the draft plan;

(ii) adequate notice of the availability of the draft plan is provided through publication in appropriate local newspapers in the area of the District; and

(iii) at least 1 public hearing in the vicinity of the District is conducted by the Commission with respect to the draft plan.

(4) Review of the plan by the secretary.—The Secretary shall review the draft plan submitted under paragraph (3) and, not later than 90 days after the date on which the draft plan is submitted, shall either—

(A) approve the draft plan as the plan if the Secretary finds that the plan, when implemented, would adequately protect the significant historical and cultural resources of the District; or

(B) reject the draft plan and advise the Commission in writing of the reasons therefore and indicate any recommendations for revisions that would make the draft plan acceptable.

(g) Duties of the Secretary.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary may award grants, provide technical assistance and enter into cooperative agreements with the Commission, management entity, other units of government, or other persons to provide for the preservation and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historical resources within the District.
(2) **Technical assistance.**—The Secretary may make grants, provide technical assistance, and enter into cooperative agreements for—
(A) the preparation and implementation of the plan pursuant to subsection (f);
(B) interpretive and educational programs;
(C) acquiring lands or interests in lands from willing sellers;
(D) capital projects and improvements undertaken pursuant to the plan; and
(E) facilitating public access to historic resources within the District.

(3) **Early actions.**—After enactment of this Act but prior to approval of the plan, the Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance for early actions which are important to the purposes of this Act and which protect and preserve resources in imminent danger of irreversible damage but for the fact of such early action.

(4) **Acquisition of land.**—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in lands from a willing seller or donee within the District that have been specifically identified by the Commission for acquisition by the Federal Government. No lands or interests therein may be acquired by condemnation.

(5) **Detail.**—Each fiscal year during the existence of the Commission and upon request of the Commission, the Secretary shall detail to the Commission, on a nonreimbursable basis, 2 employees of the Department of the Interior to enable the Commission to carry out the Commission’s duties under section 9. Such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status, benefits, or privileges.

(6) **Report.**—Not later than 2 years after approval of the plan, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report recommending whether the District or components thereof meet the criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park Service.

(7) **Other assistance.**—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit the Secretary or units of government from providing technical or financial assistance under any other provision of law.

(h) **Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.**—
(1) **Establishment.**—There is hereby established the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.
(2) **Membership.**—The Commission shall be composed of 19 members, to be appointed by the Secretary as follows:
(A) 5 members representing local governments of communities in the vicinity of the District, appointed after the Secretary considers recommendations made by appropriate local governing bodies.
(B) 10 members representing property owners within the District (1 member within each unit of the battlefields).
(C) 1 member with demonstrated expertise in historic preservation.
(D) 1 member who is a recognized historian with expertise in Civil War history.
(E) The Governor of Virginia, or a designee of the Governor, ex officio.
(F) The Director of the National Park Service, or a designee of the Director, ex officio.
(3) **Appointments.**—Members of the Commission shall be appointed for terms of 3 years. Any member of the Commission appointed for a definite term may serve after the expiration of the term until the successor of the member is appointed.
(4) **Election of officers.**—The Commission shall elect 1 of its members as Chairperson and 1 as Vice Chairperson. The Vice Chairperson shall serve as Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson.

(5) **Vacancy.**—Any vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made, except that the Secretary shall fill any vacancy within 30 days after the vacancy occurs.

(6) **Quorum.**—Any majority of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(7) **Meetings.**—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Commission, but not less than quarterly. Notice of the Commission meetings and agendas for the meetings shall be published in local newspapers that have a distribution throughout the Shenandoah Valley. Meetings of the Commission shall be subject to section 552b of title 5, United States Code (relating to open meetings).

(8) **Staff of the commission.**—The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff as may be necessary to carry out its duties.

(9) **Administrative support services.**—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide to the Commission, without reimbursement, such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(10) **Federal agencies.**—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail to the Commission or management entity, without reimbursement, personnel of the agency to assist the commission or management entity in carrying out its duties and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status, benefits, or privileges.

(11) **Subpoenas.**—The Commission may not issue subpoenas or exercise any subpoena authority.

(12) **Expenses.**—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but the Secretary may reimburse members for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out the responsibilities of the Commission under this Act.

(13) **Mails.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(14) **Gifts.**—The Commission may, for purposes of carrying out the duties of the Commission, seek, accept, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or donations of money, personal or real property, or services received from any source.

(15) **Termination.**—The Commission shall terminate at the expiration of the 45-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary approves the plan under subsection (f)(4).

(i) **Duties of the Commission.**—

(1) **In general.**—The Commission shall—

    (A) develop the plan and draft plan referred to in subsection (f), in consultation with the Secretary;

    (B) assist the Commonwealth of Virginia, and any political subdivision thereof, in the management, protection, and interpretation of the natural, cultural, and historical resources within the District, except that the Commission shall in no way infringe upon the authorities and policies of the Commonwealth of Virginia or any political subdivision; and
(C) take appropriate action to encourage protection of the natural, cultural, and historic resources within the District by landowners, local governments, organizations, and businesses.

(j) Authorization of Appropriation.—

(1) In general.—From the amounts made available to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission not more than $250,000 annually to remain available until expended.

(2) Assistance.—

(A) From the amounts made available to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for grants and technical assistance pursuant to subsections (g) (1), (2), and (3) not more than $2,000,000 annually to remain available until expended.

(B) The Federal share of any funds awarded under subsection (g)(2) may not exceed the amount of non-Federal funds provided for the preservation, interpretation, planning, development, or implementation with respect to which the grant is awarded.

(3) Land acquisition.—From the amounts made available to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition pursuant to subsection (g)(4) not more than $2,000,000 annually to remain available until expended.

(4) Management entity.—From the amounts made available to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the management entity not more than $500,000 annually to remain available until expended.
APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES
Summary of Alternatives

In developing this plan, the Commission studied a range of alternatives to address the goals and mandates for battlefield and resource protection, interpretation, visitor services, and management. Throughout the planning process, public suggestions led to often significant adjustments and changes to the proposed alternatives. Ultimately, the Commission developed and then studied four alternatives. One, a “No Action” alternative is required for any federally funded project and is a baseline for evaluation. The other three were termed “action alternatives” and propose varying levels of activity. As the plan developed, it became apparent that in these “action alternatives” there was only one approach to battlefield and resource protection, interpretation and management that would satisfy the Commission’s mandates. Their principal distinctions are in the visitor services component.

This section provides an overview of the alternatives that were analyzed and an explanation of the options and alternatives eliminated from consideration. A complete description can be found in the draft Management Plan/Special Resource Study/Environmental Impact Statement prepared for this project.

OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A – No Action / Continue Current Management: Under this alternative, the efforts of existing groups would continue and a successor to the Commission would not be formed. Although a significant amount of development for visitors is planned, little coordination exists among District sites, governments, and other partners. Interpretation of the Civil War is currently limited, uneven, and narrowly focused. Visitors are not presented with a consistent message and visitor attractions are not tied together. Although much has been accomplished in the District, without coordinated leadership and state and federal assistance, it is unlikely that District resources would be protected from development or that an improved visitor experience would be provided.

Alternative B – "Clusters," the Proposed Action: Alternative B was identified in the draft plan as the Commission’s “preferred alternative” and is presented as “The Plan” (Chapter III) in this document. It involves the creation of a new non-profit organization to achieve the mandates of the Commission’s legislation. Visitor services and interpretation will be focused at Civil War orientation centers situated in five “clusters” of battlefields, towns, and related-resources. Visitors will follow historic routes to move around the entire District, from cluster to cluster, or within clusters. This alternative encourages communities to collaborate on creating or improving interpretive sites and other community development opportunities. The Commission selected this alternative because it best fulfills the legislative mandates, has the fewest negative impacts, and generates the greatest degree of local participation. It distributes the economic benefits of tourism most evenly throughout the District, creates the greatest degree of local stewardship for battlefield preservation, and offers opportunities to tell the most complete story of all the alternatives.
Alternative C – Exploration: Under this alternative, visitors would be encouraged to explore the battlefields and the District on their own. Visitor facilities would be developed at each of the battlefields to provide orientation to the District and interpretation of the site. Visitors would move from one site to the next along marked and interpreted historic routes and trails. Extensive use of brochures, maps, and informational kiosks would encourage self-guided exploration of the District. This alternative was not selected because it would require the most extensive development of the battlefields and would be the least likely to generate strong District-wide support.

Alternative D – Destination Center: Under this alternative, the District would be organized around a single, “blockbuster” facility at the Virginia Military Institute’s Hall of Valor Civil War Museum in New Market. The Destination Center would present a sophisticated, state-of-the-art educational experience and provide an overview of all aspects of the War in the District. Extensive tour routes, brochures, and interpretive displays would encourage visitors to venture beyond the Destination Center and see the other battlefields and sites in the District. This alternative was not selected because it would be difficult to draw visitors from the Destination Center to the other sites. This approach would also concentrate economic benefits—and development pressures—in one area and make it difficult to create and sustain District-wide partnerships.

Options and Alternatives Eliminated from Consideration

In the process of considering options, the Commission rejected a number of ideas based on study of models, the experience of its members, and public comment. Because the Commission did not combine these ideas into full-fledged alternatives, technically speaking the Commission did not eliminate alternatives from consideration, only potential parts of alternatives. Options considered and eliminated include:

Designation of the entire eight-county National Historic District as a new national park. The Commission felt that such a proposal would be inappropriate and ineffective in meeting the partnership mandates of the legislation. Longstanding resentment over the establishment of Shenandoah National Park and concern over the size of federal landholdings in the District, make it unlikely that strong District-wide support could be generated. In the Special Resource Study that was prepared with the draft plan/EIS, the National Park Service (NPS) evaluated this proposal and found that it would be difficult for the NPS to effectively manage a resource on the scale of the District. In addition, the Commission was concerned that designating the NPS as a lead agency would cause the Commonwealth, local governments, and private donors to assume their support would not be needed.

A single, stand-alone management entity, whatever its structure as a public agency or non-profit organization. The Commission believed that its successor would be unable to attempt the agenda laid out in its alternatives alone, nor should it try. The Commission’s enabling legislation emphasizes the importance of creating “… partnerships among federal, state, and local governments….” It would be difficult for a single group to develop and maintain the partnerships necessary to implement the ambitious program the plan outlines.
A federal authority or federal commission as the management entity. The Commission studied the experience of other federal entities organized on a regional basis to interpret, conserve, promote, and otherwise manage similar resources, known as “heritage areas.” While early versions of these efforts employed federal commissions, the trend in recent years, in reacting to the administrative difficulties experienced by these commissions, has been to establish federally recognized non-profit organizations.

A new state agency as the management entity. Early in its study of options, the Commission regarded the long-standing Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation and the more recent Museum of American Frontier Culture as advantageous models, because of their strong leadership from state officials and the continued state support of their operations. Discussions with state leaders, however, persuaded the Commission that establishment of a new agency responsible to one of the Commonwealth’s departments (the two examples here are within the Department of Education) would not be feasible in today’s political climate. Moreover, a greater degree of independence would be desirable.

A new state authority as the management entity. The Commission retained this option long into its consideration, seeking a major role for the Commonwealth and an alternative to the idea of a state agency that would still obligate the state to contribute to the annual budget of the successor and otherwise draw state leadership. The retention of this idea was also in response to the expression of public concern that the state be directly involved. The model is the Virginia Tourism Corporation, a quasi-governmental organization recently created as an alternative to a former state agency. Discussion with state leaders, however, persuaded the Commission that, like the state agency, this option would not be feasible. Moreover, the Commission was assured that the Commonwealth would become involved in a non-profit organization—thus still addressing public concern about state leadership.

Creation of a non-profit to act solely as a "lands board." Early in its deliberations, the Commission discussed the idea of segmenting the roles that would be assigned to its successor, focusing particularly on the need to protect the extensive acreage comprising the battlefields. The idea of an organization focused entirely on land acquisition and protection was ultimately rejected because of the intertwined nature of the roles of protecting and interpreting the battlefields—it would be necessary to understand interpretive needs in order to decide how to protect certain aspects of the battlefields. The Commission ultimately found that it would be better for both policy and fundraising to maintain a unified approach to all parts of the successor’s agenda.

Creation of a private, for-profit corporation as the management entity. The Commission briefly considered this idea. The model was a new for-profit organization spun off by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission. The Commission felt that while there may be certain opportunities for licensing or concessions that would generate funds independent of government support, there are not enough for-profit opportunities to generate the funding required to accomplish the overall agenda. The opportunities for licensing or concessions can be managed within a public or non-profit approach, much as museums and parks do in many cases.
Establishment of a regional authority (within the Shenandoah Valley) as a manager. Two models for this idea exist within Virginia; one is in the District, focused on a single park shared by Augusta and Rockingham counties. Two heritage areas also employ this approach, one in a single county in Pennsylvania, and one involving Augusta, Georgia, and the county in which the city is located. The Commission believed that District residents and governments have been skeptical of regional authorities and that the number of jurisdictions that would be involved in an authority to manage the District makes the idea too unwieldy.

The ability of the successor to review actions of local jurisdictions that may negatively affect the District. The Commission considered the idea of seeking the power for its successor to review “developments of regional impact,” similar to the process employed in Vermont under its Act 250, in which regional organizations review the zoning and permitting decisions of local jurisdictions affecting developments over a certain size. The Commission felt that this power, being unfamiliar to Virginia, was too difficult to sell to counties and other jurisdictions, and too great a burden on a successor already facing a large agenda. The Commission elected to have its successor work with local jurisdictions and non-profit organizations to reduce the impacts of development decisions and to step in as an advocate in issues where its leadership in articulating preservation and interpretation values is needed.

Development of two Civil War “Gateways.” One option for visitor services called for the development of two large “gateway” orientation centers. In meetings with the public, the Commission learned that group after group supported more than just two orientation centers. This idea was ultimately folded into Alternative B: “Clusters,” with the proposed Civil War orientation centers providing overall orientation to the District.
Programmatic Agreement
among the
National Park Service,
Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania
National Military Park
the
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
the
Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer
and the
Advisory Council On Historic Preservation
for the
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District
Implementation Funds
Matching Grant Program

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Commission Act of 1996 (the Act) created, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District (District) in northwestern Virginia comprising Augusta, Clarke, Frederick, Highland, Page, Rockingham, Shenandoah, and Warren counties as well as ten Civil War battlefields and historic transportation routes; and

WHEREAS, the Act also created the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission (Commission) to prepare a plan for the future management and administration of the District and to submit the plan to the Secretary of the Interior for approval; and

WHEREAS, the Commission, as called for in the legislation and the plan, will create a new nonprofit organization—the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation (Foundation)—incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia and endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior to succeed the Commission, administer the District, and disburse federal funds to other units of government or other nonprofit organizations to implement the plan as called for in the Act; and

WHEREAS, the National Park Service (NPS) is a principal partner in the project, provides funding and technical assistance to the Commission, and will provide funding and technical assistance to the Foundation to implement the plan; and
WHEREAS, the NPS, as the federal agency responsible for meeting the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, authorizes the Foundation to carry out the terms of this Programmatic Agreement in cooperation with Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park (FRSP); and

WHEREAS, the NPS has determined that projects to implement the plan may affect properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register, and is entering into this agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council), the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Commission to ensure that future actions have appropriate project review and comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470) and its implementing regulations, “Protection of Historic Properties,” (36 CFR Part 800); and,

WHEREAS, the Foundation will require recipients of federally funded grants to cooperate with the FRSP and the SHPO to comply with Section 106 prior to awarding grants, and will not fund projects that do not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the NPS, the Council, the Commission, and the SHPO agree that the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Implementation Funds Matching Grant Program shall be administered in accordance with the following stipulations to satisfy the NPS’s Section 106 responsibility for all individual undertakings of the program.

**STIPULATIONS**

The Foundation and the NPS, acting through the FRSP, will ensure that the following measures are carried out:

**I. QUALIFIED REPRESENTATIVE**

A. The NPS will provide the Foundation’s Section 106 Coordinator with access to the FRSP review team of qualified cultural resource specialists.

B. The Foundation’s Section 106 Coordinator will fill out a Professional Qualifications form, which will be reviewed and approved by the NPS. Evidence of professional certification of the Section 106 Coordinator will be kept on file at the Foundation offices.

C. Qualified cultural resource specialists team members providing project review may be from the FRSP or the NPS, Northeast Regional Office cultural resource staff.

D. Should the Foundation not have a Section 106 Coordinator on staff, a NPS preservation professional may coordinate review of projects in accordance with this agreement.
E. The Superintendent of the FRSP acting as an NPS signatory to this agreement, will insure each undertaking reviewed under this agreement is reviewed by a formally designated set of cultural resource management advisors.

II. EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

A. If the Foundation’s Section 106 Coordinator in consultation with the SHPO and the federal team of advisors, determines that there is an undertaking but that the action meets one of the categories listed below, no further review will be required.

1. preservation maintenance (housekeeping, routine maintenance, and stabilization)

2. acquisition of battlefield lands and historic resources for preservation, including additions to existing sites;

3. rehabilitation and widening of existing trails, walks, paths, and sidewalks within previously disturbed areas;

4. repaving of existing roads or existing parking areas within previously disturbed areas;

5. placement, maintenance, or replacement of utility lines, transmission lines, and fences within previously disturbed areas;

6. rehabilitation work limited to actions for retaining and preserving, protecting and maintaining, and repairing and replacing in kind materials and features, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the accompanying guidelines;

7. health and safety activities such as radon mitigation, and removal of asbestos, lead paint, and buried oil tanks;

8. installation of fire detection and suppression systems, and security alarm systems, and upgrading of HVAC systems;

9. erection of signs, wayside exhibits, and memorial plaques;

III. IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION

A. In consultation with the FRSP and the SHPO, the Foundation shall prepare and implement a program to identify and evaluate historic properties within the area of potential effect. The Foundation shall provide both FRSP and the SHPO with copies of this report.

B. If the SHPO does not object to the recommendations made in the resulting survey report within 30 days of receipt, the Foundation will assume concurrence. If no potentially eligible historic resources are present in the area surveyed, the Permittee may proceed to implement the undertaking upon receipt of written approval from the Foundation.
C. Prior to affecting any potentially eligible historic resource, the Foundation will develop and implement a testing program of sufficient intensity to provide an evaluation of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places, in consultation with the FRSP and the SHPO, following the regulations outlined in 36 CFR 800.4 (c).

IV. TREATMENT

A. If, as a result of the testing program, historic properties are identified that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the Foundation shall develop a treatment plan in consultation with the FRSP and the SHPO. The treatment plan may include, but need not be limited to, any one or more of the following: avoidance, protection in place, stabilization, recordation, data recovery, incorporation into protected areas, curation, publication, public interpretation, repatriation, long term management and co-management. The Foundation shall submit the plan to the SHPO for review and approval prior to implementation. Any comments received within 30 days of SHPO receipt of the plan shall be addressed in the final document.

B. All archeological data recovery plans prepared under the terms of this agreement shall include the following elements:

- Information on the archeological property or properties where data recovery is to be carried out, and the context in which such properties are eligible for the National Register;

- Information on any property, properties, or portions of properties that will be destroyed without data recovery;

- Discussion of the research questions to be addressed through the data recovery, with an explanation/justification of their relevance and importance;

- Description of the recovery methods to be used, with an explanation of their pertinence to the research questions;

- Information on arrangements for regular progress reports or meetings to keep the FRSP and the SHPO up to date on the course of the work. The plan will contain the expected timetable for excavation, analysis, and preparation of the final report;

- Description of the proposed disposition of recovered materials and records, along with evidence of an agreement executed with the FRSP regarding curatorial responsibilities;

- Proposed methods for disseminating results of the work to the interested public (e.g. slide packet for use in local schools, and exhibit in libraries during Archeology Month, etc.); and
• Proposed method by which any relevant Indian tribes, and other specific groups/interested parties will be kept informed of the work, and if human remains or grave goods are expected to be encountered, information on consultation with the Virginia Council on Indians, the United Indians of Virginia and any other relevant Indian tribe regarding final disposition of the materials.

V. DISCOVERIES

The Foundation shall ensure that construction documents for any undertaking involving ground disturbance arising from this program contain a plan for the treatment of unexpected discoveries, as follows:

• In the event a previously unidentified archeological resource is discovered during ground disturbing activities, all construction work involving subsurface disturbance will be halted in the area of the resource and in the surrounding area where further subsurface remains can reasonably be expected to occur. An archeologist approved by the FRSP will immediately inspect the work site and determine the area and the nature of the affected archeological property. Construction work may then continue in the project area outside the site area. Within 10 working days of the original notification of discovery, the Foundation in consultation with the FRSP and the SHPO, will determine the National Register eligibility of the resource.

• Work in the affected area shall not proceed until either (a) the development and implementation of appropriate data recovery is completed or (b) the determination is made that the resource is not eligible for inclusion on the National Register.

• If the resource is determined to meet the National Register criteria, the grantee will either avoid the area entirely or follow the conditions and guidelines outlined in The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s Recommended Approach to Consultation on Recovery of Significant Information from Archeological Sites.

• Any human remains encountered during the implementation of this agreement shall be treated in accordance with the “Regulations Governing Permits for the Archeological removal of Human Remains” (VR 390-01-02) found in the Code of Virginia (10.1-2305, et seq., Virginia Antiquities Act).

• The grantee must obtain a permit from the Department of Historic Resources for the removal of human remains in accordance with the regulations stated above. In reviewing a permit involving removal of Native American human remains, the SHPO will notify and consult with the Virginia Council on Indians, the United Indians of Virginia, and other tribal leaders as appropriate.

If previously unidentified historic properties, including archeological sites, are discovered during project construction, that portion of the project will stop immediately. The grantee will immediately contact the Foundation who will immediately contact the SHPO and the FRSP and the requirements of 36 CFR Section 800.11 will be satisfied.
VI. REPORTING AND SEMI-ANNUAL REVIEW

A. At the request of any party to this agreement, a meeting or meetings will be held to facilitate review and comment, to resolve questions or objections.

B. The Foundation shall provide the following reports to the Council, SHPO and the FRSP on an annual basis:

1. Documentation of the aforesaid activities undertaken among and between the Foundation and its grantees;

2. A brief project description of each activity undertaken;

3. A listing of projects funded through the Implementation Funds matching grant program that were reviewed for compliance through another agency; including written documentation of compliance and the Foundation’s decision that another agency is the lead agency;

C. The Council, SHPO and the FRSP will review the annual report and provide comments, including indications of where they want further involvement with the grant projects, to the Foundation and/ or its delegates.

D. Based on this review, the Council, SHPO and the FRSP will determine whether this agreement will continue in force, be amended, or terminated.

VII. AMENDING THIS AGREEMENT

The Management Plan for the District recommends that a new unit of the national park system be created at Cedar Creek battlefield. If such a unit is created, the Programmatic Agreement could be amended and the new NPS unit could assume the duties and responsibilities of the FRSP.

This Programmatic Agreement will be reviewed by the Foundation, the FRSP, and the SHPO for possible modification, termination, or extensions at the end of each federal fiscal year.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Each year, as the Foundation undertakes new program activities, it will notify the public regarding the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Implementation Funds Matching Grant Program activities. This notification will be done as part of the annual meeting conducted by the Foundation. The public meeting will include a list of projects funded by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Implementation Funds matching grant program and the Foundation contact name, address and telephone number for those interested in
inspecting the documentation of the Foundation’s determination of whether the projects will have an impact on the environment and/or historic properties.

IX. REVIEW OF PUBLIC OBJECTIONS

At any time during implementation of the measures stipulated in the Agreement, should an objection to any such measure or its manner of implementation be raised by a member of the public, the Foundation and/or the FRSP shall take the objection into account and consult as needed with the objecting party, the FRSP, the SHPO, or the Council to resolve the objection.

X. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A. If the SHPO objects within 30 days to any treatment plans or reports provided for review, or to any proposed action, the Foundation shall consult with the FRSP and the SHPO to resolve the objection. If the FRSP determines that the objection cannot be resolved, it shall request the further comments of the Council pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.7(b). Any Council comment provided in response to such a request will be taken into account by the FRSP and the Foundation in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.7(c)(4) with reference only to the subject of the dispute. The grantee’s obligations to carry out all other actions agreed to that are not the subject of the dispute will remain unchanged.

B. If the SHPO raises an objection concerning a determination of effect by the Foundation, or to the development and implementation of any measure and/or stipulations for treatment of adverse effects to an historic property from the grant, the Foundation will notify the FRSP of the objection, and will initiate consultation with the SHPO, including other consulting parties as appropriate in seeking to resolve the objection, and will ensure that the Grantee will cease construction in the area of concern raised in the objection. The Foundation may request expedited responses during this consultation.

C. Should any member of the general public object to any actions carried out pursuant to this agreement, the Foundation shall consult with the Grantee, the SHPO, the FRSP, and other consulting parties to resolve the objection.

D. If the FRSP, in consultation with the SHPO determines that further consultation will not lead to the resolution of the objection, the NPS shall take into account and consult as needed with the SHPO or the Council to resolve the objection.

E. All final decisions related to any unresolved issue will be in accordance with 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4) and documented by the NPS.

F. Any party to this agreement may terminate it by providing thirty (30) days written notice to each of the other parties provided that the parties will consult during the period prior to termination to reach agreement on amendments and other actions that would avoid termination. In the event of termination, the NPS will comply with 36 CFR 800.3 through 36 CFR 800.13 with regard to the undertaking.
Execution and implementation of this Programmatic Agreement evidences that the NPShas satisfied its Section 106 responsibilities for all individual undertakings of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Implementation Funds Matching Grant Program.
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APPENDIX A

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Property
Address: ____________________________________________________________
Municipality or township: ____________________________________________
County: ____________________________________________________________

Please attach front and rear photographs of project, building, structure, or site

National Register Status

Listed Eligible _____ Individually _____ Historic District _____ Not Eligible _____

If not listed, property appears: Eligible_____ Part of potential district_____Not Eligible_____

Based on
Criteria: __________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Name of Historic District: __________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Architectural Survey

Complete _______ Incomplete _______ Area Not yet Surveyed _______

Property Description

Year of Construction: c: _________ Type of Construction __________________________

Style/ Design: _________________________________________________________________

Significant Elements: _____________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Comments:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX A (continued)

Preservation Professional recommends additional review by the following CR Specialists:

- Archeologist
- Ethnographer
- Historian
- Architectural Historian
- Historical Architect
- Historical Landscape Architect
- Curator
- Other Advisers

________________________________ title or area of specialty

Because this is a routing determination and falls within the field of expertise of the Foundation Preservation Professional any additional review by the NPS CR Specialist staff or consultant is at the discretion of the Superintendent.

Determined by:

______________________________________________ Date: _________________________

Preservation Professional, Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation
DETERMINATION OF EFFECT

Site Inspection completed: Yes ____ No ____ Date ____

Description of All Proposed Work

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Demolition:  Yes _____             Exterior Work:  Yes _____                 Interior Work:  Yes _____
No _____                                         No _____                                            No _____

Ground Disturbance:  Yes _____ Archeological Site:  Yes _____
No _____                                    No _____

Determination of Effect

No Effect ____  No Adverse Effect _____  Adverse Effect _____

Compliance is: Completed _____ Not Completed _____

Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

_____ Preservation Professional recommends additional review by the following CR Specialists:
    _____ Archeologist
    _____ Ethnographer
    _____ Historian
    _____ Architectural Historian
    _____ Historical Architect
    _____ Historical Landscape Architect
    _____ Curator
    _____ Other Advisers

........................................................................ title or area of specialty
APPENDIX D

FEDERAL, STATE, AND NPS REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
### Relevant Federal, Commonwealth of Virginia, and Department of the Interior Policies Statutes, Regulations and Policies

**SHENANDOAH VALLEY BATTLEFIELDS NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Mandates</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Compliance Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service Organic Act of 1916</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 1-4, et seq.</td>
<td>To promote and regulate the use of national parks, monuments, and reservations, by such means and measures as to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the land in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Authorities Act of 1970</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 1</td>
<td>Affirmed that all national park areas, including historic sites, while acknowledged to be &quot;distinct in character,&quot; were &quot;united through their interrelated purposes and resources into one national park system, as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage.&quot;</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)</td>
<td>42 U.S.C. 4321-4347</td>
<td>Establishes national policy for protection of the human environment and ensures that decisionmakers take environmental factors into account. Requires all Federal agencies to analyze alternatives and document impacts resulting from proposed actions that could potentially affect the natural and human environment.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, as amended</td>
<td>40 CFR 1500-1508</td>
<td>Implements NEPA and provides guidance to Federal agencies in the preparation of environmental documents identified under NEPA.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Performance and Results Act of 1993</td>
<td>P.L. 103-62</td>
<td>Requires Federal agencies to develop a strategic planning and performance management system setting goals and reporting results.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act by the Council on Environmental Quality, as amended</td>
<td>40 CFR Parts 1500-1508</td>
<td>Provides guidance to Federal agencies in the preparation of environmental documents.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mandates (continued)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust Act of 1949</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 468c-e</td>
<td>Facilitates public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings and objects of national significance or interest.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Procedures Act of 1979, as amended</td>
<td>5 U.S.C. 551, et seq.</td>
<td>Outlines the forms of administrative proceedings (hearings, adjudication, etc.) and prescribes procedural and substantive limitations thereon. Provides for judicial review of Federal decision making actions.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Commission Act of 1996</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 461SEC. ß606.b.1-4</td>
<td>[To] preserve, conserve, and interpret the legacy of the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley; recognize and interpret important events and geographic locations representing key Civil War battles in the Shenandoah Valley, including those battlefields associated with the Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson campaign of 1862 and the decisive campaigns of 1864; recognize and interpret the effect of the Civil War on the civilian population of the Shenandoah Valley during the war and postwar reconstruction period; and create partnerships among Federal, state, and local governments, the regional entities of such governments, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, enhance, and interpret the nationally significant battlefields and related sites associated with the Civil War in the Shenandoah Valley.</td>
<td>Shenandoah Valley Battlefield National Historic District Commission National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Sites Act</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 461-467 and 36 CFR 65</td>
<td>Establishes a national policy to preserve historic sites and objects of national significance for public use.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities Act of 1906, as amended</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 431-433</td>
<td>Provides for the protection of historic or prehistoric remains, &quot;or any antiquity,&quot; on Federal lands; authorizes the President to declare national monuments by proclamation; authorizes the scientific investigation of antiquities on Federal lands. Protection of historic monuments and ruins on public lands.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm</td>
<td>Prohibits the unauthorized excavation or removal of &quot;archeological resources&quot; on Federal and Indian land. Archaeological resources include sites, features, artifacts, etc.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mandates (continued)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; Sec. 106 and Sec. 110</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 470; 36 CFR 800</td>
<td>To protect and preserve districts, sites and structures and architectural, archaeological and cultural resources. Sec. 106 requires consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office. Sec. 110 requires that NPS identify and nominate all eligible resources under its jurisdiction to the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, as amended</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 469-469c</td>
<td>Requires survey, recovery and preservation of significant scientific, prehistorical, historical, archaeological or paleontological data when such data may be destroyed due to a Federal project. Directs Federal agencies to notify the Secretary of the Interior whenever they find that such a project may cause loss or damage.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 4301-4310</td>
<td>To secure, protect and preserve significant caves on Federal lands for the perpetual use, enjoyment and benefit of all people; and to foster increased cooperation and exchange of information between governments and those who use caves on Federal lands.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934, as amended</td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 661-666</td>
<td>Requires early coordination with the U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service whenever water resources are involved. Applies to all projects that affect water resources.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mandates (continued)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1977, as amended; Sec. 401, Sec. 402, &amp; Sec. 404(b)(1)</strong></td>
<td>33 U.S.C. 1251, et seq.</td>
<td>Virginia Dept. of Environmental Quality. Sec. 401 regulates water quality requirements specified under the CWA. Section 402 requires a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for discharges into waters of the U.S. Sec. 404 requires a permit before dredging or filling wetlands can occur.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, as amended</strong></td>
<td>33 U.S.C. 1251-1376, et. seq.</td>
<td>Establishes criteria and performance standards for the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters through prevention, reduction, and elimination of pollution.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968</strong></td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 1271, et. seq.</td>
<td>To preserve certain rivers with outstanding natural, cultural or recreational features in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of present and future generations.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) of 1981</strong></td>
<td>7 U.S.C. 4201-4209</td>
<td>Minimizes impacts on farmland and maximizes compatibility with State and local policies.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1990, as amended; Sec. 118</strong></td>
<td>42 U.S.C. 7401, et seq. 42 U.S.C. 7609</td>
<td>Establishes standards to protect and improve air quality. Authority for air quality delegated to States. Requires project conformity with State Implementation Plan concerning air quality. Sec. 118 requires Federal land managers to protect air quality on Federal land.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended</strong></td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 1531-1543</td>
<td>Establishes a policy to protect and restore federally listed threatened and endangered species of flora and fauna.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LAWCON) of 1965, as amended; Sec. 6(f)</strong></td>
<td>16 U.S.C. 4601-4 to 4601-11</td>
<td>Preserves, develops and assures the quality and quantity of outdoor recreational resources. Applies to all projects that impact recreational lands involving LAWCON funds.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mandates (continued)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Transportation Act of 1966, Sec. 4(f)</td>
<td>49 U.S.C. 1653(f)</td>
<td>Provides that the Secretary of Transportation shall not approve any program or project requiring the use of any publicly owned park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, historic site, or land of local, state, or national significance, unless there is no prudent or feasible alternative to using such land.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS Policies and Guidance</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Compliance Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Planning</td>
<td>Director's Order 2</td>
<td>Directs the decision-making processes that result in the goals and actions specific to each unit of the national park system and those units of the national trails system administered by the National Park Service.</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act Guidelines, 1997</td>
<td>Director's Order 12</td>
<td>Provides bureau guidance on NEPA compliance consistent with CEQ regulations and on approaches to environmental documentation.</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Criteria for Parklands&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>NPS criteria and qualifications for resource evaluation and determination of a site’s suitability and feasibility for inclusion into the National Park System. Provides guidance for NPS Special Resource Studies.</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Management Guidelines</td>
<td>Director's Order 28</td>
<td>NPS policy regarding the preservation and treatment of archaeological, cultural and historic properties and ethnographic resources.</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Protection</td>
<td>Director's Order 77-1</td>
<td>Establishes NPS policies, requirements and standards for implementing Executive Order 11990, &quot;Protection of Wetlands.&quot;</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPS Policies and Guidance (continued)</strong></td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chesapeake 2000, Chesapeake Bay Agreement</em></td>
<td>Directive No. 98-2</td>
<td>NPS agreed to work cooperatively with the participating states, including Virginia, and other Federal agencies and partners to manage the 64,000-square-mile Chesapeake Bay watershed as a cohesive ecosystem through its 26 park units. Through the 1998 Federal Agencies Chesapeake Ecosystem Unified Plan (FACEUP), NPS recommitted to cooperative ecosystem management, watershed protection, living resources and habitat stewardship, nutrient and toxins prevention and reduction and sustainability.</td>
<td>National Park Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service, NOAA, U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Dept. of Defense; Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, District of Columbia, Chesapeake Bay Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Federal Executive Orders</strong></th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Compliance Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs</td>
<td>Executive Order 12372</td>
<td>Establishes clearinghouse coordination required with State and local agencies concerning impacts of Federal projects.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Executive Order 11514, as amended by E.O. 1199</td>
<td>Provides Federal leadership in protecting and enhancing the quality of the Nation's environment to sustain and enrich human life.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Wetlands</td>
<td>Executive Order 11990</td>
<td>Requires Federal agencies to consider all practicable alternatives to impacting wetlands.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management</td>
<td>Executive Order 11988</td>
<td>To avoid the long-and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Executive Orders (continued)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>Compliance required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations</td>
<td>Executive Order 12898</td>
<td>To avoid Federal actions that cause disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations with respect to human health and environment.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Historic Buildings in Historic Districts</td>
<td>Executive Order 13006</td>
<td>Agencies are to give priority consideration to use of historic buildings in historic district in Central Business Areas or give consideration to compatible new construction in a CBA.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection and Enhancement of Cultural Environment</td>
<td>Executive Order 11593</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the cultural environment.</td>
<td>Federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonwealth of Virginia Statutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>Compliance required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Environmental Review Process (SERP)</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1-1188 (b), Chapter 11, Art. 2</td>
<td>Provides guidance on the Commonwealth of Virginia's environmental review process</td>
<td>Commonwealth agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Review of Major State Facilities</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1-1188(a), Chapter 11, Art. 2</td>
<td>Requires Commonwealth agencies to submit environmental impact reports on major projects. Sets forth procedures for agency environmental impact reports.</td>
<td>Commonwealth agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Rivers Act, 1970</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1-401 et seq.</td>
<td>To protect and preserve certain rivers possessing natural or pastoral beauty. The Shenandoah River in Clarke Co. from the Warren-Clarke Co. line to Lockes Landing 14+ miles is designated a Scenic River.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Cave Protection Act</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10-150.11-150.18</td>
<td>Recognizes the unique qualities of caves and the irreplaceable archaeological and natural resources found therein and establishes measures to protect these resources.</td>
<td>All agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Virginia Statutes (continued)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 15.2-2223-2224</td>
<td>Requires that all localities have comprehensive plans showing the proposed uses for land throughout the locality; sensitive environmental areas; historical areas; etc.</td>
<td>Local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Historic District Zoning</td>
<td>Code of Virginia Title 15.2-2283</td>
<td>Authorizes localities to protect historic structures and areas through zoning.</td>
<td>Local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Districts</td>
<td>Code of Virginia Title 15.2-2306</td>
<td>Authorizes localities to preserve historic resources through the establishment of historic districts.</td>
<td>Local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, Horticultural and Food</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 3.1-18-8</td>
<td>To protect and enhance agricultural and forestal land as economic and environmental resource</td>
<td>Commonwealth agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Forestal District Act</td>
<td>Code of Virginia Title 15.2-440</td>
<td>Provide for the creation of Agricultural and Forestal Districts through the voluntary applications of landowners.</td>
<td>Local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Register Listing</td>
<td>Code of Virginia Title 10.1-2204</td>
<td>The Virginia Board of Historic Resources can nominate historic structures, sites and districts for listing on the Virginia Landmarks Register and National Register of Historic Places.</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1-2200</td>
<td>To preserve and protect State cultural, historic and archaeological resources.</td>
<td>Commonwealth &amp; Non Governmental Organizations (NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Antiquities Act</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1, Chapter 23</td>
<td>To identify, evaluate, preserve and protect sites and objects of antiquity which have historic, scientific, archaeological or educational value and are located on State-controlled land.</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Natural Heritage Program</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1-212</td>
<td>Establishes a natural heritage program that identifies significant natural resources.</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Water Quality Improvement Act of 1997</td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1, Chapter 21.1</td>
<td>Establishes the State’s water quality and defines point source and nonpoint source pollution programs in Virginia.</td>
<td>All agencies &amp; NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Virginia Statutes (continued)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Compliance Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Act, 1973, as amended</strong></td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1, Chapter 5, Art. 4</td>
<td>Establishes regulations controlling soil erosion, sediment deposition and runoff to prevent the unreasonable degradation of properties, stream channels, waters and other natural resources.</td>
<td>All agencies &amp; NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Natural Area Preserves Act</strong></td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Title 10.1-209, Chapter 2, Art. 3</td>
<td>Establishes and protects areas of special concern that the Commonwealth has designated as Natural Area Preserves.</td>
<td>All agencies &amp; NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Endangered Plant and Insect Act</strong></td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Sec. 3.1-1020-1030</td>
<td>Authorized Virginia Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services to regulate and protect Virginia's endangered plants and insects.</td>
<td>All agencies &amp; NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Endangered Species Act, 1987, as amended</strong></td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Sec. 29.1-564-568, Chapter 5, Art. 1</td>
<td>Regulates endangered or threatened species in Virginia and to prohibit the taking, transportation, processing, sale or offer for sale within the Commonwealth, any threatened or endangered species of fish or wildlife.</td>
<td>All agencies &amp; NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Highway and Virginia Byways Act, 1966</strong></td>
<td>Code of Virginia: Sec. 10, Chapter 390</td>
<td>Authorizes the Commonwealth Transportation Board the Dept. of Recreation and Conservation to recognize certain roads for outstanding features.</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX F

LIST OF HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
## Resources Listed on the National Register of Historic Places and other Sites and Features By Cluster

### SHENANDOAH VALLEY BATTLEFIELDS NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battlefield Analysis Areas</th>
<th>National Register-Listed Resources *</th>
<th>Identified Sites and Features Associated with the Battlefield **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDowell</strong></td>
<td>Fort Johnson; Hull House; Presbyterian Church; UDC Battle Monument, Bullpasture River; Cedar Knob; Cemetery Hill; Crab Run; Hull's Hill; Mill Site; Old Town McDowell; Parkersburg Road; Rodger's Tollgate site; Shaws Ridge; Shenandoah Mountain; Siltinton Hill; Warm Springs Road; Wilson House site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Keys, Port Republic</strong></td>
<td>Brick House (Dr. J. B. Webb House); Cross Keys Battle Monument; Cross Keys Tavern; Widow Polly Haugh House, Frank Kemper House; Port Republic Battle Monument, Black Anchor Creek and Heights; Keezletown Road; Kempers or Kyle's Mill site; Longs Hill; Massanutten Peak; Mill Creek; Oak Ridge; Port Republic; Port Republic Road; Trimble's Ravine; Union Church Cemetery; Union Church site; Victory Hill, Baugher House site; Bogota; Brown's Gap Road; Coaling; Deep Run; Dr. Kempter House site; Jackson's Prayer Tree; John Lewis House site; Lawyer's Road; Lewis' Mill site; Lewiston site; Louay Road; Lynnwood; Mt. Vernon Furnace ruin; New Haven; Pirky's Ford; South Fork Bridge site; South River; Wagon Bridge Site; Yost House site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Market</strong></td>
<td>54th PA Monument; Cedar Grove Church and Cemetery; Rice House; Rude House; Woodson Monument, Bushong Farm and Orchard; Bushong's Mill site; Harper-Rice House site; Harshburger House site; Indian Hollow; J.B. Strayer House site; Manor's Hill; Meem's Bottom; Mt. Airy; Neff's Mill (mill race); New Market, North Fork Bridge Site; Old Church Road; Old Town Rude's Hill; Shirley's Hill; Sigel's Hill; Smith Creek Crossing; St. Matthews Church site; St. Matthews Cemetery; Valley Pike; Williamson's Hill; Zirkle's Mill site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tom's Brook, Fisher's Hill, Cedar Creek</strong></td>
<td>Baker's Store; Crabill House; Locke House; Mt. Hebron Church; Turnpike Toll House (Mauertown), Barbe House; Eastep House; Fisher's Mill; Hupp House; Keller's Mill; Miller House; Mt. Hebron Church; S. Funkhouser House; Spangler's Mill; St. Stephens Church, 8th Vermont Monument; 128th New York Monument; Belle Grove; Bowman's Fort; Cooley House; Fisher's Mill; George Hupp House; Heater House; Long Meadow; Lowell Monument; Miller House; Miller-Kendricks Structures; Nieswander's Fort; Ramseur Monument; Spangler's Mill; Stickley House; Stone House; Walton House Back Road; Frieden Church site; Harrisville; Heischmann Farm; Jordon Run; Middle Road; Mt. Olive; Muhlenburg Farm; Old Mill sites; Old Town Tom's Brook; Pugh's Run; Round Hill; Sand Ridge Road; Sawmill Valley; Spiker's Ridge; St. Johns Church site; St. Matthews Church Hill; Thornton Farm; Tom's Brook; Valley Pike; Woodstock Road, A. Funkhouser House site; Back Road; Entrenchments; Fisher's Hill; Flint Hill; Fort Banks site; I. Piper House site; Jacob Funk House and Barn ruin; Locust Grove School site; Manassas Gap Railroad; Middle Road; Miller's Bottom; Newell House site; Old Town Strasburg; Picnic Ground; Prospect Hill; Quarry Hill; Ramseur's Hill; Round Hill; Signal Knob; Stage Road; Stone Bridge Site ruin; Tumbling Run; Valley Pike; Widow Funkhouser House site, 19th Corps Entrenchments; Bowman's Mill;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlefield Analysis Areas</td>
<td>National Register-Listed Resources *</td>
<td>Identified Sites and Features Associated with the Battlefield **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom's Brook, Fisher's Hill, Cedar Creek (Continued)</td>
<td>Bowman's Mill Ford; Buckton Ford; Cedar Creek Crossing; Clover House at Mine Bank Ford; Col. Bowman's Ford; Collapsed Bridge Site; Crook's Entrenchments; Cupp's Ford; Entrenchments; Fisher's Hill; G.A. Hupp House site; Hottle's Mill site; Hupp's Ford; Hupp's Mill; Manassas Gap Railroad; McInturff House ruin; McInturff's Ford; Meadow Brook; Middle Marsh Brook; Middletown Cemetery; Miller's Mill ruin; North Fork Shenandoah River; Old Front Royal Road; Old Town Strasburg; Old Town Middletown; Red Hill; Signal Knob; Fort Banks site; Sperry House site; Stickley's Mill ruin; Stone Bridge ruin; Sunnyside; Thoburn's Redoubt; Valley Turnpike; Widow Funkhouser House site; Wm. Dinges Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Winchester, Second Kernstown, Opequon (Third Winchester)</td>
<td><strong>Stonewall Jackson's Headquarters (National Historic Landmark)</strong>, Winchester Historic District, Glen Burnie, Hexagon House, Handley Library, Old Stone Church, Adam Kurtz House, Abram's Delight, Springdale Mill Complex, John Hite House</td>
<td>Jonathan Smith House; Star Fort; Stone Houses; Taylor's Hotel; West Fort, Bartonsville Mill; Glass House; Magill House; Opequon Church and Cemetery; Pritchard House; Stone Walls, Brumley House; Carter House; Greenwood Church; Hasting's Monument; I. Wood House; Star Fort; Thomas McCann House, Abrams Creek; Abrams Delight; Apple Pie Ridge; Battery Hill; Battery Heights; Berryville Pike; Bower's Hill; Camp Hill; Cedar Creek Grade; Cloverdale; Collier Redoubt; Entrenchments; Fort Milroy; Front Royal Pike; Jordan Springs; Keckley Mills; Kernstown; Louisiana Heights; Middle Road; Milburn Cemetery; Milburn Road; Milltown; National Cemetery; Northwestern Pike; Old Charles Town Road; Old Town Winchester; Parkin's Mill; Pritchard's Hill; Stephenson's Depot; Stine's Chapel site; Stonewall Cemetery; Tidball's Spring; Tollgate site; Valley Pike; Walnut Grove; Willow Lawn; Winchester &amp; Potomac Railroad, Buffalo Lick Run; Cedar Creek Grade; Front Royal Road; Hoge's Ordinary; Hoge's Run; Kernstown; Middle Road; Old Town Winchester; Pritchard's Hill; Pritchard's Lane; Sand Ridge; Springdale; Stephenson's Depot; Stone Lane; Tollgate site; Valley Pike, Baker House site; Berryville Canyon; Berryville Pike; Burnt Factory Farm; C. Wood's Mill site; Cleridge Farm; Collier Redoubt; Dinkle Barn site; DuPont's Hill; Eversole House site; First Woods; Hackwood; Hackwood Lane; Hoffmann House site; Huntsberry House site; Jordan Springs; Locke's Ford; Milburn Cemetery; Middle Field; Morgan's Mill ruin; National Cemetery; Old Town Winchester; Opequon Crossing; Ravine (Rodes' attack); Red Bud Mill site; Rutherford House site; Second Woods; Sevier's Ford; Spout Spring (Wood House); Stephenson's Depot site; Stonewall Cemetery; Tanqueray's Ford; Valley Mill Farm; Valley Pike; West Woods; Wood's Mill site; Wright's Ford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Source: Study of Civil War Sites in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, 1992.
Items in bold have been determined by the National Park Service to be nationally significant.
APPENDIX G

TECHNIQUES FOR BATTLEFIELD PRESERVATION

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
# Techniques for Land Conservation (page 1 of 9)
**SHENANDOAH VALLEY BATTLEFIELDS NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase at fair market value</td>
<td>A transfer of ownership to a willing buyer at fair market value.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 60 days to one year.</td>
<td>Purchase price of land. Closing costs. Appraisal cost (not always required). Maintenance costs of land including taxes.</td>
<td>Strongest; allows complete control over the parcel.</td>
<td>Usually none. Local governments may find it advisable to transfer a conservation easement (see action described below) to an independent qualified holder to bind future officials to conservation intent.</td>
<td>Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation (SVBF), District partners, land trusts, local, state, and federal governments, or conservation-minded buyer(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full protection of land in perpetuity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase at bargain price (less than fair market value)</td>
<td>See above. Buyer agrees to accept less than fair market value, and if selling to a nonprofit or government buyer, the seller may be able to deduct the difference in value as a charitable contribution for state and federal income taxes. Federal deduction generally allowed if the difference in value is 20 percent.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 60 days to one year.</td>
<td>Reduced purchase price of land. Closing costs. Appraisal cost (not always required). Maintenance costs of land including taxes.</td>
<td>Strongest; allows complete control over the parcel.</td>
<td>Usually none. Local governments may find it advisable to transfer a conservation easement (see action described below) to an independent qualified holder to bind future officials to conservation intent.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trusts, local, state, and federal governments, or conservation-minded buyer(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full protection for lower purchase price</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 All transactions listed in this document may be initiated by the property owner or solicited by a land conservation entity.
### Techniques for Land Conservation (page 2 of 9)
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Acquisition of land via donation or bequest  
*Full protection and tax benefit for seller* | Property owner freely transfers the property by transferring the deed or by instructions in his or her will. | Owner may initiate the bequest or donation. Timing varies—60 days to a year for donation; for a bequest, the property would not be transferred until death of the owner. | Donor or the estate of the party making the bequest typically covers transfer costs. Maintenance costs of land including taxes. | Strongest; allows complete control over the parcel. | Donor may choose to stipulate restrictions. Recipients generally prefer to be told of the donation or bequest in advance and to work with the donor on terms, and may refuse unexpected donations or bequests. | SVBF, District partners, land trusts, or local, state, and federal governments.2 |
| Acquisition or receipt of charitable remainder trust (or “donation with reserved life estate”)  
*Full protection similar to bequest without potential for contested wills* | Sale or donation (for charitable deduction) of property with retention of use by seller/donor until the seller/donor or his or her heirs die. Further stipulations may be applied. Owner can take a deduction for the donation immediately. | Owner initiates the transaction. Timing varies—6 to 12 months. | Administrative costs. Maintenance costs of land including taxes. | Strongest; allows complete control over the parcel once acquired. (Acceptance of the trust can be conditioned on maintenance of property so as to maintain integrity.) | Often none. Use may be restricted to terms negotiated between recipient and donor. | SVBF, District partners, or land trusts. |

---

2 It is unusual but not unheard of for property owners to donate property to governmental bodies. Other techniques following this point may also be used by governmental bodies to protect land, but require a level of expertise and experience more often found among land trusts, which can work on behalf of governmental bodies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition of option or right of first refusal</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>Securing exclusive purchase arrangements</em></td>
<td>Property owner agrees to sell or donate a property or property interest by either of two methods:&lt;br&gt;Purchase option – allowing the purchaser the right to buy the property at a later date at a specified value (or with an agreed process for determining future value)&lt;br&gt;Right of first refusal – the right to match a <em>bona fide</em> offer of purchase within a specified period of time.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 30 days to one year. Property itself may not be acquired for years.</td>
<td>Purchase price of option or right of first refusal.&lt;br&gt;Legal fees.&lt;br&gt;Recording costs.&lt;br&gt;Associated purchase costs when actual purchase occurs.&lt;br&gt;Maintenance costs of land including taxes.</td>
<td>Strong when option or right is exercised. (May be conditioned on maintenance of property so as to maintain integrity.)</td>
<td>Usually none.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trusts, or conservation-minded buyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition or receipt of undivided interest</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>Ownership of a share of a property to affect the use of the whole property</em></td>
<td>Acquisition or receipt of donation of an interest or share of a property. Usually occurs when multiple owners collectively share ownership. Each owner enjoys equal property rights.&lt;br&gt;Such owners may sell or donate their interest to a conservation-minded buyer (if transferred to a nonprofit via donation or bargain sale, the value may be deductible), thus potentially limiting use of other owners.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 6-12 months.</td>
<td>Purchase price of interest.&lt;br&gt;Closing costs.&lt;br&gt;Maintenance costs assignable to the interest obtained, including taxes.</td>
<td>Protection depends upon scope of ownership interest.</td>
<td>Undivided interest permits holder a voice in operation or disposition of property, including the power to force sale or division of the parcel.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trusts, or conservation-minded buyers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Note the difference between the following: rights of a property (development, use, mineral, etc.), share of property (multiple owners with equal rights to a single parcel of land), and subdivision of property (into individual parcels).
## Techniques for Land Conservation (page 4 of 9)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land exchange</td>
<td>Public entities or nonprofits exchange developable land of low conservation value for land with high conservation value. Can be exchanged between private and public entities. May reduce capital gains taxes for original owner of protected land.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding, parcel for exchange, and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 6-12 months.</td>
<td>Administrative costs.             Closing costs.            Appraisal costs. Maintenance costs of land if exceeding original holding or if property was bought for the exchange, including taxes.</td>
<td>Strongest; allows complete control over the parcel. Land exchanged may or may not be restricted via conservation easement or covenant.</td>
<td>Usually none.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trust, or conservation-minded buyer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swapping land to improve effectiveness of conservation activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated conservation easements</td>
<td>Owner of land voluntarily restricts the developable use of the land by stating limits in the deed, according to rules specified under Virginia law. The limits form a transferable interest that can be donated to a qualified organization ⁴ and the value may be deductible from state and federal income taxes.</td>
<td>For purchased easements, depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; if donated, the recipient may initiate; 3-12 months.</td>
<td>Administrative costs. Appraisal, documentation, and endowment costs. ⁵ Recording costs. Annual inspection costs, when not covered by endowment.</td>
<td>Second strongest after fee simple ownership.</td>
<td>Depends on terms of easement; development, subdivision (beyond reservations for use by the owner and family) or a substantial change in use may be prohibited. Easement restricts all future owners. ⁶ Easements often address property maintenance and provide a right of inspection.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trusts, and local, state and federal governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation through partial ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴ New nonprofit organizations must wait five years to hold non-appurtenant easements in Virginia. There is no waiting period for co-holding easements when one co-holder has been qualified under Virginia law. Organizations receiving donated easements for which the donor intends to take a tax deduction must be qualified under federal tax rules.

⁵ The Virginia Open Space Land Preservation Trust Fund may pay for appraisal, survey, and documentation expenses for donated easements. Endowment and other donation expenses are generally tax deductible as charitable contributions. Endowment pays for monitoring and enforcement. Documentation provides "base line" data for monitoring.

⁶ Easements must be re-recorded periodically to assure they remain in force under state law.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased conservation easements</td>
<td>Same as above, except that owner sells the interest in exchange for cash and/or other financing and may therefore pay capital gains taxes. Most often used to conserve farmland by limiting development.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 6-12 months.</td>
<td>Administrative costs. Appraisal, documentation and endowment costs. Recording costs. Annual inspection costs.</td>
<td>Second strongest after fee simple ownership.</td>
<td>Depends on terms of easement; development, subdivision (beyond reservations for use by the owner and family) or a substantial change in use may be prohibited. Easement runs with land, restricting all future owners.</td>
<td>Federal, state, and local governments. The Virginia General Assembly has enabled local governments with the authority to use public funds to purchase easements. Land trusts may also use this technique if they have available funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation through partial ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants(^8)</td>
<td>A restriction of use placed on a property by the owner before the property is sold. Though generally voluntary, covenants can bind future owners. Similar to an easement if used by a nonprofit or government. May be purchased or donated, but donation may not be deductible.</td>
<td>Time varies with negotiation; 3-12 months.</td>
<td>Same as an easement.</td>
<td>If adjacent to land permanently held by a nonprofit or corporation covenant holder, second strongest after fee simple ownership.</td>
<td>Depends on terms of covenant. A covenant may not bind future owners.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trusts, and neighboring conservation-minded buyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) The Virginia General Assembly has enabled local governments with the authority to use public funds to purchase easements.

\(^8\) This technique is best used where the covenanted land is adjacent to land owned by the covenant holder; for a non-profit, this approach is similar to a conservation easement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease, with option to buy</td>
<td>A rental agreement for a specified period of time, with an extra, legally recorded clause for optional purchase at a specified price.</td>
<td>Depends on available funding and speed with which purchaser(s) can act; 3-12 months.</td>
<td>Negotiable between lessee and lessor. Closing costs. Maintenance costs of land including taxes. Legal expenses of drafting agreement.</td>
<td>Until option to purchase is exercised, it is only as strong as the terms of the lease and the intentions of the landowner.</td>
<td>Use restricted to terms negotiated between lessor and lessee.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, and land trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases and management agreements</td>
<td>Leases are rental agreements and may be governed by legal rules; management agreements may have fewer legal rules but work in essentially the same way. Rental payments may not change hands for management agreements. Under leases, the lessee is responsible for the property; under a management agreement, the owner retains responsibility.</td>
<td>2-12 months.</td>
<td>Negotiable between lessee and lessor. With a lease, could require maintenance costs of land including taxes, depending on terms of the lease. Legal expenses of drafting an agreement.</td>
<td>Only as strong as the terms and length of the lease or agreement and the intentions of the landowner.</td>
<td>Use restricted to terms negotiated between lessor and lessee.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, land trusts, and, for leases, conservation-minded lessee(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary dedication and voluntary payment in lieu of dedication</td>
<td>Request by local government for a developer to voluntarily donate land for open space or pay a fee as an incentive for subdivision approval. Payment may be used to fund other land conservation activities.</td>
<td>Speed determined by will of local governments to request such conditions.</td>
<td>Administrative costs. Land maintenance costs including taxes for developer or residents of subdivision. Legal expenses of drafting an agreement.</td>
<td>Potentially strong protection for land dedicated or purchased through payment.</td>
<td>Local government policy may prescribe how such land or cash may be used.</td>
<td>Local governments with public support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Speed of Use</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Relative Strength of Protection</td>
<td>Degree of Restriction</td>
<td>Who Can Use the Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Forestal Districts for easier farming</td>
<td>Use-value taxation program for forestal and agricultural land in specific districts. Also protects land owner from farm-related nuisance claims and exercise of eminent domain.</td>
<td>Six months or more. Requires minimum acreage (usually involves more than one owner) and agreement by local government.</td>
<td>Administrative costs for local government.</td>
<td>Moderate. Fairly strong through the life of the district, but must be renewed every five to ten years. An owner who stops participating in a district may face penalties.</td>
<td>Limits property to agricultural and forestal uses.</td>
<td>Property owners and local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise of state and federal regulations for ecologically sensitive areas Relying upon available regulations</td>
<td>A wide variety of state and federal regulation can be used to support land conservation if enforced. Generally for wetlands and habitat for endangered species.</td>
<td>Usually immediate, but may depend upon the regulation. Habitat conservation plans may take time to prepare, but a moratorium on further development is often imposed until negotiations are complete.</td>
<td>Administrative costs.</td>
<td>Strong but protection technique only available for use in sensitive area.</td>
<td>Restriction depends upon terms of regulation.</td>
<td>Federal and state governments; local governments may participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and transportation planning Land conservation through local planning</td>
<td>Land use planning (zoning and subdivision review) and transportation planning can be used to decrease development pressures on land.</td>
<td>May take years to encourage local governments to require consideration of impacts on battlefields and other resources and to call for their protection.</td>
<td>Administrative costs for local government.</td>
<td>As strong as the will of local government. Not permanent protection.</td>
<td>Depends upon the type of implementation tool employed (i.e., zoning).</td>
<td>Local governments with public support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 Use is limited to agriculture but does not specify type of agriculture. Farm owner may subdivide land for use by family only.
# Techniques for Land Conservation (page 8 of 9)
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster zoning/ Planned Unit Development</td>
<td>Allows conservation by clustering subdivisions into small areas and dedicating the remainder of the property as open space. A PUD provision allows clustering for large mixed use developments. ¹⁰</td>
<td>Up to one or more years to gain approval from all necessary planning and zoning boards and governing bodies.</td>
<td>Administrative cost for local government. Extra design costs for developer, although costs may be recaptured in faster sales and higher prices.</td>
<td>Good planning concept for land conservation, but not first choice for protecting high priority parcels of core battlefield land. This tool is stronger if it requires permanent dedication of open space, but is still limited by the location and extent of the development.</td>
<td>Varies with local government requirements on protecting open space.</td>
<td>Property owners (developers) and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density bonuses</td>
<td>Local governments provide developers special conditions, variances and other similar benefits in exchange for increased density in subdivision</td>
<td>Local lobbying for government to offer bonuses for higher density development may take years.</td>
<td>Administrative cost for local government. Extra design costs for developer, although costs may be recaptured in faster sales and higher prices.</td>
<td>Good planning concept for land conservation, but not first choice for protecting high priority parcels of core battlefield land. This tool is stronger if it requires permanent dedication of open space, but still limited by the location of the development. Results in additional development on some land in exchange for protection of other lands. Best if bonuses are banked to protect large areas of significant battlefield land.</td>
<td>Varies with local government requirements on protecting open space.</td>
<td>Property owners (developers) and local governments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁰ Accomplishes land preservation, but could involve a subdivision or other development on battlefield land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speed of Use</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Relative Strength of Protection</th>
<th>Degree of Restriction</th>
<th>Who Can Use the Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation subdivisions</td>
<td>Similar to clustered development with emphasis on conserving specified natural, cultural, and historic features.</td>
<td>Local lobbying for government to permit and encourage such development may take years.</td>
<td>Administrative cost for local government. Extra design costs for developer.</td>
<td>Good planning concept for land conservation, but not first choice for protecting high priority parcels of core battlefield land. Strong if it requires permanent dedication of open space, but a portion of the parcel is still developed. Typically offers smaller lot size than the required minimum and greater dedicated open space.</td>
<td>Usually involves permanent prohibition of additional subdivision and/or permanent protection of shared open space, if any.</td>
<td>Property owners (developers) and local governments. May be used by land trusts in certain situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering to protect key features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large lot zoning</td>
<td>A zoning category for conservation requiring specified minimum lot sizes. (Usually 25-40 acre minimum)</td>
<td>Up to a year to revise zoning ordinance and zoning map. May require time for amendment to comprehensive plan.</td>
<td>Administrative costs for local government.</td>
<td>Not strong because it is reversible by a zoning change, or can be undermined by variance, but it can support agriculture and slow loss of land through subdivision.</td>
<td>Subdivision would require zoning amendment or variance.</td>
<td>Local governments with public support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting development through zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and certification program</td>
<td>Honorary distinctions conferred for property owners who excel in conservation activities or for properties that exhibit historical and ecological significance. Examples include the state and federal lists for historic resources and scenic byway and river designations. New local programs may be created with similar benefits and results.</td>
<td>Need lead time to create program; once program is set up and the public is aware of the program, speed would be determined by the time needed for application preparation, review and designation.</td>
<td>Administrative costs, publicity, and fabrication of signage. Some monitoring costs, as organizations with such programs typically visit the property for friendly consultation.</td>
<td>Little strength, but educates owners about other possibilities.</td>
<td>No restriction.</td>
<td>SVBF, District partners, or land trusts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources:

The Regional Plan Association, the Trust for Public Land, and the National Park Service, *Tools and Strategies: Protecting the Landscape and Shaping Growth*. The Open Space Imperative #3, a Regional Plan Association publication.

APPENDIX H

CRITERIA FOR ACQUISITION OF BATTLEFIELD LAND AND INTEREST

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
Criteria for Acquisition of Battlefield Land and Interests

LAND ACQUISITION PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM

The Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission suggests the following system be used to determine priorities for land acquisition within the historic district. The system was developed as a general guide for determining priorities, not as a rigid system from which deviations are not permitted. It should be used to develop specific battlefield management plans as well as to make critical yearly decisions on the appropriate battlefield lands to be acquired or otherwise preserved.

A ranking system similar to the following one was used by the Commission during its three-year life to evaluate parcels that came up for sale during the period. The latter ranking system was designed to evaluate parcels on an emergency basis, and therefore was not entirely appropriate for long term planning. It has been modified accordingly. The Commission tested its emergency ranking system and found that it produced results that Commissioners could agree with and support as representing fairly its land acquisition priorities. The following long-term priority ranking system has not been so tested. This task falls to the Commission’s successor, which should test the system on real parcels and may modify it as appropriate to ensure that application of the system reflects the successor’s true priorities.

The Land Acquisition Priority Ranking System that follows sets up various criteria for evaluating the value of land for preservation, interpretation, and view management. Other criteria may be needed to evaluate land for visitor services. For each criterion, possible point values are given with guidance provided for the assignment of points. A range of points is provided, say from 0 to 10, with guidance provided for various points along the continuum. Though the system shows points awarded in even numbers, odd number points can be assigned.

The system contains two parts: a system for ranking individual parcels within a battlefield and a system for setting priorities between battlefields. This allows priorities for acquisition/preservation to be developed for each battlefield, and then, if needed between battlefields. This highest number of points a parcel could receive under the A within the battlefield system is 40; the highest for the A between the battlefields system is 20.

The following four pages describe the ranking system. It is recommended that the system and its ranking of battlefield integrity and threat be evaluated every three years to keep the system current with successor’s knowledge, experience and priorities.
## Land Acquisition Ranking System for Evaluating Priorities within the Entire District, i.e., between Battlefields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># Points</th>
<th>Guidance for Point Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity of battlefield</strong>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POOR to FAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threat of development</strong>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HIGHEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Battlefield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGH MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LOW MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LOWEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Significance</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nationally significant according to <em>Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation=s Civil War Battlefields</em> - Class A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Having direct and decisive influence on campaign - Class B. Large forces engaged. High fatalities. High attrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Having direct and decisive influence on campaign - Class B. Smaller forces engaged. Fewer fatalities. Lower attrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having observable influence on the outcome of a campaign - Class C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Locally significant - Class D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-federal funding available</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50% or more available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>More than 25%, but less than 50% available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>More than 5%, but less than 25% available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The ratings of the battlefields as evaluated by the Commission in 2000 are listed on the next page. These ratings should be evaluated every three years to determine their validity.
RATINGS OF BATTLEFIELDS REGARDING INTEGRITY AND THREAT OF DEVELOPMENT

**Integrity of Battlefield**

GOOD
- McDowell
- Cross Keys
- Port Republic

FAIR
- Fisher’s Hill
- Toms Brook
- Cedar Creek

POOR
- Second Winchester
- Second Kernstown
- New Market
- Opequon / Third Winchester

**Threat of Development to Battlefield**

HIGHEST
- Opequon / Third Winchester
- Second Winchester
- Second Kernstown
- Cross Keys

HIGH MODERATE
- New Market
- Toms Brook

LOW MODERATE
- Fisher’s Hill
- Cedar Creek

LOWEST
- Port Republic
- McDowell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># Points</th>
<th>Guidance for Point Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition purpose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Historic preservation / interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visitor services or view management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation value</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Large parcel (at least 100 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Small parcel contiguous to land already preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small non-contiguous parcel within viewshed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of tract</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Very High Integrity</strong>: Current use mirrors Civil War conditions; historic structures/features still present; no non-contributing features on site; no non-contributing features visible off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>High Integrity</strong>: Current use mirrors Civil War conditions; historic structures/features still present; no non-contributing features on site; some visual intrusions from off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Integrity</strong>: Current use mirrors Civil War conditions; historic structures/features still present; minor non-contributing features on site; some visual intrusions from off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Low Integrity</strong>: Current use mirrors Civil War conditions; historic structures/features damaged or lost; non-contributing features on site and off site, though not so extensive as to mar Civil War ambience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Lost</strong>: Current use does not mirror Civil War conditions; historic structures/features lost; high level of visual intrusions both on and off site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Immediately Threatened</strong>: Zoned for development; Comp. Plan recommends development; not in Ag. District; developers interested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Highly Threatened</strong>: Zoned for development; Comp. Plan recommends development; not in Ag. District; currently not a hot area for major growth, but some subdivision occurring. (Could include tracts zoned agriculture, but planned for development and in hot market.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Moderately Threatened</strong>: Zoned for agriculture or conservation; Comp. Plan recommends development; not in Ag. District; developers seem interested, some subdivision occurring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td># Points</td>
<td>Guidance for Point Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of development</td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Somewhat Threatened:</strong> Zoned for agriculture or conservation; Comp. Plan recommends development; in Ag. District; developers seem interested, some subdivision occurring. (Could include tracts planned and zoned for agriculture, but weak zoning ordinance allows significant subdivision.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Potentially Threatened:</strong> Zoned for agriculture or conservation; Comp. Plan recommends agriculture or conservation; not in Ag. District; some subdivision occurring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Not Threatened:</strong> Zoned for agriculture or conservation; Comp. Plan recommends agriculture or conservation; in Ag. District; area not experiencing growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Lost:</strong> planned and zoned for development; development announced; surrounded by land already developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Significance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Highest Significance:</strong> Located in core. Contains large proportion of key ground (ground where the most important action of the engagement occurred). Historic features / structures present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>High Significance:</strong> Located in core. Contains moderate proportion of key ground (ground where the most important action of the engagement occurred). Historic features / structures present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Significant:</strong> Located in study area or core. Contains ground on which fighting or other important battle activities occurred. Historic features / structures present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Significance:</strong> Located in study area or core. Contains ground on which fighting or other important battle activities occurred. Historic features / structures absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Moderately Low Significance:</strong> Located outside study area. Includes rear staging areas, camp sites, isolated landmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Lowest Significance:</strong> Located outside study area. Forces may have moved through the area, but otherwise action or events on the tract were not significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
Guidelines for Development Projects

These guidelines are for the successor and its partners to follow when developing facilities for public access and interpretation in the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District

PROCEDURE FOR SITE SELECTION

1. **Assure the need for the development:** This includes the construction of parking, trails, stream crossings, interpretive and directional signs, interpretive facilities, comfort facilities, or other development. The need should be confirmed through thorough planning and analysis. This generally requires knowledge of planned and existing interpretive programs, size of audience, and relationship to other sites. Facilities are to be shared as much as possible, and when possible (as in the case of facilities for maintenance and some administrative functions) to be sited away from public areas and critical cultural landscapes.

2. **Know the possible environmental and cultural impacts:** Impacts on environmental and cultural resources are best avoided, rather than mitigated. A thorough knowledge of wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, endangered species, archeological sites, historic structures, historical views, and important cultural landscape features—e.g., fencelines, field patterns, woodlots, or specimen trees—is required prior to selecting any site for any purpose. Such resources are to be avoided wherever possible, and mitigation is to be pursued to the maximal extent feasible when impacts are unavoidable.

3. **Know the possible impacts on the community:** Following a full analysis of environmental and cultural resources, impacts on traffic and other community-related or neighborhood-related impacts should be considered in developing a short list of potential sites or, in the case of trails, alternative designs.

4. **Follow all applicable laws:** In developing a short list of potential sites or designs, all applicable environmental and other laws are to be followed. Section 106 review is expected under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and an environmental assessment or environmental impact study is expected under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. Reviews by local authorities are expected under all applicable local laws; if the constructing organization is exempt, the courtesy of local review is encouraged.

CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT

1. **Undertake adaptive use wherever feasible:** Where a building is required as a part of the development, re-use of existing buildings is to be the first option examined and is preferred.

2. **Follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards:** Where a historic building is involved in development, rehabilitation is to be undertaken according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

3. **Create unobtrusive design:** Design of new development on battlefields should respect the cultural landscape and the integrity of the battlefield, and contribute to a satisfactory visitor experience. Colors, materials, scale, paving materials (if any), landscaping, and other elements of design should combine to form a pleasing and generally unobtrusive aspect that
complements the existing cultural landscape. Replication or the moving in or historic buildings materials is not recommended in the development of new structures. If new structures are needed, they should reflect the place and the needs and customs of the present.

4. **Create safe parking and traffic impacts:** The analysis of the potential traffic and safety impact of the development is critical, and all feasible mitigation should be pursued. Parking should be sufficient for ordinary use, and plans should be incorporated into the development for accommodating parking needs during peak times or overflow events.

5. **Follow the state of the art in earthmoving and construction to avoid temporary or permanent impacts to the environment, especially streams and wetlands.** Specifications for construction and earthmoving should be explicit on this point, and supervision of construction practices should be vigilant. Tree removal should be minimized except where scene restoration is recommended for interpretive purposes. (This does not apply to forestry activities on public-trust lands, which should follow best-management practices in maintaining woodlots and other forested areas not accessible to the public.)

6. **Minimize impervious surfaces:** To avoid water quality impacts and runoff problems, the area of the site to be covered by roofs, paving, and other impervious surfaces should be minimized.

7. **Conserve energy, minimize waste:** The specifications, construction, and operation of any structure should be designed to minimize energy use and waste products. Analysis of the total energy impact of the development is encouraged. To minimize cooling and heating costs, and to reduce the solar impact on visitors’ parked cars (in summer), landscaping and solar orientation should be considered in the design phase.

8. **Avoid or minimize impacts to biotic resources:** Consider the impact of new plantings on existing habitats for both animal and plants, avoid exotic and/or high maintenance species, and design landscaping and landscape maintenance practices to minimize or avoid entirely the need for herbicides or pesticides and in order to take maximum advantage of the principles of integrated pest management. Where possible and appropriate, landscaping should be designed with native plants and provide forage and cover for wildlife.

**COORDINATION / CONTACTS**

Appropriate local, state, and federal governments should be consulted when undertaking development projects. Some of the contact agencies and groups include:

1. **Wetlands and Floodplains:** Norfolk District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Valley Regional Office

2. **Agricultural Land:** Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and American Farmland Trust

3. **Threatened and Endangered Species:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries for animals, and Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for plants

4. **Ecologically / Environmentally Critical Areas:** local governments to identify critical areas
5. **Biotic Communities**: local governments for identified areas; Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for information on native plants; Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation

6. **Streams and Other Water Resources**: local governments for stormwater management and setback requirements; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Valley Regional Office; Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation; National Park Service Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program; other contacts include River Network, Shenandoah Valley Pure Water 2000, Shenandoah and James River Watershed Managers, and Friends of the North Fork

7. **Historic, Archeological, and Cultural Resources**: National Park Service, Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer (Virginia Department of Historic Resources), and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation per the Programmatic Agreement for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

8. **Land Use**: local governments regarding land use plans and potential spin-off development

9. **Visual Impacts**: Virginia Department of Transportation regarding the placement of road signs; local governments and historical societies regarding the appearance of new development; National Park Service, Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer (Virginia Department of Historic Resources), and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (per the Programmatic Agreement for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act) when historic properties may be impacted

10. **Public Health and Safety**: local governments and Virginia Department of Transportation for traffic safety and accessibility considerations (visitor facilities, interpretive pulloffs, walking tours); local governments for issues regarding people with disabilities; Virginia Department of Health for waterworks and sewerage regulations

11. **Construction**: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Corps of Engineers, Natural Resources Conservation Service and local officials for permit requirements, applicable regulations, and suggestions for best practices; National Park Service if federal funds, permits or assistance are involved (may require compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969); Virginia Department of Environmental Quality if state funds are involved

12. **Air Quality**: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Valley Regional Office

13. **Transportation**: Virginia Department of Transportation and local governments

14. **Solid and Hazardous Waste**: Virginia Department of Environmental Quality’s Valley Regional Office and Department of Emergency Services

15. **Energy Use and Conservation**: Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals, and Energy
16. Recreation: National Park Service Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program; Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation and local governments
12 June 2000

Mr. Carrington Williams
Chairman, SVBNNDC
PO Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

After careful review we are delighted to extend the endorsement of the Virginia Military Institute of the Management Plan drafted by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

The "Cluster" plan for Valley Civil War interpretation is a reasoned approach that will assure the visitor to the region a consistent and well-directed exploration of the ten resource battlefields.

With our focus remaining on the New Market Battlefield site, we look forward to the partnership opportunities the work of the Commission and its successor organization will bring. VMI remains ready to assist in your important work and we thank you for the opportunity to review the Commission's plan.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Green, PE
Colonel
Business Executive
RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT
CLARKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

WHEREAS, Clarke County is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites, including the Civil War Battlefield at Cool Spring, along with individual sites associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, the history of Clarke County has been shaped by the Civil War, including the aforementioned battle, and many sites whose individual histories woven together form the fabric of the County's Civil War history; and

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites associated with the Civil War as well as preservation of the stories associated with the War are means to enrich the quality of life for the residents of Clarke County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the County as well as to the County of Clarke itself through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104 – 333) in 1966 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District and to develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitors’ services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District (of which Clarke County is a major part) and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for
action in compliance with P. L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote and manage the District’s Civil War heritage;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Clarke County, Virginia, endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

Approved and signed this 16th day of May 2000 by the Clarke County Board of Supervisors.

[Signature]

A. R. Dunning, Jr., Chairman
RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT
BY THE
FREDERICK COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Board of Supervisors of Frederick County, in regular meeting on the 24th day of May 2000, adopted the following:

WHEREAS, Frederick County is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites including the Civil War battlefields at Cesar Creek, First and Second Kernstown, and Second and Third Winchester, along with individual sites associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, the history of Frederick County has been shaped by the Civil War including the aforementioned battles, and many sites whose individual histories woven together form the fabric of the county’s Civil War history;

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites associated with the Civil War, as well as preservation of the stories associated with the War, are means to enrich the quality of life for the residents of Frederick County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the county, as well as to the County of Frederick itself through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District, and develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitors services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District (of which Frederick County is a major part), and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District’s Civil War heritage.

PDRes. #18-00
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of Frederick County, Virginia endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

This resolution was approved by the following recorded vote:

Richard C. Shickle, Chairman  Aye  Robert M. Sager  Aye
W. Harrington Smith, Jr.  Aye  Margaret B. Douglas  Aye
Charles W. Orndoff, Sr.  Aye  Sidney A. Reyes  Aye

A COPY ATTEST

John R. Riley, Jr.
Frederick County Administrator

Resolution No.: 050-00
A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT by the
HIGHLAND COUNTY BOARD of SUPERVISORS

WHEREAS, Highland County is richly endowed with numerous and significant
historic sites including the Civil War battlefield at McDowell along with individual sites
associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, the history of Highland County has been shaped by the Civil War
including the aforementioned battle, and many sites whose individual histories woven
together form the fabric of the county’s Civil War history; and

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites associated with the Civil War as well as
preservation of the stories associated with the War are means to enrich the quality of life
for the residents of Highland County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential
to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the county as well as to the
County of Highland itself through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996
to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District, and develop a plan to
preserve, interpret, provide visitors services, and manage the Civil War and other historic
and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District (of which
Highland County is a major part) and to identify partnerships between local, state, and
federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District
Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for
action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve,
interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District’s Civil War heritage.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of
Highland County, Virginia endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United
States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

Approved and signed this 26 day of May in the year 2000 by the Highland
County Board of Supervisors.

By: [Signature]
Title: Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

[Signature]
Roberta A. Lambert, Clerk
RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF PAGE, VIRGINIA

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Page, Virginia, acting at a scheduled meeting of the Board held on the 12th day of September, 2000, a resolution of support for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission Management Plan.

WHEREAS, the Lord Fairfax Planning District is richly endowed with significant Civil War historic sites, along the Valley Road corridor through Frederick County and Shenandoah County including the battlefields at Cedar Creek, Fishers Hill, Kernstown, New Market, Opequon and Winchester; with related Civil War action, skirmishes and troop movements through the Counties of Clarke, Page, and Warren and the then incorporated towns of Berryville, Front Royal, Luray and Shenandoah; and

WHEREAS, the rich antebellum history of the Northern Shenandoah Valley was further shaped by the Civil War as a result of the aforementioned battles, impacting the lives and fortunes of its people, are today compelling stories of war and recovery as the region’s Civil War heritage; and

WHEREAS, the preservation of sites associated with the Civil War as well as remembrance of the stories associated with the War are a heritage link that sustains efforts to maintain the quality of life for the residents of the Northern Shenandoah Valley and their descendants; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, also have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the region through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District, and develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitors services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District, of which the Lord Fairfax Planning District is a major part, and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that
proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District’s Civil War heritage; and

WHEREAS, that plan is consistent with the Lord Fairfax Planning District Commission’s 1997 “Shenandoah Valley Civil War Heritage Tourism Battlefield Protection Action Plan” and the District Strategic Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the County of Page endorses the Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted at a scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Page, Virginia, on the 12th day of September, 2000.

IN FAVOR: 5 OPPOSED: 0
ABSENT: 0 ABSTAINED: 0
DATE: 09/12/00

Nora Belle Comer
Chairman, Page County Board of Supervisors

CERTIFICATE

I, Charles Ballard, County Administrator, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was passed at a scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Page, Virginia, held on the 12th day of September, 2000.

Dated: 09/12/00

Charles Ballard, County Administrator
RESOLUTION NO. 00-10

WHEREAS, Rockingham County is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites, including the Civil War battlefields at Cross Keys and Port Republic, along with individual sites associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, the history of Rockingham County has been shaped by the Civil War, including the aforementioned battles, the events associated with "The Burning," and many sites whose individual histories woven together form the fabric of the County's Civil War history; and

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites associated with the Civil War as well as preservation of the stories associated with the War are means to enrich the quality of life for the residents of Rockingham County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the County as well as to the County of Rockingham itself through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District and to develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitors' services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District (of which Rockingham County is a major part) and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District's Civil War heritage;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Rockingham County, Virginia, endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.
I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of
the Board of Supervisors of Rockingham County, Virginia, held on May 10, 2000.

Given under my hand this 10th day of May, 2000.

[Signature]

William G. O'Brien, Clerk
A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT BY THE
SHENANDOAH COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

WHEREAS, Shenandoah County is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites including the Civil War battlefields at Cedar Creek, Fisher’s Hill, New Market, and Tom’s Brook along with individual sites associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, the history of Shenandoah County has been shaped by the Civil War including the aforementioned battles, the events associated with “The Burning,” and many sites whose individual histories woven together form the fabric of the county’s Civil War history; and

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites associated with the Civil War as well as preservation of the stories associated with the War are means to enrich the quality of life for the residents of Shenandoah County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the county as well as to the County of Shenandoah itself through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (PL 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District, and develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitors services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District (of which Shenandoah County is a major part) and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District’s Civil War heritage.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Shenandoah County, Virginia endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

*****

Approved and signed this 23rd day of May in the year 2000 by the Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors.

Beverley H. Fleming, Chairman
Board of Supervisors

A COPY TESTE:

Vincent E. Poling
Clerk to the Board
RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE SHENANDOAH VALLEY BATTLEFIELDS NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the Lord Fairfax Planning District is richly endowed with significant Civil War historic sites, along the Valley Road corridor through Frederick County and Shenandoah County including the battlefields at Kernstown, New Market, Opequon and Winchester; and in the case of the Fishers Hill and Cedar Creek battlefields, interpretation encompassing Warren and Page Counties; with further Civil War action, skirmishes and troop movements throughout the region, specifically noting the 1862 Battle of Front Royal and the 1864 Cool Spring battlefield; and

WHEREAS, the rich antebellum history of the Northern Shenandoah Valley was further shaped by the Civil War as a result of the aforementioned battles, impacting the lives and fortunes of its people, which are today compelling stories of war and recovery as the region’s Civil War heritage; and

WHEREAS, the preservation of sites associated with the Civil War as well as remembrance of the stories associated with the War are a heritage link that sustains efforts to maintain the quality of life for the residents of the Lord Fairfax Planning District, which is contained in its entirety within the legislative boundaries of the Shenandoah Battlefields National Historic District, and their descendants; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, also have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the Planning District region through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District, and develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitors services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District, of which the Lord Fairfax Planning District is the major part, and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District’s Civil War heritage; and

WHEREAS, that plan is consistent with the Lord Fairfax Planning District Commission’s 1997 “Shenandoah Valley Civil War Heritage Tourism Battlefield Protection Action Plan,” the “District Strategic Plan,” and the “Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Partnership Strategic Plan;” and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Lord Fairfax Planning District Commission endorses the Management Plan with the intent that the management entity provide equitable treatment to all localities within the Planning District and the Historic District and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

Adopted this 21st day of September, 2000.

Nora Belle Comer
Chairman

Attest: Stephen W. Kerr
Executive Director
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Rockingham County is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites, including the Civil War battlefields at Cross Keys and Port Republic, along with individual sites associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites will enrich the quality of life for the residents of Rockingham County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and their related stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of the County through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District’s Civil War heritage;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Council of Bridgewater, Virginia, endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

Approved this 13th day of June, 2000.

Hallie D. Dinkel, Mayor

Doris S. Kennedy, Clerk of the Council
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission of the City of Winchester, Virginia,
upon its submission by the Shenandoah Valley Battlegrounds National Historic District Commission
hereby adopts the following Resolution as a recommendation of the Commission of the City of Winchester, Virginia.

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlegrounds National Historic District Commission has prepared a
Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with PL 104-333 that proposes feasible
measures to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District's Civil War Heritage.

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlegrounds National Historic District Commission was created by an act
of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of use these Battlefield Sites in the
State of Virginia and other

WHEREAS, the Commission of the City of Winchester, Virginia, has been involved in the development of a
Plan to preserve, interpret, provide public access, and manage the Civil War sites and other
locations within the City of Winchester.

WHEREAS, these Sites and Stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable
economic return to the citizens and businesses of the City of Winchester and the Shenandoah
Valley, and

WHEREAS, preservation of the locations associated with the Civil War will benefit not only the
City of Winchester but also the Civil War enthusiasts.

WHEREAS, the history of Winchester is closely intertwined with the Civil War, including the story of the
battlefields at First, Second and Third Winchester and the Shenandoah Valley Battlegrounds.

WHEREAS, the City of Winchester is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites, including

MERRIMAN, W. D. Day, Clerk of the Common Council

AUGUST 1, 2000

ADOPTED

Resolution No. 2000-19.

THE COMMON COUNCIL

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT by the
WOODSTOCK TOWN COUNCIL

WHEREAS, Shenandoah Valley is richly endowed with numerous and significant historic sites including the Civil War Battlefields at Cedar Creek, Fisher's Hill, New Market, and Tom's Brook along with individual sites associated with this conflict; and

WHEREAS, the history of Shenandoah County and Woodstock has been shaped by the Civil War including the aforementioned battles, the events associated with "The Burning", and many sites whose individual histories woven together form the fabric of the county's Civil War history; and

WHEREAS, preservation of these sites associated with the Civil War as well as preservation of the stories associated with the War are means to enrich the quality of life for residents of Shenandoah County and the Shenandoah Valley; and

WHEREAS, these sites and stories, preserved and interpreted, have the potential to generate considerable economic return to the residents of Woodstock as well as to the County of Shenandoah itself through heritage tourism; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission was created by an act of the United States Congress (P.L. 104-333) in 1996 to identify the locations of ten of these battlefields in the District, and develop a plan to preserve, interpret, provide visitor’s services, and manage the Civil War and other historic and natural resources lying within the eight-county National Historic District (of which Shenandoah County and Woodstock are a major part) and to identify partnerships between local, state, and federal governments, private-sector interests and the successor to the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission has now prepared a Draft Management Plan with recommendations for action in compliance with P.L. 104-333 that proposes feasible means to preserve, interpret, celebrate, promote, and manage the District's Civil War heritage.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Council of the Town of Woodstock, Virginia endorses this Draft Management Plan and urges the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve such plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

Approved and signed this 6th day of June in the year 2000 by the Woodstock Town Council.

[Signature]
William C. Moyers; Mayor

[Signature]
Dorothy Hutchinson; Town Clerk
May 9, 2000

Mr. Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Chairman Carrington;

The Mayor and Council have reviewed the four alternatives as presented in your publication. In addition, many members also heard Mr. Kittell’s excellent presentation about the Commission’s work at the recent Town/County dinner.

We wish to compliment you, the members of the commission and your staff for all your fine efforts to develop diverse and effective alternatives. We also commend your efforts to involve as many persons and groups in this process as possible.

We believe the Clusters Plan would be the most effective and would serve the largest number of people. One of the primary constituencies to be served is the traveling public. Multiple centers are far more likely to reach these tourists and involve them in the history of these important battlefields and to bring them into the area as tourists and customers of the businesses supporting these battlefield sites and their history.

Likewise, persons visiting a part of the valley will be much more likely to visit a nearby cluster center than drive to a more distant central facility, and might not even get involved in the battlefield history if their only possible contact was through random access to brochures and signs.

We, therefore, urge the Commission to support the Clusters concept.

Again, thank you for all your great work.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Williams
Mayor
July 28, 2000

Mr. Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation appreciates the professionalism and dedication of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission’s members in developing a comprehensive plan to preserve the Valley’s Civil War heritage. Our Foundation’s Board of Directors endorse the Commission’s plan, and are pleased to provide this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Valley Battlefields.

We believe that the plan provides a balanced approach to interpretation and preservation of the battlefields, attracting tourists, and managing local resources through partnerships and cooperative efforts. Additionally, the Foundation supports the Commission’s recommendation to the National Park Service to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and actively participates in implementing this plan.

The Foundation hopes the plan can be completed and approved in the very near future, and look forward to its implementation. It is our sincere hope that funding from Federal, State and local government agencies will be provided to the Commission to make this plan a reality.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Lewis
Executive Director
Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
    National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Civil War Preservation Trust it is my pleasure to provide the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission with this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. Our organization and its members appreciate the hard work and skill that has gone into developing this plan to preserve the Valley's Civil War heritage.

The plan sets for a balanced approach to preserving, interpreting, directing and attracting visitors, and managing the Civil War resources in the District through partnerships and cooperative efforts. We also support the Commission's recommendation to the National Park Service to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and actively participate in implementing the plan.

Our hope is that the plan can be completed and approved with all due expediency. Now that the Commission and the Valley have labored for almost three years to develop the plan we are eager to see it plan implemented. Federal, state, and local funding will be essential and we trust that our political leaders in Washington, Richmond, and in the county seats and city and town councils will follow up with the commensurate support equal to the quality of the Commission's proposal.

Sincerely yours,

O. James Lighthizer
President
October 19, 2000

Howard J. Kittell, Executive Director
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
PO Box 897
New Market, VA  22844

Dear Howard,

RE: Request for First Kernstown to be included in Battlefield Plan

At its October 17, 2000 meeting, the Board of Directors of the Glen Burnie Museum voted unanimously to request that the site of the First Battle of Kernstown known as Rose Hill be included in the plan prepared by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission. This letter comes to formally make that request.

As a protected site, Rose Hill can only add to the Commission’s efforts to develop interpretive access to and market Civil War battlefields in the Shenandoah Valley. We feel that our efforts at developing Rose Hill are in line with the objectives of the Commission and its successor, the Foundation, and hope that you will accept us into the group.

Please let me know if I can provide further information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jennifer Esler
Executive Director
August 21, 2000
Harrisonburg-Rockingham Convention & Visitors Bureau
10 E. Gay Street • Harrisonburg, VA 22802 • (540) 434-2319 • Fax: (540) 433-2293 • http://www.harrisonburg.org/hrcvb/

Mr. Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P. O. Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Convention & Visitors Bureau, it is my pleasure to provide the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission with this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission. Our organization and its members appreciate the hard work and skill that has gone into developing this plan to preserve the Valley’s Civil War heritage.

The plan clearly sets forth a balanced approach to the preservation, interpretation, direction and attraction of visitors while maintaining the Civil War resources in the District through partnerships and cooperative efforts. We have been encouraged to participate in developing this plan and believe that it will establish the most feasible means for communities, organizations, and individuals to participate in making the plan a reality. We also support the Commission’s recommendation to the National Park Service for the establishment of a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and active participation in the implementation of the plan.

Our hope is that the plan can be completed and approved with all due expediency. All of the long work and endless meetings have produced a plan which is truly reflective of the needs of the area. The Commission has done an excellent job of involving the various DMO’s in the community -- our C/VB has given input into the process on several occasions. Federal, state and local funding will be necessary to make the plan come to fruition, and we trust that our political leaders in Washington, Richmond, locally will follow up with commensurate support equal to the quality of the Commission’s proposal.

Very truly yours,

Ruth Deskins
Executive Director

RD: ms
August 8, 2000

Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Board of Directors of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Historical Society at its August 2nd meeting voted unanimously to endorse the management plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefield’s National Historic District as stated in it’s most recent draft plan. The cluster concept appears to best encourage visitation to the various battlefield sites while meeting the interests of the various localities involved.

Our organization, which represents approximately one-thousand households in the central Shenandoah Valley, is deeply interested in the preservation of these battlefields and the history which they represent. Our membership and Board of Directors appreciate the good work done by the Battlefield Commission. I know it has been a long process but you clearly have made every effort to involve the public and organizations, such as ourselves, which have a natural interest in the preservation of our history.

Sincerely,

Lawrence D. Bowers, Jr.
President, Harrisonburg-Rockingham Historical Society
August 10, 2000

Mr. Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National
Historic District Commission
Post Office box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On the behalf of the Board of Directors and the general membership of the Highland Historical Society, I would like to express our deep appreciation and enthusiastic support for the Draft Management Plan which the Commission has worked so hard to complete for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. We believe that the successful implementation of the plan will have an extraordinarily positive impact on the entire Valley region.

We are particularly interested and pleased that the plan recognizes and promotes the active preservation of the unique Civil War heritage we all share here in Virginia, and believe that the opportunities to both save and to share this heritage make the plan one of enormous benefit to the economic and social welfare of our own area here in Highland County. The hard work and dedication which the Commission has shown in involving and working with so many people and organizations in the plan’s evolution will touch the lives of Virginians for generations to come.

This promises to open a tremendously exciting new chapter in historic preservation - and its attendant historic tourism for Highland, for the Valley, and for all of Virginia, and we look forward to its swift implementation through Federal, state and local funding and support.

Very sincerely,

Diane Klein
Chairman
August 7, 2000

Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P. O. Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

By a unanimous and enthusiastic resolution, the KBA Board of Directors recently voiced their firm support of the Commission’s plan for the preservation and interpretation of the Shenandoah Valley’s Civil War Battlefields. Let me add to that my personal congratulations and appreciation for all the hard work you did to accomplish this worthy task.

We were impressed by the innovative and realistic goals of the plan, and are excited by the potential benefits this new entity will bring to the Valley’s heritage tourism efforts. It’s also a wonderful coincidence that, like the Commission, the KBA will be passing an important milestone this fall as we finally settle on the Grim Farm and begin to offer it to the community as the precious historic and natural resource that it is.

Your efforts, along with the Commissioners and your excellent staff, are an impressive example of the good works that can be done through the power of partnering and leveraging the numerous groups and resources you identified. When this plan is fully funded and implemented, it should be a model to the nation.

We of the KBA appreciate all of the attention and vital support the Commission has provided us in the past three years, and we look forward to our role in the Shenandoah Valley Battlefield Foundation.

Very truly yours,

W. Lawrence Duncan
President

WLD/cwh
June 1, 2000

Carrington Williams, Esq.
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Sir:

The members of the Lower Shenandoah Valley Civil War Round Table wish to add their support to the Commission's preferred alternative (Alternative B: Clusters).

We also wish to thank the members of the Commission for their efforts in preserving the heritage and integrity of the Shenandoah Valley.

Sincerely,

Lyle G. Henschell
President
LSVCWRT

Visit our Web Site http://www.geocities.com/lsvcwrt
June 1, 2000

Carrington Williams, Esq.
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Sir:

The members of the Lower Shenandoah Valley Civil War Round Table wish to add their support to the Commission's preferred alternative (Alternative B: Clusters).

We also wish to thank the members of the Commission for their efforts in preserving the heritage and integrity of the Shenandoah Valley.

Sincerely,

Lyle G. Henschell
President
LSVCWRT
August 22, 2000

Carington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P. O. Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of the Berkeley County Roundhouse Authority it is my pleasure to provide the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission with this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. Our organization and its members appreciate the hard work and skill that has gone into developing this plan to preserve the Valley’s Civil War heritage.

The plan sets forth a balanced approach to preserving, interpreting, directing and attracting visitors, and managing the Civil War resources in the District through partnerships and cooperative efforts. We have been encouraged to cooperate with the District as we consider ways to develop our Civil War related assets. We also support the Commission’s recommendation to the National Park Service to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and actively participate in implementing the plan.

Our hope is that the plan can be completed and approved with all due expediency. Now that the Commission and the Valley have labored for almost three years to develop the plan, we are eager to see it implemented.

I remain,

Very truly yours,

Clarence E. Martin, III, Chairman

amt
July 18, 2000

Mr. Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of the Page County Civil War Commission it is my pleasure to provide the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission with this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. Our organization and its members sincerely appreciate the hard work and skill that has gone into developing this plan to preserve the Valley’s Civil War heritage.

The plan sets for a balanced approach to preserving, interpreting, directing and attracting visitors, and managing the Civil War resources in the District through partnerships and cooperative efforts. We have been encouraged to participate in developing this plan and believe that it will establish the most feasible means for communities, organizations, and individuals to participate in making the plan a reality. We also support the Commission’s recommendation to the National Park Service to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and actively participate in implementing the plan.

Our hope is that the plan can be completed and approved with all due expediency. Now that the Commission and the Valley have labored for almost three years to develop the plan we are eager to see the plan implemented. Federal, state, and local funding will be essential and we trust that our political leaders in Washington, Richmond, and in the county seats and city and town councils will follow up with the commensurate support equal to the quality of the Commission’s proposal.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Robert H. Moore, II
Chairman
August 10, 2000

Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
PO Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Potomac Headwaters RC&D Council it is my pleasure to provide the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission with this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. Our organization and its members appreciate the hard work and skill that has gone into developing this plan to preserve the Valley’s Civil War heritage.

The plan sets a balanced approach to preserving, interpreting, directing and attracting visitors, and managing the Civil War resources in the District through partnerships and cooperative efforts. We believe that it will establish the most feasible means for communities, organizations, and individuals to participate in making the plan a reality. We also support the Commission’s recommendation to the National Park Service to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and actively participate in implementing the plan.

Our hope is that the plan can be completed and approved with all due expediency. Now that the Commission and the Valley have labored for almost three years to develop the plan we are eager to see it implemented. Federal, state, and local funding will be essential and we trust that our political leaders in Washington, and at the local level will follow up with the commensurate support equal to the quality of the Commission’s proposal.

Very truly yours,

John H. Wagoner
Council Chair

XC: Roger Boyer, RC&D Project Coord.
August 2000

Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
PO Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Board of Directors of the Shenandoah Preservation League supports the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission’s Draft Management Plan for the creation of the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. We feel that this plan provides for an effective, manageable and equitable approach to the preservation and interpretation of our Shenandoah Valley Civil War sites.

The Preservation League has been impressed by the process whereby consideration was given to the needs and wishes of the communities, organizations, businesses, and individuals in the Shenandoah Valley Region. Equally impressive is the way in which tourism, interpretation, and the management of this valuable resource were interwoven to formulate this plan. The establishment of the five cluster areas allows for the participation of civic, private and non-profit groups, as well as residents in the preservation of our Civil War Heritage.

It is the League’s hope that the long and arduous work of the Battlefields Commission can now move forward into the next phase; the implementation of this plan. For this, the support of local, state, and federal funding, as well as their participation and support is needed. The Shenandoah Preservation League is ready to be a partner and support this plan in any way it can.

Sincerely,

Judy Reynolds, President
Shenandoah Preservation League
Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, VA 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Society of Port Republic Preservationists, Inc., it is my pleasure to provide the Commission with a letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District.

Our organization is one of those which participated for a number of years in drafting the bill to create the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission and in garnering the support to encourage its passage by Congress. We consider the Management Plan a feasible, balanced approach to preserving, interpreting, and managing the Civil War resources in the District through partnerships and cooperative efforts.

Our society is keenly aware of the pressing need, even the moral obligation, to preserve and interpret the sites and stories of this era of American history. We trust that localities will realize the additional economic benefits of a relatively “clean industry”, namely heritage tourism. Public funding at all levels...Federal, state, and local...will be essential and we trust that our political leaders at all levels of government will provide the funding necessary for the implementation of the plan.

We applaud the work of the Commission during the past three years, recognizing the difficulty of devising a plan acceptable to all entities involved. Now, it is our hope the plan can be completed and approved with expediency. We, the Society of Port Republic Preservationists, urge the United States Secretary of the Interior to approve the Management Plan upon its submittal by the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission.

Sincerely yours,

Carol Poulson
Carol Poulson, President
Society of Port Republic Preservationists, Inc.

"Remember the Past...Preserve for the Future"
August 8, 2000

Carrington Williams, Chairman
Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission
P.O. Box 897
New Market, Virginia 22844

Dear Mr. Williams:

On behalf of Valley Conservation Council it is my pleasure to provide the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission with this letter of support for its Draft Management Plan for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District. We at VCC understand the threats facing the Valley’s Civil War resources. We appreciate and support your efforts to protect and interpret those resources, and to increase public awareness of the Civil War heritage in the Shenandoah Valley.

VCC’s mission is to promote land use that sustains the Valley region’s farms, forests, open space and cultural heritage. VCC supports the concept of voluntary land protection. We work hard as an organization to educate landowners about voluntary techniques and to promote their use. The statement on page II-25 identifies many of our shared concerns: “There are a number of special resources to which the successor is expected to pay attention. These include agricultural lands; historic resources, including historic transportation routes; the current character and charm of the District’s communities, especially its small towns; and rivers, trails, and natural resources…”

We feel that the Commission has prepared an excellent document with a sound proposal for interpretation and management. We also support the Commission’s recommendation to the National Park Service to establish a new national park at the Cedar Creek Battlefield and to actively participate in implementing the plan.

VCC looks forward to participating as a partner with the successor organization in implementing the plan. As a land trust, we feel that state and federal funding opportunities for land protection, especially for the acquisition of conservation easements, is essential. Thank you for including VCC in the review process for this important plan.

Sincerely,

Mary Joy Scala
Executive Director

...promoting land use that sustains the farms, forests, open spaces, and cultural heritage of the Valley of Virginia.