



Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park

General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement –
Scoping Report
December 14, 2006



Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park

GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SCOPING REPORT

Contents

page no.

INTRODUCTION	1
EXTERNAL PUBLIC SCOPING	1
Scoping with the Park’s Federal Advisory Commission	1
Scoping with the Park’s Key Partners	2
Scoping with Local Governments	2
Scoping with Individuals Affiliated with Local Colleges	3
Scoping with Other Interested Parties	3
Scoping with the General Public.....	3
Responses to Comment Form Questions	4
Comments Received on the NPS PEPC Web Site	4
AGENCY COORDINATION	1
INTERESTS AND CONCERNS IDENTIFIED THROUGH SCOPING	8
Major Issue Categories.....	8
Park Federal Advisory Commission	8
Key Park Partners	9
Local Government and Other Interests	10
Individuals Affiliated with Local Colleges.....	10
Public Scoping Meetings	11
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: Public Scoping Meetings – Summary of Comments Received	A-1
APPENDIX B: Agency Coordination Letter	B-1
APPENDIX C: Inventory of Issues and Concerns Expressed at Scoping Meetings	C-1

Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park

GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SCOPING REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The National Park Service has completed the scoping process for the Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park (NHP) General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement as required pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Scoping is a process that occurs early in the development of a general management plan (GMP) for all units of the National Park System. Scoping is conducted both internally by National Park Service staff and externally with the public. Its general objectives are to obtain the views of NPS staff, other public agencies, and the general public regarding:

- the issues related to management of a park
- the range of management alternatives that should be considered to address those issues
- the types of impacts that should be used to evaluate and compare alternative management actions

This Scoping Report summarizes the scoping activities that NPS has completed for the Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park GMP/EIS, identifies the agencies and members of the public who participated in the activities, summarizes the issues raised that will be evaluated in the GMP/EIS, and describes the views regarding those issues of the parties who participated.

PUBLIC SCOPING ACTIVITIES FOR THE CEDAR CREEK AND BELLE GROVE NHP GMP/EIS

NPS conducted external public scoping for the Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP GMP/EIS over an 18-month period from June 2005 through November 2006. Scoping included numerous group and individual meetings with the park's Federal Advisory Commission, the park's key partners, other public agencies, and stakeholders (see Table 1). It also included a series of three public scoping meetings held on June 20, 21, and 22, 2006, in Strasburg, Middletown, and Front Royal, Virginia, respectively.

Scoping with the Park's Federal Advisory Commission

Beginning in July 2005, the Park's Federal Advisory Commission has met on the third Thursday of every other month, as follows:

- | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| - July 13, 2005 | - January 19, 2006 | - July 19, 2006 |
| - September 15, 2005 | - March 16, 2006 | - September 21, 2006 |
| - November 17, 2005 | - May 18, 2006 | - November 16, 2006 |

Scoping activities were included on the agenda for each of these bimonthly meetings. These focused on identifying interests and concerns related to long-term management of the park to be addressed in the

GMP/EIS. The meetings also included discussion of the park's fundamental and other important resources and values.

NPS has also encouraged Advisory Commission members to meet individually with the NPS GMP Planning Team. Five meetings occurred, including:

- Howard Kittell, Executive Director, Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation, April 4, 2006
- Kris Tierney, Assistant County Administrator, Frederick County and Board Member, Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields Foundation, April 7, 2006
- Elizabeth McClung, Executive Director, Belle Grove, Inc., April 7, 2006
- Mary Bowser, private landowner in the park, May 19, 2006
- Patrick Farris, Executive Director, Warren Heritage Society, June 22, 2006

Scoping with the Park's Key Partners

NPS has attended all monthly meetings of the park's Key Partners and conducted scoping activities at four of these meetings, including:

- December 13, 2005
- February 15, 2006
- March 15, 2006
- May 17, 2006

Scoping meetings also occurred individually with the Key Partners and their representatives:

- **Belle Grove, Inc.**
Belle Grove Advisory Board, November 13, 2005
Belle Grove Docents and Volunteers, March 29, 2006
- **Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation**
Suzanne Chilson, Executive Director, April 6, 2006
Joseph Whitehorn, PhD, Board Member, June 20, 2006
Michael Kehoe, Board Member, June 23, 2006
- **National Trust for Historic Preservation**
Executive Leadership, June 6, 2006
Staff, June 6, 2006
- **Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation**
Advisory Board, September 19, 2005
Foundation Interpretation Committee, November 11, 2005
Staff, April 4, 2006
- **Shenandoah County**
Marcus Ordonez, Director, Shenandoah County Parks and Recreation, April 7, 2006

Scoping with Local Governments

NPS has met with local government elected officials and staff on numerous occasions for purposes of scoping the management interests and concerns to be addressed in the GMP/EIS. The following meetings occurred:

- **Town of Middletown**
Middletown Town Council, October 3, 2005
Tess Klimm, Middletown Planning Board, June 22, 2006
- **Town of Strasburg**
Planning Commission and Town Council, August 27, 2005
Strasburg Town Council, October 11, 2005
Nora Amos, Strasburg Town Planner, June 20, 2006
Sarah Mauck, Strasburg Town Council (Councilperson-Elect), June 21, 2006
- **Frederick County**
Frederick County Board of Supervisors, June 14, 2006
- **Shenandoah County**
Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors, November 15, 2006
- **Warren County**
Warren County Board of Supervisors, December 6, 2005

Scoping with Individuals Affiliated with Local Colleges

Several scoping meetings occurred with individuals and scholars affiliated with local colleges who are knowledgeable regarding the cultural and natural history of the Shenandoah Valley. These included:

- Shenandoah University scholars and students, March 21, 2006
- Lord Fairfax Community scholars and students, April 27, 2006
- Warren Hofstra, PhD, Professor of History, Shenandoah University, May 19, 2006
- Joseph Whitehorn, PhD, Professor of History, Lord Fairfax Community College, June 20, 2006

Private Not for Profit Organizations

Scoping letters were sent to the following private not for profit organizations with a potential interest in the project:

- Civil War Preservation Trust
- Land Trust of Virginia
- Piedmont Environmental Council
- The Nature Conservancy, Virginia Field Office
- Scenic Virginia
- Virginia Outdoors Foundation

Scoping with Other Interested Parties

Numerous additional scoping meetings occurred with special interests groups and other members of the public, including:

- Warren/Linden Rotary Club, February 1, 2006
- Fisher Diagnostics employees, February 22, 2006
- Retired USGS employees, April 18, 2006

- Tom Christoffel, Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Commission
- Gigi and George Pasquet (landowners in the park) June 23, 2006
- Frederick County Rotary Club, July 11, 2006

Scoping with the General Public

NPS hosted a series of three public scoping meetings for purposes of soliciting public input regarding the management issues and concerns that should be addressed in the GMP/EIS.

In advance of the public scoping meetings approximately 350 meeting invitations were mailed to interested parties, including:

- Property owners within the park (approximately 100)
- Belle Grove Plantation Board members
- Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation Board members
- Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation Board members
- Frederick County Board of Supervisors
- Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors
- Warren County Board of Supervisors
- Middletown Town Council
- Mayor Town of Middletown
- Strasburg Town Council
- Mayor Town of Strasburg
- other individuals and groups who had previously expressed an interest in long-term park management

NPS staff also issued a press release to approximately 60 media sources in the Shenandoah Valley and appeared on local television and radio.

The public scoping meetings were held on consecutive nights in the counties in which the park is located:

- Strasburg Town Hall, Shenandoah County, June 20, 2006 (37 attended)
- Middletown Town Hall, Frederick County, June 21, 2006 (67 attended)
- Warren County Government Center, Front Royal, Warren County, June 22, 2006 (9 attended)

At each meeting NPS made a formal presentation providing an overview of the purpose and significance of the park and outlining the scope of the GMP/EIS. Following the presentation the public participated in facilitated group discussions to identify park management issues and long-term visions for the park. Comments received in the facilitated group discussions are summarized in Appendix A below.

Responses to Comment Form Questions

At the public scoping meetings those attending were offered an additional opportunity to comment through a GMP comment card. The same comment card was also made available to visitors at the park offices. The card asked the following questions:

- What would you like to do at the park in the future?
- What would you like to learn about at the park?
- What facilities would you like to have available for visitors in the park?
- What other issues would you like to see addressed in the general management plan?

One completed comment card was mailed back to the park office. This card was sent back by Preserve Frederick, who responded to the four questions as follows:

- What would you like to do at the park in the future?
...community awareness sessions, nature walks, trails, environmental studies...
- What would you like to learn about at the park?
...historical value to the land, creatures and habitat indigenous to this region, threatened and endangered species that are in this area...
- What facilities would you like to have available for visitors in the park?
...trails, visitor center, bike paths, informational guided tours and non-guided tours...
- What other issues would you like to see addressed in the general management plan?
...community preservation group like Preserve Frederick involved in issues (re: landowners, park officials, local and state governments and industry)...

Comments Received on the NPS PEPC Web Site

The NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) web site provided the public with an electronic link for obtaining information about or commenting upon the general management planning process. No comments were received during the scoping process period.

AGENCY COORDINATION

As part of the scoping process the NPS sent coordination letters to the following federal, state, and regional agencies:

Federal Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service
U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Virginia Field Office
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Office of Federal Agency Programs

State Agencies

Virginia Department of Agriculture
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Natural Heritage Program
Virginia Department of Emergency Management
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Environmental Enhancement Division
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Waste Division
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Water Quality Division
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Water Resources Division
Virginia Department of Forestry
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries

Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development
Virginia Department of Mines
Virginia Department of Transportation, District Administrator
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Virginia State Health Commissioner
Virginia Tourism Corporation
Virginia Department of Historic Resources

Regional Agencies

Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Planning Commission

Five agencies responded in writing within the 30-day comment period following receipt of scoping letters. Following is a brief overview of the comments received:

▪ **Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation**

The Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) noted the occurrence of the following significant natural resources within the park:

- along the southern boundary of the park the North Fork of the Shenandoah River is part of the North Shenandoah – Strasburg Stream Conservation Unit; this section of the river is of general biodiversity significance due to three associated species of conservation interest, two of which are designated as endangered or threatened by the state
- the park includes sections of Cedar Creek and Meadow Brook that have been designated by the state as threatened and endangered species water
- the park includes the Panther Conservation Site which has been designated by the state as a site of high biodiversity significance
- the karst topography of the park is typically associated with caves that could provide habitat to rare insects and subterranean aquatic species

The Department made a number of management recommendations pertaining to each of these areas. In addition the following two determinations were made:

- park management actions will not affect any documented state-listed plants or animals
- there are no State Natural Area Preserves under DCR's jurisdiction in the project vicinity

▪ **Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Natural Heritage Program**

The Natural Heritage Program indicated that two species designated as threatened or endangered by the State of Virginia have been documented within the park boundaries and/or in waters adjacent to the park. (These were also identified by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation – see above). Comments also indicated that a number of additional species designated as species of greatest conservation need in Virginia's *Wildlife Action Plan* also have the potential to occur within the park boundaries and/or in waters adjacent to the park. Various management actions were recommended to protect the species.

▪ **Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division**

The Air Quality Division noted that Frederick County is designated an ozone non-attainment area and requested that all precautions be taken to restrict emission of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and

volatile organic compounds (VOC) during construction and operation of park facilities. The Division also cited sections of the Virginia Code related to open burning and fugitive dust emissions that should be considered while preparing the GMP.

- **Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Environmental Enhancement Division**

The Office of Environmental Impact Review indicated that it would coordinate the state's review of the GMP/EIS pursuant to NEPA. Accordingly the office forwarded the scoping letter to ten state agencies, the Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Commission, and Frederick County. The office also requested that NPS provide 17 copies of the Draft GMP/EIS for review.

- **Virginia Department of Transportation**

The Department of Transportation District Administrator responded by identifying two individuals within the Department who could provide NPS with further assistance.

TABLE 1. Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP GMP/EIS – Civic Engagement Activities
(June 1, 2005 through August 31, 2006)

Date	Audience	Venue	Planning Presentation	Scoping Session
6/15/05	Interim Park Management Team	Belle Grove	●	
7/13/05	Park Advisory Commission	Middletown Town Hall, Middletown	●	
8/27/05	Strasburg Planning Commission and Town Council	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg	●	●
9/15/05	Park Advisory Commission	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg	●	●
9/19/05	Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation Advisory Board	SVBF Office, New Market	●	●
10/03/05	Middletown Town Council	Middletown Town Hall, Middletown	●	●
10/11/05	Strasburg Town Council	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg	●	
10/20/05	Frederick County/Winchester Tourism Board	Public Safety Bldg., Winchester	●	●
10/26/05	Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation Interpretation Committee	SVBF Office, New Market	●	●
11/13/05	Belle Grove Advisory Board	Belle Grove	●	●
11/15/05	Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors	Shenandoah Co Office, Woodstock	●	●
11/17/05	Park Advisory Commission	Middletown Town Hall, Middletown	●	● Partnerships
12/06/05	Warren County Board of Supervisors	Warren County Office, Front Royal	●	●
12/13/05	Key Partners	Belle Grove	●	● Partnerships
1/19/06	Park Advisory Commission	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg	●	● Transportation
2/01/06	Warren/Linden Rotary Club	The Apple House Restaurant, Linden	●	●
2/15/06	Key Partners	Belle Grove		● Partnerships
2/22/06	Fisher Diagnostics – All Employee Meeting (160 people)	Fisher Diagnostics, Middletown	●	

TABLE 1(cont). Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP GMP/EIS – Civic Engagement Activities
(June 1, 2005 through August 31, 2006)

Date	Audience	Venue	Planning Presentation	Scoping Session
3/15/06	Key Partners	Belle Grove	●	● Fundamental Resources and Values
3/16/06	Park Advisory Commission	Middletown Town Hall, Middletown	●	● Fundamental Resources and Values; Facilities and Visitor Experience
3/21/06	Shenandoah University – Scholars and Students	Shenandoah University, Winchester	●	● Scholar's Roundtable on Fundamental Resources and Values
3/29/06	Belle Grove docents and volunteers	Belle Grove	●	● Interpretive Themes
4/04/06	Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation Executive Director and Staff	SVBF Office, New Market		●
4/06/06	Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation Executive Director	CCBF Office, Middletown		●
4/07/06	Kris Tierney, Assistant County Administrator, Frederick County	Frederick County Office, Winchester		●
4/07/06	Belle Grove Plantation Executive Director	Belle Grove		●
4/07/06	Shenandoah County Parks and Recreation, Executive Director	Parks and Recreation Office, Edinburg		●
4/18/06	Retired USGS employees	Old Country Buffet, Fairfax	●	●
4/27/06	Lord Fairfax Community College – Scholars and Students	LFCC Campus, Middletown	●	●
5/17/06	Key Partners	Belle Grove	●	●
5/18/06	Park Advisory Commission	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg	●	● GMP Alternatives; "Vision" for the Park
5/19/06	Mary Bowser, Park Advisory Commission	Middletown		●
5/19/06	Warren Hofstra, Professor of History, Shenandoah University	Winchester		●

TABLE 1 (cont). Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP GMP/EIS – Civic Engagement Activities
(June 1, 2005 through August 31, 2006)

Date	Audience	Venue	Planning Presentation	Scoping Session
6/06/06	National Trust for Historic Preservation – Executive Leadership	NTHP Headquarters, Washington, DC	●	
6/06/06	National Trust for Historic Preservation – Staff	NTHP Headquarters, Washington, DC	●	●
6/14/06	Frederick County Board of Supervisors	Frederick County Office, Winchester	●	
6/20/06	Joseph Whitehorn, Professor of History, Lord Fairfax Community College	Middletown		●
6/20/06	Nora Amos, Planner, Town of Strasburg	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg		●
6/20/06	NPS Public Scoping Meeting	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg	●	●
6/21/06	Sarah Mauck, Councilperson-Elect, Town of Strasburg	Strasburg Town Hall, Strasburg		●
6/21/06	NPS Public Scoping Meeting	Middletown Town Hall, Middletown	●	●
6/22/06	Patrick Farris, Park Advisory Commission and Executive Director, Warren Heritage Society	Warren Heritage Society Office, Front Royal		●
6/22/06	Tom Christoffel, Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Commission	Front Royal		●
6/22/06	Tess Klimm, Town of Middletown Planning Board	CEBE Office		●
6/22/06	NPS Public Scoping Meeting	Warren County Government Ctr, Front Royal	●	●
6/23/06	Gigi and George Pasquet	Strasburg		●
6/23/06	Michael Kehoe, Board of Directors, Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation	Stephens City Town Hall, Stephens City		●
7/11/06	Frederick County Rotary Club	Buffet Restaurant, Stephens City, VA	●	
7/20/06	Park Advisory Commission	Middletown Town Hall, Middletown	●	●

GMP Scoping Results

INTERESTS AND CONCERNS IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE SCOPING PROCESS

Inventory of Interest and Concerns

Project scoping identified a wide range of issues relevant to the management of Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park. In order to identify which issues are appropriately addressed in general management level planning for the park they have been sorted into five categories, as follows:

- interests and concerns that are appropriately addressed by the GMP
- interests and concerns that are adequately addressed by servicewide law or policy guidance
- interests and concerns that should be addressed in implementation plans

The complete list of comments received sorted by these categories is included in Appendix C.

Summary of Issues and Concerns Raised by Various Groups and the Public at Public Scoping Meetings

- **The Park's Federal Advisory Commission – Interests and Concerns**
 1. The park's landscapes are important and threatened. Partnerships are needed to protect them.
 2. In addition to acquiring them, private lands can be protected through conservation easement and zoning
 3. Visitors should have opportunities to experience a broad range of interpretive themes, which should be coordinated by NPS and its partners.
 4. Visitors should be able to start at the park visitor center and way-find as described in the management plan for the National Historic District.
 5. The visitor center should be in a central location and have panoramic views of the park.
 6. The park should have its own identity and "branding." People must know when they are "in" and "outside" of the park.
 7. Can the Park Advisory Commission have a long-term role in managing the park?
 8. A management entity or representative body is needed to manage the mutual interests of NPS and its partners.
 9. NPs should be the anchor that ties partners and lands together but should be more focused on coordination, technical and financial support than a traditional NPS operation.
 10. Local governments must buy-in to whatever management entity is created.
 11. There are partners other than the "Cornerstones." How do we involve them?

12. The park and its partners need to develop the capability to serve large groups at annual reenactments

▪ **The Park's Key Partners – Interests and Concerns**

1. Visitors should have many interpretive experiences in the park, such as early settlement and the influence of the natural environment, the full dimensions of the Civil War and Battle of Cedar Creek, agriculture and its importance, and family stories.
2. Integrated interpretive themes should be one of the park's unifying elements. The park will be more densely interpreted than the heritage area.
3. Can NPS and its partners have a consistent set of management policies?
4. The park's visitor center could be the principal gateway to the entire region.
5. Is NPS willing and able to help partners with the management of their lands?
6. Partners need a mutual decision-making process and coordinated programming. The GMP needs to provide a decision-making matrix.
7. Partners should have cooperative agreements with NPS to formalize their participation in the management entity. Key issues should run through the management entity.
8. The management entity will be a forum or congress for decision-making.
9. Should consider a "hub and spoke" management concept with NPS at the hub and partners at the spokes.
10. One GMP alternative should show NPS in a traditional role, another should show NPS as strictly a partnership coordinator, and a third should be somewhere between the two.
11. NPS needs a central location and high visibility in the area.
12. Land protection must be done now and should be a major GMP issue.

▪ **Local Government and Other Interests – Interests and Concerns**

1. There are concerns about the impacts of Chemstone's proposed expansion on the park, water resources, viewsheds, noise levels, and traffic.
2. Whereas the heritage area is focusing on the Civil War, CEBE should provide a window into 200 years of history. Pre-Civil War history is important. Cannot tell the full story of the area without including the stories of the towns.
3. Annual Civil War reenactments are very important to the area's economics and interpretation. NPS should consider the reenactors as its largest user group.
4. There was a lot of energy and anticipation when CEBE was created, but not much has happened and the energy needs to be rejuvenated.

5. Perhaps Middletown could use annexation to bring the park into town and to provide better development controls, e.g., through a historic protection ordinance and traditional neighborhood design ordinance.
 6. Land protection is very important. We will not have a viable park without an appropriate land base. Can towns and counties help?
 7. Frederick County's 2003 Comprehensive Plan has an urban growth boundary but does not recognize that the park is in the County. However, that could change with an upcoming update.
 8. Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors is concerned about land protection.
 9. Warren County should consider working with landowners along Bowmans Mill Road and Long Meadow Road to rezone for preservation.
 10. The park is already compromised by I-81.
 11. Should use local network of leaders to work on protecting the park's land base. Town and counties could approach property owners and offer conservation incentives.
 12. Strasburg needs to develop a new vision for its growth considering an urban growth boundary.
- **Individuals Affiliated with Local Colleges – Interests and Concerns**
1. Park viewsheds and landscapes are very important. The area has unique flora and fauna.
 2. What has been preserved is only the infantry contact area. The battle area was really 20 x 15 miles in size. By focusing within the park, the visitor will think that is all that was involved.
 3. Civil War perspectives are varied. Examples include slavery, life in small communities, military history, women's roles during the war, and the impact of a civil war on people's lives. How can we get people to think at the level that Early and Sheridan were thinking, i.e., the bigger scale of the battle?
 4. CCBF has repeatedly tested the reenactment fields with metal detectors and feels that the historic resources have been extracted.
 5. Need interpretive enclaves outside of the park.
 6. Park should consider being a permanent host to seasonal arts, crafts, theme festivals and events in conjunction with nearby communities.
 7. Reenactments may face a time in the next 5-10 years when they are not as popular because the reenactors have become older and are not being replaced by younger people.
 8. Shenandoah University and Lord Fairfax Community College can provide volunteers, interns, educational programs, and research projects.

9. CCBF has been acting as a land trust. It could operate as a “friend of the park” to buy land when NPS cannot. CCBF has raised money with the focus on the need to retain a national memory and sustain national values.
10. Ed Bearss, who wrote the Cedar Creek National Historic Landmark application, was interested in protecting the setting of Belle Grove as the primary point of contact.
11. Land protection is critically important. The GMP must address a coordinated approach for dealing with external threats and land protection issues. Need conservation easements on lands within the viewshed.
12. It was important to create the park to assist in the overall concept of the Historic District. For 20 years before the District, it was a perpetual fight to preserve anything.

▪ **Public Scoping Meetings – Interests and Concerns**

1. Identify scenic resources in and outside of the park. Protect the Shenandoah River and Cedar Creek. Preserve historic houses. Protect the environment. Preserve Route 11.
2. By 2008, will there be anything left to preserve?
3. Interpret the valley’s early history, the charm of small towns and roads.
4. Address potential impacts of the quarry on the park as well as the expansion of I-81.
5. Provide public access to Cedar Creek.
6. Coordination needed with towns and counties, as well as communications with local residents. How do property owners have a voice in the park?
7. What is the future of significant sites outside the park boundary?
8. Should have visitor services coordinated with regional visitor services partners.
9. Concern for traffic on narrow unpaved roads, particularly buses.
10. Maintain agrarian community.
11. Expand boundaries of the park.
12. Guidance to local governments on development issues.

Key Questions to be Answered by the GMP

Analysis of the full range of these interests and concerns has revealed that there are seven subject areas in which key questions need to be answered related to the park's future management, including:

1. How will the park's resources and values be protected?
2. What interpretive experiences will visitors have?
3. What visitor facilities and services will be provided?
4. How will visitor access to the park and circulation within it be managed?
5. How will resources related to the park but outside its current boundaries be protected?
6. How will NPS and its partners collaborate to manage the park?
7. What kinds of technical assistance will NPS provide to its partners and others?

APPENDIX A

SCOPING REPORT

Public Scoping Meetings – Summary of Comments Received June 20, 21, and 22, 2006

Contents

page no.

FACILITATED SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS – “What are the issues that should be considered in the general management plan for the park?”	A-1
Strasburg (Groups 1, 2, 3 and 3)	A-1
Middletown (Groups 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5).....	A-3
Front Royal (Group 1)	A-5
FACILITATED SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS – “What are your ideas for the future of the park?”	A-5
Strasburg (Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4)	A-5
Middletown (Groups 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5).....	A-7
Front Royal (Group 1)	A-9

Public Scoping Meetings – Summary of Comments Received

FACILITATED DISCUSSION – What are the issues that should be considered in the general management plan for the park?

STRASBURG GROUP 1 – June 20, 2006	
Issue	Votes Received
▪ growth and development – impact on park	8
▪ interpretation of the valley's early history, Valley Pike history and Civil War history	5
▪ protection of the river and Cedar Creek	5
▪ coordination by NPS with towns and counties	4
▪ adequacy of future funding of partners	3
▪ visitor access and transportation	2
▪ air quality and environment	2
▪ potential restrictions on landowners within park (land use, buildings, etc.)	2
▪ identify scenic resources	1
▪ impact of Corridor H	1
▪ communication between NPS and local residents and communities	1
▪ establishment of park headquarters (role, size, location, mission)	0
▪ Chemstone (impact of expansion)	0

STRASBURG GROUP 2 – June 20, 2006	
Issue	Votes Received
▪ time it takes for NPS plan – by 2008 will there be anything left? (timing and land protection)	7
▪ historical conservation easements	6
▪ protecting viewsheds and improving buffers	6
▪ traffic issue on Route 11 and on all roads in park (reenactments)	4
▪ charm of small towns/roads – after widened to manage people	4
▪ development issues	4
▪ water pollution by Chemstone on Cedar Creek	3
▪ water issues with industrial neighbor	3
▪ coordination between NPS and local government	3
▪ adding other areas to park	3
▪ looks – scenic viewsheds – remain as today	2
▪ zoning – land protection by Middletown/Strasburg/ counties	2

STRASBURG GROUP 2 (continued)	
Issue	Votes Received
▪ local, state, federal government communication issues – big developers vs local	2
▪ positive economic stimulus – what is attraction of park?	2
▪ protecting environment	2
▪ Battlefield Foundation has money and could own more land than park service – how much will be accessible by public (use and access issue)	1
▪ what do we offer the public? access, transportation, history, information, entertainment, education	1
▪ real asset to this state, local and federal interests	0
▪ continuing communication among stakeholders and public	0
▪ define plans	0
▪ fees? access, etc.	0

STRASBURG GROUP 3 – June 20, 2006	
Issue	Votes Received
▪ growth and development impacts	7
▪ balance between public value and private property rights	6
▪ limits to what can be built on adjoining property and within	5
▪ preservation of natural resources and viewshed	5
▪ interpretation of history – how?	3
▪ land acquisition – concern with condemnation	3
▪ how do property owners have a voice in park?	3
▪ boundary adjustments – concern about property rights	2
▪ preservation of historic houses	1
▪ use of Keister Tract	1
▪ water./air quality	1
▪ what are NPS authorities?	1
▪ address alternative transportation	1
▪ guidance to local governments on development issues	1
▪ tourism and private property rights	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 1 – June 21, 2006

Issue	Votes Received
▪ viewscape – NPS voice in local government to influence growth and development	13
▪ how to preserve visitor experience in face of I-81 expansion and quarry expansion?	8
▪ environmental restoration	7
▪ land protection plan/land acquisition and easements	7
▪ private property – park vision	5
▪ transportation/buses on narrow unpaved roads	3
▪ adequate federal funding	3
▪ archeological digs as interpretive tool	3
▪ allowance for continued current uses	2
▪ communication with park private landowners and homeowners associations	2
▪ public access to Cedar Creek	2
▪ coordinated visitor services with regional visitor services partners	1
▪ lesser-known historic resources	1
▪ no parking at Ranseur Mt.	1
▪ new stakeholders	0
▪ land use/camping	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 2 – June 21, 2006

Issue	Votes Received
▪ landowners' rights – restrictions – passing to children (inheritance) – farming	13
▪ infrastructure impacts – water, air pollution, sewage issues – noise pollution (buses)	8
▪ input from landowners – how were boundaries drawn?	8
▪ scope of history – span from pre-European to Civil War to modern	7
▪ neighbors to park – industrial (compatible zoning)	6
▪ viewshed – possibly losing it	4
▪ reenactments? more than one – how many per year?	4
▪ local, federal, state government – good communication and coordinated planning	4
▪ location of visitors center	3
▪ road problems – too small for traffic, paving, maintenance – park traffic vs commuter/local traffic	3
▪ services – horseback riding, biking, walking – facilities and activities	3
▪ limitations of access to <u>all</u> areas of park – private land, etc.	3
▪ water in Cedar Creek	2
▪ traffic issues with tourists (buses)	2
▪ property values if not in park at this time – right of first refusal, fair market value	2
▪ land use – land in park is preserved	1
▪ governance of park (management)	1
▪ eminent domain	1
▪ cultural interaction – improving them, educational ones	1
▪ public outreach and communication to park	0
▪ fees? landowners have little access?	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 3 – June 21, 2006	
Issue	Votes Received
▪ maintaining scenic views/improving current viewshed challenges	10
▪ effect of possible quarry rezoning – adjacent industrial impact	8
▪ how will park affect private property and owners?	6
▪ funding for property acquisition within park	6
▪ public safety/traffic issues/control of truck traffic on Route 11	6
▪ effect on property owners in park	6
▪ future control of landowners' property by park (concern about)	5
▪ visitor center – will there be one?	5
▪ maintain agrarian community	4
▪ balance of historical interpretation – prehistoric through post Civil War	4
▪ expand boundaries of park	2
▪ adjacent Fort Nislander's insider park?	1
▪ I-81 expansion/sound mitigation	1
▪ signage – historical markers – directions to important sites – tapes for driving tours	0
▪ what's going to happen to property adjacent?	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 4 – June 21, 2006	
Issue	Votes Received
▪ how and why were boundaries decided, and are they permanent? (quarry and homes)	7
▪ impacts of water withdrawal from streams	6
▪ enforcement of viewshed pollution on adjacent properties	6
▪ quarry's impacts on park	5
▪ preservation of scenic resources and living history (e.g. reenactment)	4
▪ protection of scenic resources outside of park boundaries	4
▪ future hunting and fishing in the park	4
▪ future road changes in the park	3
▪ future of private lands in park	3
▪ building regulations on private lands in the park	3
▪ reconstruction of spring house near Heeter House	3
▪ impacts of expanded I-81, and consideration of alternatives	1
▪ preservation of Route 11	1
▪ public safety hazards of increased road traffic, especially trucks on Route 11 and expanded I-81 and quarry	1
▪ future of significant sites outside park boundary	1

FRONT ROYAL GROUP 1 – June 22, 2006 (note that no voting occurred during this scoping session)

Issue	Votes Received
▪ transportation	<i>na</i>
▪ challenge to provide visitor information	<i>na</i>
▪ get land protection to privation landowner soon	<i>na</i>
▪ how to connect points of interest	<i>na</i>
▪ safety on Route 11 with increased traffic; train	<i>na</i>
▪ protecting core battlefield	<i>na</i>
▪ how park is linked to resources around it	<i>na</i>
▪ private property rights and issues	<i>na</i>
▪ graveyard protection	<i>na</i>
▪ viewshed protection	<i>na</i>

FACILITATED DISCUSSION – What are your ideas for the future of the park?**STRASBURG GROUP 1 – June 20, 2006**

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ interpret/recognize area's early history	6
▪ tell the natural story and recognize the park's environmental significance	6
▪ more living history	5
▪ programmed removal of non-contributing structures	5
▪ common carrier transportation network within park	4
▪ should be the visual gem of the valley into the future	4
▪ partners work together to ensure historic character of surrounding area	3
▪ walking and biking trails	2
▪ maintain existing quality	1
▪ a park like Gettysburg NHP with the economic benefits	0
▪ prevent overbuilding of entryways – undesired development	0

STRASBURG GROUP 2 – June 20, 2006

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ rural zoning around park – major buffers – traffic control	6
▪ wildlife/ecological preserve – caves, native plants, endangered animals	6
▪ visitors center – to educate/interpret – a learning center	5
▪ clean, pure air; fresh, pure water – no motorized craft (canoes, kayak, horses, bikes)	5
▪ history of pre-1800s Native Americans, pre-historic	5
▪ bicycle-friendly roads - access	4
▪ walking trails, horse paths (stables)	3
▪ amenities – restaurants and hotels in area to support increasing visitors outside park	2
▪ strong volunteer component	2
▪ more living history	2
▪ appropriate architecturally designed amenities for time period and valley	2
▪ local council/board to advise park service	2
▪ signage	2
▪ camping (cabins of logs)/picnic areas	1
▪ fundraising via seminars, etc.	1
▪ respect landscape – explore 1864 reality	1
▪ limit amount/numbers/size of monuments	1
▪ children's programs	1
▪ guide tours – electric (non-polluting), golf carts, walking tours	1
▪ admission fee? paid guides	1
▪ include all master plans of all entities in park	0
▪ self-guided tours (taped)	0
▪ artifact displays	0

STRASBURG GROUP 3 – June 20, 2006

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ preserve a sense of valley history to past; historical viewshed	6
▪ maintain landscape integrity with viewshed screening	6
▪ communication network	4
▪ park infrastructure – does not impact private property	4
▪ preserve working farms within park	3
▪ park with multi-use trail system; hiking, biking, horses	3
▪ network of properties and opportunities within park	2
▪ living history programs, reenactments, etc., educational	2
▪ interpretation of American Indians and early settlers	2
▪ partnership with other locals and organizations (i.e., Wayside Inn)	2
▪ Middletown retain current character	1
▪ CEBE as partnership role model	1
▪ Antietam – different units	0
▪ transportation within park between areas	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 1 – June 21, 2006

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ NPS engage in external threats/protection	9
▪ visitor center – expanded facilities over current CCBF	9
▪ museum collection maintained and acquired at park; consolidate existing museums	7
▪ interpretive guides in period dress/living history	4
▪ open/green space in three-county area	4
▪ interpreting a range of history	4
▪ encourage walking and hiking trails; get people out of cars	4
▪ peaceful, serene, natural beauty	3
▪ deconstruct useless facilities; restore natural environment	3
▪ maintain rural/rustic character	3
▪ Civil War as focus of interpretation without clutter or monuments	2
▪ audio-visual history overview	2
▪ natural resource preservation	1
▪ park provide information on regional resources	1
▪ lots of interpretive information	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 2 – June 21, 2006

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ historical education center – local history as it connects to regional, state and national history	10
▪ respect for private landowners who don't sell	10
▪ no restrictions on private landowners for land use – hunting, fishing, metal detection	8
▪ home to <u>RELEVANT</u> reenactments with historical scope	7
▪ positive economic impact on community	6
▪ respect for privacy	6
▪ integrate park with community – fit with town, rural area	6
▪ clean, pure air, water, beautiful scenery	5
▪ traffic, parking – adequate infrastructure	4
▪ visitor/interpretation center	3
▪ environmental and natural components preserved and enjoyed – gardens	3
▪ children's educational program – camps, field trips, nature walks, bike trails	3
▪ great communication (cooperation) among NPS and key partners and landowners	3
▪ guided and self-guided tours	1
▪ crown jewel of NPS – tourist draw – quality experience	1
▪ at least half of park land protected from development	0
▪ paddleboats and children's activities – canoeing	0
▪ alignment with I-81 and Corridor H	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 3 – June 21, 2006

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ preservation of natural wildlife, resources/education about	10
▪ model for stewardship (historic, natural, agrarian) a working viable community	9
▪ visitor center – with exhibits, maps, children’s topographic 3-D maps	7
▪ minimum of roads, maximum of walking paths	6
▪ living history events in addition to Civil War	6
▪ horseback trails, canoeing, recreation walking trails	5
▪ limit commercial “peddlers” around park (no junky entrances)	4
▪ interpretation of historic and natural resources	2
▪ I-pod, electronic information for visitors	2
▪ no entry fee	1
▪ increased archeology/research	0
▪ ways of connecting 3 counties, 2 towns, sites in park-like shuttle buses	0
▪ documentary videos	0
▪ picnic areas – many	0

MIDDLETOWN GROUP 4 – June 21, 2006

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ maintain and improve natural beauty	11
▪ park acquire quarry land, i.e. all 1,200 acres	7
▪ preserve natural resources, especially wetlands	5
▪ preserve farmland and orchards	4
▪ expand park boundaries	4
▪ promote tourism	2
▪ interpretive wayfinding	2
▪ slow down development	1
▪ control traffic on backroads, especially buses and trucks	1
▪ nature trails, especially along creeks	1
▪ provide a place for tourist buses and tours	1

FRONT ROYAL GROUP 1 – June 22, 2006 (note that no voting occurred during this scoping session)

Vision Idea	Votes Received
▪ bringing diverse partners together to form a vision	na
▪ park as gateway to Shenandoah Valley history	na
▪ NPS and partners to coordinate facilities	na
▪ park strengthens its relationship with towns	na
▪ consider range of history	na
▪ heritage tourism – linking with other regional sites	na
▪ opportunity to interpret our heritage	na
▪ extend the educational mission of the Museum of the Shenandoah Valley	na
▪ visitor center – gateway to valley (provide info to get visitors out to other sites)	na
▪ Front Royal as a gateway	na
▪ visitor center in/near gateway towns	na
▪ visitor center – don't disturb vista – facilities compatible with surroundings	na
▪ ADA considerations – activities directed toward different age groups – adults/children/elderly	na
▪ interest in continuing pre-Civil War reenactments near Belle Grove	na
▪ boundary of park – sufficient to interpret resources of park, particularly water	na
▪ park not be an island – park needs to be integrated with surrounding communities and landowners	na
▪ park has resources to help landowners protect resources	na
▪ land can remain in private ownership	na
▪ parking and access; trailhead parking for walkers/hikers	na
▪ historic road traces – utilize these?	na
▪ park conducive to foot traffic (trails to connect sites)	na
▪ Appalachian Trail style trail through park (trail visits locations in parks – visitor sees without being in a motorized vehicle – make trails compatible with all skill levels)	na
▪ access to Cedar Creek and River	na
▪ connect to nearby state parks	na
▪ hot air balloons as a way to see park	na
▪ camping?	na
▪ Belle Grove represents late colonial period	na
▪ group provides labor support to Belle Grove	na
▪ Middle Marsh	na
▪ German settlers in Valley – why did they come here?	na
▪ demographic shift after war (loss of African American people – African American contribution to valley is forgotten as a result)	na
▪ river carried traffic historically	na
▪ caves (karst features)	na
▪ I-81; Corridor H; quarry related to boundary	na
▪ proximity to hotels and RV campgrounds (foster development of overnight accommodations, make park a destination center)	na
▪ Valley Pike – “Great Wagon Road”	na
▪ historic transportation – wagon towns	na

APPENDIX B

SCOPING REPORT

Representative Agency Coordination Scoping Letter



In reply refer to:

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Cedar Creek and Belle Grove
National Historical Park
7718 ½ Main St., P.O. Box 700
Middletown, Virginia 22645



26 October 2006

Amy Martin, Environmental Review
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
4010 West Broad St.
Richmond, VA 23230

Subject: Request for Scoping Comments

Dear Ms. Martin:

The National Park Service (NPS) is preparing the first general management plan for Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park (NHP). All units of the national park system are required to have a general management plan that provides the long-term vision for the future of the park, what visitors will do there, and how resources will be managed. We request your input and comments on any issues that should be addressed in the general management plan. A map of the Park and surrounding area is enclosed for reference.

Authorized by Congress in 2002, the Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP was established for the purpose of preserving the significant historic, natural, cultural, military, and scenic resources found in the Cedar Creek Battlefield and Belle Grove Plantation areas through partnerships with local landowners, non-profit organizations, and communities. The park, consisting of approximately 3,400 acres, is located in the northern Shenandoah Valley in Warren, Shenandoah, and Frederick Counties, and is adjacent to the towns of Strasburg and Middletown. The NPS's partners – Belle Grove, Inc., the Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefield Foundation, and Shenandoah County – collectively own about 1,000 acres within the park. Currently NPS owns only seven acres within the park and is authorized to acquire additional property only from willing landowners for the purpose preserving the park's natural and historic setting.



When a draft general management plan and environmental impact statement is completed we will forward a copy to your office for review and comment. If you or your staff have questions, please feel free to contact me at (540) 868-9176.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Stubbs
Community Planner (Acting Superintendent)

Enclosures:

1. Map of Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP



APPENDIX C

SCOPING REPORT

Interests and Concerns Expressed during Scoping

Contents

page no.

Interests and Concerns that are Appropriately Addressed by the GMP	C-1
The Park’s Fundamental and Other Important Resources and Values	C-1
Resource Protection	C-6
Visitor Use and Experience	C-7
Partnerships and Organizational Effectiveness	C-9
Park Operations and Facilities	C-13
Land Protection and Boundary Adjustment	C-15
 Interests and Concerns that are Adequately Addressed by Servicewide Law or Policy Guidance	 C-20
 Interests and Concerns that should be Addressed in Implementation Plans	 C-21
 Key to Meeting Events	 C-23

1.0 Interests and Concerns that are Appropriately Addressed by the GMP

1.1 The Park's Fundamental and Other Important Resources and Values

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	How should CEBE provide a broader interpretation of social history and the Civil War?
2.3	11/17/05	The Native American story is important.
2.5	03/16/06	Settings and stories associated with Belle Grove and Harmony Hall.
2.5	03/16/06	Story of Harriet Robinson/Belle Grove.
2.5	03/16/06	Story of slavery, the plantation community and relationship between slaves and their owners.
2.5	03/16/06	Important natural and cultural landscapes and their interrelationships.
2.5	03/16/06	Important views and viewsheds, particularly those that have not changed much since the Civil War.
2.5	03/16/06	Story of Valley Pike's history and importance.
2.5	03/16/06	Importance of topography and the Shenandoah Valley to the Civil War.
2.5	03/16/06	Story of the Shenandoah Valley as America's first frontier, with sensitivity given to the Native American perspective.
2.5	03/16/06	Story of the Shenandoah Valley's importance to the Civil War and the significance of the Battle of Cedar Creek.
2.5	03/16/06	Story of Signal Knob and its importance.
2.5	03/16/06	The "bread basket" role of the Shenandoah Valley
2.5	03/16/06	The natural environment and its relationship to the built environment.
3.4	03/15/06	Experience of visiting the reenactment and a Civil War landscape.
3.4	03/15/06	19th century agriculture.
3.4	03/15/06	The Valley Pike as an original roadway - its narrow character as it passes through the towns in the northern Valley.
3.4	03/15/06	The waterways in the park.
3.4	03/15/06	The overlap between the cultural and natural landscape.
3.4	03/15/06	Transportation, commerce and the movement of people - the transitory nature of people moving from the East to the interior USA.
3.4	03/15/06	Archaeological resources and sites.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
3.4	03/15/06	The valley's transition from prehistoric to modern times.
3.4	03/15/06	The architectural integrity of Belle Grove and Harmony Hall.
3.4	03/15/06	Integrity of the park's landscapes.
3.4	03/15/06	Importance of towns along the Valley Pike.
3.4	03/15/06	Limestone and its importance to agriculture, early settlement and economic development.
3.4	03/15/06	The stories of the Heater, Bowman and Hite families.
3.4	03/15/06	Harmony Hall as an icon of early Valley settlement.
3.4	03/15/06	Relationships in a plantation society, i.e., free and slave labor.
3.4	03/15/06	Early grain mills.
3.4	03/15/06	Towns as gateways, i.e., "string of pearls" along the Valley Pike.
3.4	03/15/06	Connect the battle of Cedar Creek to the rest of the entire Civil War.
3.4	03/15/06	Individual stories of the battle of Cedar Creek, e.g., Ramseur and Custer, Sheridan's ride, the end of the Confederate presence in the Valley, and the battle's impact on Lincoln's reelection.
3.4	03/15/06	Signal Knob and its importance to the war.
3.4	03/15/06	The Hotchkiss maps and Taylor sketches.
3.4	03/15/06	Monuments within the park.
3.4	03/15/06	Transportation, commerce and the settlement pattern in the Northern Valley.
3.4	03/15/06	Belle Grove and plantation life and culture.
3.4	03/15/06	The Civil War, battle of Cedar Creek and their many stories.
3.4	03/15/06	Agriculture and the Valley as a breadbasket.
3.4	03/15/06	Landscapes and views.
3.4	03/15/06	The stories of the Hites, Bowmans, Heaters and other families.
3.4	03/15/06	Interaction between and effect of the natural environment on settlement life
3.5	05/17/06	One focus of the GMP would be to understand history through the Civil War period. Another would be broader, i.e., Native American sites, early settlement, the Civil War, and subsequent valley history.
3.5	05/17/06	The park area may be seen as representing a middle class, with Belle Grove being the exception.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
4.2	03/29/06	Plantation culture, valley settlement, George Washington's relationship to the area, and stories of how the Civil War affected everyday people.
4.3	04/04/06	Compared to the heritage area, the park will be telling a longer deeper story over the course of human history. It needs to tell a bigger story than the Cedar Creek battle.
4.3	04/04/06	Entire Heritage District offers opportunity to tell the Civil War story
4.3	04/04/06	Cedar Creek should tell the story not told at other battlefield sites or parks, including communities and civilians who experienced the Shenandoah Valley battles.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF's interest is to have visitors experience the Shenandoah Valley through visits to the valley's communities and approximately 30 museums.
4.3	04/04/06	If NPS were not involved in CEBE, SVBF would probably be doing a battlefield preservation plan for the area within the park.
4.4	04/07/06	Chemstone has proffered to give Belle Grove the original mill.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove Inc. would like to have Belle Grove become a model for land stewardship, e.g., it is working with the Potomac Conservancy to develop a rain garden and remove cattle from the pond.
4.6	06/06/06	Viewsheds should be one of the criteria for land protection planning.
4.7	06/23/06	Reenactments can be damaging to the resource, e.g., contemporary percussion caps are almost identical to those used in Civil War.
4.7	06/23/06	Opinions differ as to whether reenactments should be contained to present locations or expanded.
4.7	06/23/06	CCBF owns Panthers Cave, a natural area with archaeological resources used by local colleges, and it should be part of the park.
4.7	06/23/06	There are Indian mounds within the park.
4.7	06/23/06	CCBF lands include four prehistoric, largely undisturbed sites.
4.7	06/23/06	Fort Bowman (Harmony Hall) and Belle Grove would best tell the colonial stories.
5.1	10/04/05	Pre-Civil War history of the area is important.
5.2	10/20/05	There are concerns about the impacts of Chemstone's proposed expansion, e.g., the park's resources, water, viewsheds, noise and blasting, truck traffic and public safety.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County has done a lot of work to protect Civil War sites.
5.6	06/22/06	Historically, Middletown was a wagon town -- all the stuff is still there.
5.6	06/22/06	Whereas the SVBF is focusing on the Civil War, CEBE should provide a window into 200 years of history.
5.6	06/22/06	Cannot tell the full story of the area without including the stories of the towns.
5.6	06/22/06	West side of Warren County was settled by Germans, which is different than the English dominance in the tidewater area.
5.6	06/22/06	Long Meadow Farm was large enough to have slaves and was tied somewhat with the culture of eastern Warren County.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
5.6	06/22/06	German heritage remained until the Revolution.
5.6	06/22/06	Quakers arrived with the Germans and settled in the corridor along Front Royal Pike (Route 540). Yet there is no place in the valley where the Quaker story is told.
5.6	06/22/06	There was an influx of Quakers into the area during the Revolution, to escape being rounded-up because their refusal to sympathize with the war effort. Afterwards, they largely dispersed, many moving to Ohio.
5.7	06/22/06	Middletown Heritage Society members want a broader interpretation of the area than the Civil War, e.g., local 18th century iron forge.
5.7	06/22/06	Middletown has a state-recognized historic district and is developing its own historic district ordinance.
6.1	03/21/06	Landscapes and scenery are important, i.e., views of the Blue Ridge, Massanutten and Allegheny Mountains
6.1	03/21/06	The landscape was fundamental to Jackson's 1862 campaign, e.g., the Valley was an avenue of invasion to Washington, DC.
6.1	03/21/06	Cedar Creek is a high quality stream, and water supplies for Winchester are drawn from the Shenandoah River below Cedar Creek.
6.1	03/21/06	The park has excellent bird habitat.
6.1	03/21/06	The Valley's limestone is the source of its fertile soils as well as building material.
6.1	03/21/06	The Valley's natural resources had a major effect on settlement patterns.
6.1	03/21/06	Habitat diversity is a key natural feature of the Valley. Several state listed plant species are within the park but no known Federally listed species.
6.1	03/21/06	Shenandoah River bottoms were probably used as camping grounds by Native Americans.
6.1	03/21/06	Valley Pike has been a major transportation route historically, dating back to prehistory.
6.1	03/21/06	Civil War perspectives are varied. Examples include slavery, life in small communities, military history, women's roles during the war, and the impact of a civil war on people's lives.
6.2	04/27/06	The African American/slave experience in the Northern Valley is a very important story.
6.2	04/27/06	The park has important areas such as the infantry contact area and cemetery hill.
6.2	04/27/06	Park viewsheds and landscapes are very important.
6.4	05/19/06	People visiting the valley have images in mind, and they will be drawn to the park to have those images fulfilled.
6.4	05/19/06	Some European families came to the colonies to build a republican society, i.e., economically independent people living free as citizens in a republic. The valley embodied those ideas as early as 1780s.
6.4	05/19/06	Jefferson's sense of liberty was derived largely by his visits to the valley - in comparison to eastern VA where society was stratified and people were exploited.
6.4	05/19/06	People in the valley lived in a "happy state of mediocrity."
6.4	05/19/06	Belle Grove can be misunderstood as a presentation similar to those of eastern VA. It was more of a big farm than a plantation.
6.4	05/19/06	Slavery is a complicated issue in the valley. Slaves were used on small farms but they were fewer in number than elsewhere.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
6.4	05/19/06	Very hard to see the original landscape, although there are exceptions such as the Heater House.
6.4	05/19/06	Belle Grove provides an excellent opportunity to tell the story of the republican style landscape.
6.4	05/19/06	Should look to what historically attracted people to the Shenandoah Valley, and why they are attracted today. The Valley has been the top list of travel destinations since the late 18th century.
6.4	05/19/06	The economic world that developed by 1800 would sell very well to the Civil War visitor.
6.5	06/20/06	The area has unique flora and fauna, and it is used by Shenandoah University and Lord Fairfax Community College for training natural history students.
6.5	06/20/06	What has been preserved is only the infantry contact area. The battle area was really 20x15 miles in size. By focusing within the park, the visitor will think that is all that was involved in the battle.
6.5	06/20/06	The key to understanding the ultimate federal success is the ridgeline northwest of the cemetery. Has been partially subdivided. The area should be purchased and the houses torn down.
6.5	06/20/06	Challenge during the Civil War was the continuous pitting of a powerful opponent against a much weaker entity. who used the element of surprise to compensate.
6.5	06/20/06	Need interpretive enclaves outside of the park.
6.5	06/20/06	How can we get people to think at the level that Early and Sheridan were thinking, i.e., the bigger scale of the battle?
6.5	06/20/06	As people become more interested in the battlefield, they should be exposed to other sites such as Shawnee Springs hospital and the railroad site in Winchester.
6.5	06/20/06	Visitors need to understand the importance of Fishers Hill where confederates were camped and started their march. Until the actual contact, all other sites are outside the park boundary.
6.5	06/20/06	The old subdivision in Middletown is a depression era subdivision and it encompasses the area of final forward Confederate movement.
6.5	06/20/06	No one has yet mapped the historically important sites on the periphery of the park. Those sites could tell the story of how armies work before they confront one another.
6.5	06/20/06	The area began growing wheat in the 1850s, using slaves.
6.5	06/20/06	Belle Grove is the last surviving example of a plantation and was a focus of the movement in the valley that supported secession.
8.1	06/20/06	Identify scenic resources.
8.1	06/20/06	Interpretation of the valley's early history, Valley Pike history and Civil War history.
8.2	06/21/06	Scope of history – span from pre-European to Civil War to modern.

1.2 Resource Protection

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	What will be the strategy for protecting the privately-owned the Vermont monument?
1.1	04/12/06	How can CEBE assist Middletown with its proposed historic preservation ordinance?
1.1	04/12/06	How will the existing NPS 7-acre property be treated in the GMP?
1.1	04/15/06	Core area of the Cedar Creek battlefield encompasses approximately 15,000 acres.
2.6	05/18/05	The GMP must protect vistas and the park's setting, which may be the most important aspect of the area.
2.6	05/18/05	The value of the area will be diminished exponentially if the landscape becomes cluttered.
3.2	12/13/05	Different sites have differing carrying capacities. The GMP should cover this.
3.5	05/17/06	Proposed expansion of I-81 will impact Harmony Hall.
6.5	06/20/06	Land that key partners have cobbled together now extends from Bowman's Ford to Middletown.
6.5	06/20/06	There has never been a broad understanding of the area's important resources.
6.5	06/20/06	Stickley Farm and Cemetery area should be acquisition priorities.
8.1	06/20/06	Protect Shenandoah River and Cedar Creek.
8.1	06/20/06	Concerns for the expansion of Chemstone quarry, pollution of Cedar Creek.
8.1	06/20/06	Preservation of historic houses.
8.2	06/21/06	Environmental restoration.
8.2	06/21/06	Possibility of losing the park's viewsheds.
8.2	06/21/06	Water quality of Cedar Creek.
8.2	06/21/06	Preservation of scenic resources and living history (e.g. reenactments).
8.2	06/21/06	Reconstruction of spring house near Heeter House.
8.2	06/21/06	Preservation of Route 11 corridor.
8.2	06/21/06	Future of significant sites outside park boundary.

1.3 Visitor Use and Experience

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	Will NPS own sufficient contiguous land to enable a meaningful visitor experience?
1.1	04/12/06	How would CEBE approach the visitor experience with no further land acquisitions?
1.2	05/18/06	The Town of Strasburg would like to see Civil War reenactments south of I-81
1.3	05/19/06	What are the NPS management implications of CEBE not having a significant land base?
2.3	11/17/05	Partners must develop a coordinated interpretive plan for visitors.
2.3	11/17/05	A visitor center can serve as a starting point for visitors.
2.5	03/16/06	Visitors should receive information at Belle Grove, and through individual and group touring by vehicles and foot.
2.6	05/18/05	Favorable view of the cluster concept as depicted in the SVBF plan.
3.2	12/13/05	Use interpretative themes as an umbrella to connect us.
3.5	05/17/06	The park's visitor center could be the principal gateway to the Signal Knob Cluster and function as the introduction to the entire region.
3.5	05/17/06	The park might be more densely interpreted than the Shenandoah Valley Historic District.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF's management plan calls for each cluster to have an orientation center as the jumping off point for visitors. It has been generally thought that NPS would have the largest visitor center in the heritage area.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove has many visitors who ask about the full range of recreation opportunities in the area.
4.4	04/07/06	Electronic media should be explored for interpretation.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove Inc. plans to develop a master site plan for the plantation, which is likely to change its interpretive approach, e.g., providing interpretive zones for telling stories of slavery, industrial development and family histories.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove Inc. envisions Harmony Hall as another Horne Museum with public access.
4.7	06/23/06	CEBE is the center of the Shenandoah Valley heritage area. It is the first place you come to and it should be a gateway.
5.1	10/04/05	Middletown is interested in becoming a better gateway community.
5.1	10/04/05	Annual Civil War reenactments are very important to the area's economics and interpretation. NPS should consider the re-enactors as its largest user group.
5.2	10/20/05	CEBE is a critical component of the tourism industry, which is very important to the region.
5.4	02/01/06	Warren County portion of the park is very rural and presents opportunities for a park experience.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
5.6	06/22/06	Marketing will help the visitor understand the difference between the heritage area and the park.
5.6	06/22/06	Worst case scenario for the park will be if the public only sees it as the Battle of Cedar Creek.
5.7	06/22/06	Middletown Heritage Society created in 1996 to develop a walking tour.
5.7	06/22/06	Middletown should be a gateway community to the park.
5.7	06/22/06	Would like to see a visitor center in Middletown.
6.3	05/02/06	Permanent small scale reenactment activities, e.g., a settler's wagon, cannon/musket demonstration, fife-and-drum unit, bring history to life and tend to draw return visitors.
6.3	05/02/06	Possible permanent host to seasonal arts/crafts/theme festivals/events, in conjunction with nearby towns/communities.
6.3	05/02/06	Selected leasing of non-conflicting hunting areas; especially for safe low-noise/impact bow, shotgun and muzzle-loading.
6.3	05/02/06	A possible on-site period-drama utilizing Shenandoah University's Conservatory Theatre program. An outdoor amphitheatre would be needed but could also be used for everyday park educational programs and exhibits.
6.4	05/19/06	State tourism surveys suggest public's interest in the big broad context of history.
6.5	06/20/06	Need to interpret what has been preserved as well as other things peripheral to it.
6.5	06/20/06	Differing perspectives among partners on military versus cultural themes. However, most visitors initially will come because it is a Civil War site.
6.5	06/20/06	Branding the park as a broader social history park would distinguish it from the Historic District.
6.5	06/20/06	Many battlefield park visitors are attracted to the battle areas and blood-soaked ground, and they pay less attention to period structures.
6.5	06/20/06	Reenactments may face a time in the next 5-10 years when they are not as popular because the re-enactors have become older and not replaced by younger people.
8.1	06/20/06	Traffic issue on Route 11 and all roads in park during reenactments.
8.1	06/20/06	Charm of small towns and rural roads will be lost if widened to accommodate visitors.
8.1	06/20/06	Positive economic stimulus – what is attraction of the park?
8.1	06/20/06	How do we offer access, transportation, history, information, entertainment and education to the public?
8.1	06/20/06	Future use of Keister Tract.
8.2	06/21/06	How to preserve visitor experience in face of I-81 expansion and quarry expansion?
8.2	06/21/06	Public access to Cedar Creek.
8.2	06/21/06	Need to balance historical interpretation – prehistoric through post Civil War.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
8.2	06/21/06	Signage should include historical markers, directions to important sites, and audio tapes for driving tours.

1.4 Partnerships and Organizational Effectiveness

Event (see p. 23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	What is CEBE Advisory Commission's long-term role?
1.1	04/12/06	How can a partnership concept be used to manage the park?
1.1	04/12/06	How can NPS develop a shared vision of the park with its partners?
1.1	04/12/06	Should NPS partners be encouraged to adopt NPS general management policies?
1.1	04/12/06	How will CEBE work with local governments?
1.1	04/12/06	Will the GMP consider different partnership alternatives?
1.1	04/16/06	Key partners interested in a potential "hub-and-spoke" management relationship with NPS
1.1	04/17/06	NPS key partners potentially interested in collaborating on tours, trails, staffing and volunteers, meetings, land protection, fees and ticketing, marketing, security, transportation and visitor education
1.3	05/19/06	What long-term role will the CEBE Advisory Commission have?
1.3	05/19/06	Can CEBE and its partners agree on a common set of guiding principles?
2.3	11/17/05	We should encourage consistency among partners and NPS in their policies and permissible activities.
2.3	11/17/05	Park partners must look at overlap of mutual interests
2.3	11/17/05	Partners must coordinate efforts but not be involved in managing one another's properties.
2.3	11/17/05	We need a management entity or representative body to handle management of mutual interests.
2.3	11/17/05	We must look at other NPS partnership models when developing alternatives.
2.3	11/17/05	NPS should be the anchor that ties partners and lands together.
2.3	11/17/05	NPS should be more focused on coordination, technical and financial support than a traditional operation.
2.3	11/17/05	NPS should be a coordinator among partners.
2.3	11/17/05	The park should be a hybrid between traditional and non-traditional NPS operations.
2.3	11/17/05	CEBE partners should not share individual property maintenance and management, but should share land protection, scheduling of events, interpretation, and shared infrastructure.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
2.5	03/16/06	A visitor center might be multi-use and shared among the partners.
2.6	05/18/05	It is important that partners have the financial resources to sustain their own operations.
2.6	05/18/05	How to get "buy-in" of the GMP among the various partners and stakeholders? Possibly there should be a legal document.
2.6	05/18/05	One possible management entity may be a foundation with a board and voting members including the key partners.
2.6	05/18/05	There must be a management entity for the park. SVBF could serve as an example.
2.6	05/18/05	Local governments must buy-in to whatever management entity is created for the park.
2.6	05/18/05	To what extent are we talking about managing each other's operations or are we talking about managing our own operations and collaborating?
2.6	05/18/05	GMP should have general principles for how the stakeholders will collaborate.
2.6	05/18/05	Cooperative agreements could be instruments for the implementation of the GMP.
2.6	05/18/05	For partners to cede some level of autonomy, there would have to be something that they get back in return.
2.6	05/18/05	An important aspect of the partnership will be private landowners within the park. What voice will they have in creating the GMP?
2.6	05/18/05	What does "park community" mean in CEBE's legislation?
2.6	05/18/05	There are partners other than the "The Cornerstones." How do we involvement them?
2.6	05/18/05	We are fortunate that the partners are currently self-sufficient.
2.6	05/18/05	One way to protect landscapes is through partnerships.
2.6	05/18/05	One way to engage local governments is to show them that the park can bring revenue.
3.2	12/13/05	Think of partners as "overlapping spheres."
3.2	12/13/05	We need a matrix on policies/capacities and constraints, or a set of guidelines that partners agree to. Topics should include visitor education, land protection, joint ticketing, signage and marketing.
3.2	12/13/05	We have shared values and shared vision, but each property needs to maintain its unique identity, where the visitor is encouraged to pass from one property to the next.
3.2	12/13/05	We need to help the visitor understand the roles of the various partners.
3.2	12/13/05	Management and operations - what activities will we do together? Education and interpretation, sharing staff and volunteers, security and law enforcement, ticketing, tours.
3.2	12/13/05	Certain partners may have the lead on certain issues, but not on others. We will have niches.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
3.2	12/13/05	What will be the management entity for the partnership? Will it be the Park Advisory Commission. Will it be the key partners? Who will be at the table?
3.2	12/13/05	The mechanism for decision-making must be in the GMP.
3.2	12/13/05	Will the management entity be advisory? What degree of autonomy will each partner retain?
3.2	12/13/05	Partners to have cooperative agreements with NPS to formalize their participation in the management entity.
3.2	12/13/05	Conceptual model: a "hub and spoke concept," with NPS at the hub and partners as the spokes. The rim would be the mutual issues on which we work.
3.2	12/13/05	Key issues would be run through the management entity.
3.2	12/13/05	Do partners have responsibility to each other or just to NPS?
3.2	12/13/05	Would the management entity be staffed?
3.2	12/13/05	Partners to have a limited and voluntary role outside their properties.
3.2	12/13/05	The management entity will be a forum or congress for decision-making.
3.2	12/13/05	Criteria to become a key partner or perhaps be on the management entity might be "landowner interest and a preservation purpose." Would public access also be required?
3.3	02/15/06	NPS operation should fall somewhere between a traditional operation and a strict coordination role. Partners are interested in a quasi-traditional role for NPS.
3.3	02/15/06	Should a "coordinator-only" role be an alternative in the GMP?
3.3	02/15/06	Belle Grove is interested in NPS conducting interpretive programs.
3.3	02/15/06	One GMP alternative should show NPS in a traditional role, another should show NPS as strictly a partnership coordinator, and a third should be somewhere between the two. This will help bracket the analysis and educate the public.
3.5	05/17/06	Need a vision allowing NPS to assume a reasonable level of ownership and staffing.
3.5	05/17/06	The GMP should not give the impression that the park sprang from the SVBHD Plan.
4.1	11/13/05	It is important that the GMP resolve partner responsibilities, working relationships with NPS, and how partner issues will be resolved.
4.1	11/13/05	Cooperative agreements between NPS and its partners are important and should be informed by the GMP.
4.2	03/29/06	Cooperative agreements between NPS and its partners are important and should be informed by the GMP.
4.3	04/04/06	Big challenge at the park is to educate landowners regarding the difference between SVBF and NPS.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF has had to work to explain difference between the heritage district and the park.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF has started work on a cluster plan for the Strasburg area, likely to be called the Signal Hill Cluster group.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
4.3	04/04/06	There is an opportunity at Cedar Creek to engage partners in preservation activities.
4.3	04/04/06	A matrix might be used to show a management framework that provides the basis for seeking and allocating funds.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove Inc. is accustomed to working with many partners.
4.6	06/06/06	The park's future should be a partnership, with NPS, key partners and others owning land, while some stays in private hands. This would be better than an NPS "command and control" model.
4.6	06/06/06	The National Trust for Historic Preservation strongly supports its partnership with the NPS in managing the park.
5.5	04/05/06	CEBE is generally not on the "radar" of Frederick County officials, and it has not entered into discussions about what should happen to the county's rural area.
5.5	04/05/06	There was a lot of energy and anticipation when CEBE was created, but not much has happened and the energy needs to be rejuvenated.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County officials will not take actions to support the park unless they feel they have public support.
6.1	03/21/06	Shenandoah University can potentially provide volunteers, interns, educational programs, student involvement, and research projects.
6.2	04/27/06	Lord Fairfax Community College can provide support and facilities for the GMP planning effort.
6.2	04/27/06	The GMP should address student internships.
6.2	04/27/06	Lord Fairfax Community College can integrate park needs into its curriculum.
6.2	04/27/06	How can Lord Fairfax Community College use the park as a laboratory for land use and preservation studies?
6.3	05/02/06	Creation of a park "sustainability" subcommittee in conjunction with Shenandoah University's History/Tourism program and Byrd School.
6.5	06/20/06	CCBF has been acting as a land trust. It could operate as a "friend of the park" to buy land when NPS cannot.
6.5	06/20/06	It was assumed that the park and the arrival of a superintendent would bring funding. CCBF's donor base initially withered, and it took about two years to re-educate donors and bring them back.
6.5	06/20/06	CCBF has many supporters who are diverse but not particularly wealthy.
6.5	06/20/06	CCBF has raised money with the focus on the need to retain a national memory and sustain national values. At the other end of the spectrum, regional economic development has also been used.
6.5	06/20/06	Virginia Canoe Association very interested in preserving Cedar Creek as a canoe route.
6.5	06/20/06	UK Civil War Roundtable is a consistent supporter of the CCBF.
6.5	06/20/06	More things bind the CEBE partners than separate them. They don't compete for the same sources of money.
6.5	06/20/06	Belle Grove is likely to remain as an autonomous entity but CCBF could become a friends group for the park.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
7.2	10/26/05	Local colleges and universities can help educate people about the park.
7.2	10/26/05	An interdisciplinary masters degree program should be created, involving park management, history and education.
8.1	06/20/06	Coordination by NPS with towns and counties.
8.1	06/20/06	Communication among NPS, local residents and communities.
8.1	06/20/06	Time it takes for NPS plan – by 2008 will there be anything left?
8.1	06/20/06	Continuing communication among stakeholders and the park.
8.2	06/21/06	NPS voice in local government to influence growth and development, and to protect viewsapes.
8.2	06/21/06	Coordinated visitor services with regional visitor services partners.

1.5 Park Operations and Facilities

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	How will the GMP address the need for a park visitor center?
1.1	04/13/06	Interest in developing trails connecting Keister park with Signal Knob, the National Forest and Belle Grove.
1.1	04/14/06	NPS partners are interested in a CEBE visitor center.
1.2	05/18/06	GMP must distinguish short-term and long-term strategies, considering its current limited staff and land base but not missing opportunity for setting a long-term bigger vision.
1.2	05/18/06	A GMP goal should be to lay the foundation for a sustainable park, taking into account difficulty of achieving funding for a start-up park.
2.3	11/17/05	Belle Grove is seeking help from NPS in interpreting natural resources.
2.3	11/17/05	NPS should provide consistency for trails throughout the park.
2.3	11/17/05	What will be NPS policy on trail maintenance?
2.3	11/17/05	Will there be recreational non-interpretive trails, e.g., at the Keister property?
2.5	03/16/06	We need to provide access to the park for the mobility impaired.
2.5	03/16/06	A park visitor center should be in a central location.
2.5	03/16/06	The visitor center should have a panoramic view of the battlefield and park.
2.5	03/16/06	Are there existing facilities that could be used for the visitor center?

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
3.2	12/13/05	NPS should own visitor center and enough land to be a presence.
3.2	12/13/05	Visitor center issues: hub of park, staffing, potential political concerns about its location and funding sources.
3.3	02/15/06	NPS needs a central location and high visibility in the area.
3.5	05/17/06	The GMP does not need to identify a specific site for the visitor center.
4.1	11/13/05	There is an interest in where the visitor center will be located.
4.3	04/04/06	Local partners should have a strong say in where and how the visitor center will be built.
4.3	04/04/06	The visitor center for the "Signal Hill" cluster will likely be within the park.
4.3	04/04/06	"Points of visitor contact" in the CEBE legislation is assumed to mean visitor center.
4.4	04/07/06	There is a need for visitor wayfinding from Route 11.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove's Overseer's Cottage is not suitable as a visitor center site.
4.4	04/07/06	If the park is to have a trail system, it should be located along original road beds.
4.5	10/07/06	Shenandoah County would like the GMP process to incorporate the County's plan for Keister Park
4.5	10/07/06	Although it could probably not sell the property to NPS, Shenandoah County would consider NPS taking over the management of Keister Park.
5.1	10/04/05	Middletown Town Council would like to see an NPS visitor center in or near Middletown.
5.2	10/20/05	Different opinions regarding the location of the NPS visitor center, e.g., preferences for Frederick County versus another site that would maximize tourism for entire region without regard to political boundaries.
5.6	06/22/06	The visitor center should not be at Belle Grove because it would focus the experience too much on the Belle Grove story.
5.7	06/22/06	Middletown needs to update its infrastructure and accommodate some growth if it is to be vibrant and have an economic base.
5.7	06/22/06	The old Middletown School building would have been a good orientation site.
5.8	06/22/06	A continuous walking and bike trail should be considered that would connect Fishers Hill and Belle Grove, as well as the Tuscarawas Trail in the vicinity of Toms Brook.
6.1	03/21/06	What are the research needs for the park?
6.3	05/02/06	Wireless internet capability (WIFI) should be provided throughout the park for interactive sharing of information with visitors.
6.3	05/02/06	The Fort Ticonderoga, NY gift shop is tasteful in appearance. It sells tourist products that generate cash for the park, should be considered as a model.
6.5	06/20/06	CCBF has done a second reenactment in summer 2006 to generate cash, but it has been a drain on volunteers.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
7.2	10/26/05	Support for the reenactments but concerned they are impacting the resource and there is little local landowner involvement in how or when reenactment activities occur.
8.1	06/20/06	Establishment of park headquarters (role, size, location, and mission).
8.1	06/20/06	Address alternative transportation.
8.2	06/21/06	Transportation/buses on narrow unpaved roads.
8.2	06/21/06	No parking at Ranseur Monument.
8.2	06/21/06	Location of visitors center.
8.2	06/21/06	Road problems – too small for traffic, paving, maintenance – park traffic versus commuter/local traffic.
8.2	06/21/06	Traffic issues with tourists (buses).
8.2	06/21/06	Public outreach and communications.
8.2	06/21/06	Visitor center – will there be one?
8.2	06/21/06	Future hunting and fishing in the park.
8.2	06/21/06	Future road changes in the park.
8.2	06/21/06	Public safety hazards of increased road traffic, especially trucks on Route 11 and expanded I-81 and quarry.

1.6 Land Protection and Boundary Adjustment

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	How will NPS approach scenic easements outside the park?
1.1	04/12/06	Should the GMP include a land protection plan?
1.1	04/12/06	How will CEBC address resource protection in the context of encroaching development?
1.1	04/12/06	How will CEBC deal with the potential impacts of an I-81 expansion?
1.1	04/12/06	What will be the framework for decision-making related to land protection?
1.1	04/12/06	How will the CEBC Advisory Commission address lands outside the CEBC boundary?
1.1	04/12/06	How should CEBC work with developers to minimize negative impacts on the park?
1.1	04/12/06	Should CEBC work directly with the Town of Strasburg regarding their growth policies?

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.2	05/18/06	Local communities do not necessarily see the need to preserve more land in that Belle Grove and Cedar Creek Foundation already have substantial holdings.
1.2	05/18/06	NPS may have to acquire additional land to preserve and interpret the area's history,
2.3	11/17/05	NPS should purchase lands in the park.
2.3	11/17/05	NPS should be a major player in the preservation of land.
2.3	11/17/05	Private land can be protected through easements and zoning.
2.6	05/18/05	We must make sure that the rights of private property owners are respected, particularly with regard to park visitors.
2.6	05/18/05	Landscapes and views are influenced by forces within and outside the park.
3.5	05/17/06	Proposed expansion of I-81 may take 320 acres within the authorized park boundaries.
3.5	05/17/06	Land protection must be done now and should be a major issue in the GMP.
3.5	05/17/06	Need to distinguish between public and private interests in the park.
4.1	11/13/05	Land protection is critically important.
4.1	11/13/05	Some people believe that land protection is more important than the visitor center.
4.2	03/29/06	Land protection is critically important and it should be funded to its fullest extent.
4.3	04/04/06	All involved in the GMP planning process should address landowner concerns, including those of the partners and private property owners in the park.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF management plan calls for building relationships with landowners.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF's battlefield plans for Cross Keys and Port Republic were successful and done simultaneously with county comprehensive plan updates. They involved landowners and were perceived as enhancements to the county plans.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF Management Plan identified 18,000 acres as the "core area" which remains largely rural or protected, of which 6,000 acres are at Cedar Creek. Many of those lands are outside of the park's legislative boundaries.
4.3	04/04/06	It would probably be difficult to change CEBE boundaries because of political obstacles, the possible exception being Warren County.
4.3	04/04/06	Possibly NPS could indicate a federal interest in lands beyond current CEBE boundaries, which may be the basis for asking for funds to support the preservation efforts of its partners.
4.3	04/04/06	More land is being preserved in the Cedar Creek area than elsewhere in the heritage area.
4.3	04/04/06	Time has come for SVBF to become more creative with limited funding, e.g., exploring purchase and resale with conservation easements.
4.3	04/04/06	SVBF has not thought much about using limited development techniques; might be hard for the SVBF board and the public to accept.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
4.3	04/04/06	Private property rights interests have indicated concerns that the SVBF is putting pressure on local governments to adopt regulations to restrict private property rights.
4.4	04/07/06	Key partners would generally like NPS to own more land, and they believe that a larger land base will be necessary to secure adequate NPS funding for the park.
4.5	10/07/06	Shenandoah County is now working on acquiring other properties for park purposes.
4.6	06/06/06	Land protection is critically important.
4.6	06/06/06	Conservation easements should be used more aggressively, with assistance of Piedmont Environmental Council and the Potomac Conservancy.
4.6	06/06/06	Connecting protected land along US 11 is critical, e.g., Harmony Hall should be connected with Belle Grove to create a more cohesive park.
4.6	06/06/06	NPS and its partners must get land conservation groups involved in the park.
4.7	06/23/06	NPS needed to start acquiring land 15 years ago. It will have problems acquiring land today.
4.7	06/23/06	Housing developments will be the biggest threat in terms of changing the area's landscape and culture.
5.1	10/04/05	Perhaps Middletown could use annexation to bring the park into town to provide better development controls, e.g., through a historic protection ordinance.
5.1	10/04/05	Land protection is very important, i.e., the battlefield should not be developed.
5.1	10/04/05	Middletown Town Council wants to work with private landowners to promote land protection, with assistance from NPS.
5.1	10/04/05	NPS should consider conservation easements as a land protection tool.
5.1	10/04/05	Middletown concerned about the expansion of I-81 and the Chemstone quarry.
5.2	10/20/05	Land protection is very important. We will not have a viable park without an appropriate land base. Can towns and counties help?
5.3	11/15/05	Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors supports the use of conservation easements as a means of controlling growth,
5.3	11/15/05	Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors is concerned about land protection.
5.4	02/01/06	Concern for encroaching development, especially in the Strasburg area.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County's Comprehensive Plan (2003) does not recognize that the park is in the County. However, a plan update could recognize the park and propose new policies, e.g., amending rural-by-right provisions.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County has taken the position that land protection will promote tourism but has not had the hard numbers to back-up the value of preservation and creation of the park.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County government and its regulations are sensitive to property rights issues.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County recently established an authority to work on conservation easements.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County's 2003 Comprehensive Plan has an urban growth boundary and a goal to concentrate 70% of its growth in the designated urban area. Middletown is outside the urban growth area.
5.5	04/05/06	Frederick County's rural-by-right provisions allow 1 dwelling/5 acres, with clustering at the same density and 40% open space set aside.
5.6	06/22/06	What is happening on the periphery of the park poses the greatest impediment to understanding what is important and significant about the park.
5.6	06/22/06	The park is already compromised by I-81.
5.6	06/22/06	The nearby "mountainscapes" are already protected by federal ownership.
5.6	06/22/06	Should use local network of leaders to work on protecting the park's land base. Town and counties could approach property owners and offer conservation incentives.
5.6	06/22/06	Warren County should consider working with landowners along Bowmans Mill Road and Long Meadow Road, and rezone for preservation.
5.7	06/22/06	There has been a lot of real estate speculation in Middletown in recent years, but recently it has cooled off.
5.7	06/22/06	Middletown working on a "traditional neighborhood design" option for new development, e.g., with grid design and mixed housing.
5.8	06/22/06	Strasburg needs to develop a new vision for its growth, considering an urban growth boundary.
6.1	03/21/06	I-81 is often viewed as a negative but it can also be viewed as an economic benefit.
6.2	04/27/06	Land protection is critically important.
6.2	04/27/06	We must protect enough land for interpretation, and we can work with developers if necessary.
6.2	04/27/06	The GMP must address a coordinated approach for dealing with external threats and land protection issues.
6.3	05/02/06	I-81 often viewed as negative but it can also be viewed as a potential revenue stream.
6.5	06/20/06	When Joe Whitehorne wrote his driving tour in 1985, it was easy to interpret the landscape. But it has dramatically changed in the past 20 years.
6.5	06/20/06	It was important to create the park to assist in the overall concept of the Historic District. For 20 years before the District, it was a perpetual fight to preserve anything.
6.5	06/20/06	Need conservation easements on lands within the park's viewsheds.
6.5	06/20/06	Working relationships need to be established with landowners and developers to plant vegetation screens and use earth tones in building materials.
6.5	06/20/06	Currently, there is no vehicle in place for communities to inform and educate developers regarding the resources on their properties.
7.1	10/05/05	Developers are buying up all available land. NPS cannot wait until the plan is completed to protect land. All available tools should be used to protect land in the park now.
7.2	10/26/05	Land protection is of paramount importance.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
8.1	06/20/06	Growth and development - impact on park.
8.1	06/20/06	Concern for potential restrictions on landowners within park.
8.1	06/20/06	Historical conservation easements.
8.1	06/20/06	Protecting viewsheds and improving buffers.
8.1	06/20/06	Coordination between NPS and local government
8.1	06/20/06	Land protection efforts undertaken by local governments.
8.1	06/20/06	How much of CCBF's lands will be accessible to the public?
8.1	06/20/06	Growth and development impacts on the park.
8.1	06/20/06	Balance between public value and private property rights.
8.1	06/20/06	Preservation of natural resources and viewsheds.
8.1	06/20/06	Land acquisition – concern for potential condemnation by NPS.
8.1	06/20/06	How do property owners have a voice in park?
8.1	06/20/06	Boundary adjustments – concern about property rights.
8.1	06/20/06	Local governments need guidance on development issues.
8.2	06/21/06	Allowance for continued current uses.
8.2	06/21/06	Communication needed with park private landowners and homeowners associations.
8.2	06/21/06	Landowners' rights – restrictions – passing to inheritance (children) - farming
8.2	06/21/06	Input from landowners – how were boundaries drawn?
8.2	06/21/06	Maintaining scenic views/improving current viewshed challenges.
8.2	06/21/06	Effect of possible quarry rezoning on the park.
8.2	06/21/06	How will park affect private property and owners?
8.2	06/21/06	Maintain agrarian community.
8.2	06/21/06	What's going to happen to property adjacent to the Park?
8.2	06/21/06	Enforcement of viewshed pollution on adjacent properties.

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
8.2	06/21/06	Protection of scenic resources outside of park boundaries.
8.2	06/21/06	Future of private lands in park.
8.2	06/21/06	Building regulations on private lands in the park?

2.0 Interests and Concerns that are Adequately Addressed by Servicewide Law or Policy Guidance

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
1.1	04/12/06	How will CEBE and its partners manage visitors fees?
3.5	05/17/06	Hunting policy on NPS and partner lands is a huge issue.
2.6	05/18/05	Can NPS be legally bound to a voting board?
2.6	05/18/05	Can the Park Advisory Commission have a long-term role in managing the park?
2.6	05/18/05	The GMP and planning process need to stick to a broad vision. Then the partners and other stakeholders contribute resources toward the vision.
3.2	12/13/05	How to integrate partnership with NPS policies (e.g., what to do when NPS policies differ from partner policies)? For example, hunting.
3.2	12/13/05	Will management entity meetings be open to the public?
3.2	12/13/05	More NPS funding is likely if NPS owns more land, which in turn translates to more ability to assist partners.
3.2	12/13/05	What NPS funds will be available for use by partners?
3.3	02/15/06	There is an understanding of the strong correlation between having a land base and NPS funding.
3.3	02/15/06	SVBF is interested in owning land and having NPS manage it for them. Shenandoah County may be interested in this as well.
2.3	11/17/05	How will NPS and key partners affect private landowners?
2.3	11/17/05	Can NPS rangers work with partners on law enforcement matters?
2.6	05/18/05	NPS current funding realities must be incorporated into the planning process.
3.2	12/13/05	We need various contingencies for potential park funding levels.
5.2	10/20/05	Can NPS accept donations of land or money?

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
8.2	06/21/06	Will there be adequate federal funding for the park?
2.3	11/17/05	Can NPS buy land outside of its boundary?
3.2	12/13/05	The results of the land protection plan will greatly impact funding needs.
8.2	06/21/06	How and why were park boundaries decided, and are they permanent?

3.0 Interests and Concerns that should be Addressed in Implementation Plans

Event (see p. C-23)	Date	Interest/Concern
2.3	11/17/05	The partnership must be seamless at the visitor center where the overview story is presented.
2.3	11/17/05	We must let people know when they are in the park. It is very important that visitors know when they are "in" and "out" of the park.
2.5	03/16/06	Interpreting troop movements and military history is important but we must be careful not to clutter the landscape with signs, perhaps using technology.
2.5	03/16/06	Some places will require a live interpreter so that tours can be tailored to the audience.
1.1	04/12/06	How will CEBE address some negative community attitudes towards NPS?
2.3	11/17/05	Potential new key partners might be added over time.
2.3	11/17/05	Partners should coordinate hours of use and events.
3.2	12/13/05	"A Partnership Park" should be a byline in all marketing materials.
3.2	12/13/05	How will partnership conflicts be resolved?
3.2	12/13/05	What if other organizations (i.e., a land trust) protect land within the park. Are they eligible to become key partners?
8.1	06/20/06	Adequacy of future funding for key partners.
2.3	11/17/05	The park should have its own unique "branding" with consistent signage.
2.3	11/17/05	Partners can collaborate on training staff to give a consistent message.
2.3	11/17/05	How should different partners positions be handled, e.g., with respect to hunting policies?
2.3	11/17/05	We need to tell the story that this is a partnership park, even possibly including it in the sub-title of the park's name.
2.5	03/16/06	A possible interim solution for the visitor center would be Lord Fairfax College.
3.5	05/17/06	Need to obtain a commitment for staffing the park at the program level.

Event <small>(see p. C-23)</small>	Date	Interest/Concern
3.5	05/17/06	Shenandoah County would like the visitor center. The only visitor it has now is in New Market, run by the Shenandoah Valley travel organization.
4.4	04/07/06	Belle Grove is interested in acquiring public water from Middletown.
8.2	06/21/06	How many reenactments should occur yearly?
8.2	06/21/06	Funding for property acquisition within park.
8.2	06/21/06	Public safety/traffic issues/control of truck traffic on Route 11.
1.1	04/12/06	Should the GMP prescribe a general phasing plan tied to future land protection?
1.1	04/12/06	What will be the sources of NPS funding for future land acquisitions?
2.3	11/17/05	Will NPS ever have the funds to buy land?
3.5	05/17/06	Key partners as well as Shenandoah County and Middletown have taken the position of finding "reasonable solutions" for an expanded I-81.
4.6	06/06/06	Virginia tax credits for conservation easements are critically important.
4.7	06/23/06	Tax incentives should be offered to conservation easements placed on battlefield lands.

Key to Meeting Events

1.0		Internal NPS Meetings
1.1	04/04/06	Team meeting at CEBE office
1.2	05/18/06	CEBE NPS and WRT
1.3	05/19/06	CEBE NPS and WRT
2.0		CEBE Advisory Commission
2.1	07/13/05	Advisory Commission Meeting
2.2	09/15/05	Advisory Commission Meeting
2.3	11/17/05	Advisory Commission Meeting
2.4	01/19/06	Advisory Commission Meeting
2.5	03/16/06	Advisory Commission Meeting
2.6	05/18/06	Advisory Commission Meeting
3.0		CEBE Key Partners
3.1	11/13/05	Key Partners Meeting
3.2	12/13/05	Key Partners Meeting
3.3	02/15/06	Key Partners Meeting
3.4	03/16/06	Key Partners Meeting
3.5	05/17/06	Key Partners Meeting
4.0		CEBE Key Partners
4.1	11/13/05	Belle Grove Board of Directors
4.2	03/29/06	Belle Grove Docents and Volunteers
4.3	04/04/06	Howard Kittell, Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation
4.4	04/07/06	Meeting with Elizabeth McClung, Belle Grove Plantation
4.5	04/07/06	Marcus Ordonez, Shenandoah County Parks & Recreation
4.6	06/06/06	National Trust for Historic Preservation
4.7	06/23/06	Mike Kehoe, Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation
5.0		County and Local Interests
5.1	10/04/05	Middletown Town Council & Planning Commission
5.2	10/20/05	Winchester-Frederick County Convention & Visitors Bureau
5.3	11/15/05	Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors
5.4	02/01/06	Linden/Warren County Rotary Club
5.5	04/05/06	Kris Tierney, Assist. Admin., Frederick County
5.6	06/22/06	Patrick Farris, Warren Heritage Society
5.7	06/22/06	Tess Klimm, Middletown Planning Board
5.8	06/22/06	Nora Amos & Sara Mauck, Town of Strasburg
6.0		Academic Interests
6.1	03/21/06	Scholar's Roundtable, Shenandoah University
6.2	04/27/06	Lord Fairfax Community College
6.3	05/02/06	John Winn, Business School, Shenandoah University
6.4	05/19/06	Warren Hofstra, Shenandoah University
6.5	06/20/06	Joseph Whitehorne, Lord Fairfax Community College

7.0 Other Interests

7.1	10/05/05	Betty Schutte
7.2	10/26/05	Dr. Mary Bowser

8.0 Public Scoping Meetings

8.1	06/20/06	Strasburg
8.2	06/21/06	Middletown
8.3	06/22/06	Front Royal