

CHAPTER 1:

**INTRODUCTION-
PURPOSE OF
AND NEED FOR
THE PLAN**

(blank back of divider)

WHY WE DO GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLANNING

BACKGROUND

The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 and the NPS *Management Policies 2006* require each unit of the National Park Service (NPS) to develop a general management plan (GMP).

The purpose of a general management plan is to ensure that a park unit (in this case, Monocacy National Battlefield) has a clearly defined direction for resource preservation and visitor use. This enables the unit to achieve the National Park Service's mandate to preserve resources unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. In addition, general management planning makes the National Park Service more effective, collaborative, and accountable by

- achieving a balance between continuity and adaptability in decision making — defining the desired conditions to be achieved and maintained in the national battlefield will provide a touchstone that allows managers and staff to constantly adapt their actions to changing situations while staying focused on what is most important about the national battlefield.
- analyzing the national battlefield in relation to its surrounding ecosystem, cultural setting, and community will help managers and staff understand how the national battlefield can interrelate with neighbors and others in ways that are ecologically, socially, and economically sustainable. Decisions made within such a larger context are more likely to be successful over time.

- giving everyone who has a stake in decisions affecting the national battlefield an opportunity to be involved in the planning process and to understand the decisions that are made. National parks are often the focus of intense public interest. Public involvement throughout the planning process provides focused opportunities for the managers and staff to interact with the public and learn about public concerns, expectations, and values. Public involvement also provides opportunities for the managers and staff to share information about the national battlefield's purpose and significance, as well as opportunities and constraints for the management of its lands.

The ultimate outcome of general management planning for national parks is an agreement among the National Park Service, its partners, and the public about why each area is managed as part of the national park system, what the resource conditions and visitor experiences should be there, and how those conditions can best be achieved and maintained over time.

The national battlefield superintendent and staff are called upon daily to make decisions that affect how visitors view Monocacy National Battlefield. Such things as how resources are interpreted, how the landscape and historic structures are preserved, and how facilities are maintained are critical to the future of the national battlefield.

This Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for

Monocacy National Battlefield includes a description of the national battlefield's vision for preserving the nationally significant battlefield that still evokes the aura of the Civil War period. A plan is outlined for developing visitor facilities and the interpretive messages and stories to be expanded upon are described. The plan would enhance the visitor experience through programs and visitor amenities such as trails. The plan does not provide specific and detailed answers to every issue or question facing the national battlefield. However, the plan does offer a framework for proactive decision making that will guide national battlefield managers in making effective choices.

Monocacy never has had a general management plan or the precursor master plan. Before land acquisition began, an "Assessment of Alternatives" document was assembled to provide some guidance for initial management decision making. Now, with land acquisition essentially completed, this *General Management Plan* will supply the guidance necessary to take the national battlefield well into the next decade. For this relatively new area, many decisions must be made about resource preservation, locating facilities, circulation, and staff needs, most for the first time. A new plan is essential to guide the management of the national battlefield in the 21st century and to ensure the preservation of this nationally significant battlefield while presenting opportunities for visitors to have a high-quality experience.

Although the battlefield is surprisingly intact with structures, fence rows, and

road systems reflecting the Civil War period, the surrounding area is undergoing major change. Housing developments and industrial and commercial development are occurring on all sides. Because this area is a part of the expanding Baltimore–Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, it is not likely that the pace of growth will abate in the future.

The major threat to the integrity of the battlefield comes from traffic growth. This growth affects visitor safety and circulation, increases the pressure to widen roads, and causes noise and air pollution. Another threat comes from development around the boundary, which affects national battlefield viewsheds, increases runoff into the Monocacy River and other streams, and decreases biodiversity. These threats are regionwide concerns that cannot be solved solely within this plan. However, the plan can identify the concerns and suggest ways to decrease the impacts.

In the process of developing this *General Management Plan*, the planning team examined many different approaches to national battlefield use, management, and development. These were narrowed to a "no action" alternative (Alternative 1, continuation of the present management course) and three additional alternatives, each of which would allow the national battlefield to achieve its mission and mission goals. Alternative 4 has been identified as the National Park Service's preferred future direction.

To help the public and the National Park Service understand what would happen if an alternative was adopted, the impacts of each alternative on the

natural and cultural environment are described and compared. These descriptions are contained in the *Environmental Impact Statement* part of the plan, which satisfies the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. After having described a full range of alternatives, the National Park Service, in consultation with the public, will select the alternative or combination of alternatives to be implemented.

General management plans are intended to be long-term documents that establish and articulate a management philosophy and framework for decision making and problem solving in units of the national park system. Such plans usually provide guidance during a 15- to 20-year period.

Actions directed by general management plans or by subsequent implementation plans are accomplished over time. Budget restrictions, the need for more data or regulatory compliance, and competing national park system priorities prevent the immediate execution of many actions. Major or especially costly actions could be completed 10 or more years into the future. Some actions may never be funded.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

Monocacy National Battlefield lies in Frederick County, Maryland in the heavily populated Baltimore–Washington metropolitan area. The national battlefield lies in an unincor-

porated area approximately 3 miles south of the center of Frederick, the largest city in Frederick County and the second largest city in Maryland. Although this area of the county is rapidly building up, the national battlefield is remarkably free of intrusive elements. Only the modern Interstate Highway 270 (I-270) intrudes on the historic landscape, essentially bisecting the battlefield.

Within the national battlefield's boundaries are 1,647 acres, encompassing most of the lands upon which the Battle of Monocacy was fought. Six properties or farmsteads that existed during the battle are still extant within the national battlefield and retain essentially their Civil War era landscape appearance. Surrounding agricultural fields retain the feel of the Civil War era landscape, with few changes to field configurations and fence rows. Crops have gradually changed over the years from small grains to hay and corn, but the overall agricultural environment remains remarkably intact. Forested areas include Brooks Hill and lands along the Monocacy River and Bush Creek. These form an exceptional buffer from development outside the boundaries.

Approximately 2 miles of the Monocacy River runs through the national battlefield. The CSX Railroad (Baltimore & Ohio during the Civil War) also extends through the national battlefield, paralleling the Monocacy River and Bush Creek. Historic Urbana Pike (Maryland Highway 355) runs north–south through the eastern part of the national battlefield.

Urbana Pike also is the main access for visitors to the battlefield. This highway, which has four lanes on the north side of the national battlefield, is heavily used by commuters, residents, business vehicles, and trucks. In the national battlefield, the highway is two lanes with paved shoulders on the north side of the Monocacy River, and on the south side of the river it is two lanes with narrow, unpaved shoulders. South of the national battlefield it remains two lanes with narrow, unpaved shoulders. Urbana Pike provides much of the access to important features, and the heavy volumes and high speeds of commuter traffic and commercial

vehicles create a safety problem and encroach upon the visitor experience.

A small visitor contact station was opened on the site in 1991. It has been replaced by a new visitor center completed in 2007. Much of the national battlefield has remained closed to visitors as historic features were rehabilitated or restored. As a result, visitation figures (about 14,700 in 2003) reflect the low level of knowledge in the community and the nation that Monocacy National Battlefield exists or is open. With land acquisition nearly complete, opening of more of the national battlefield to visitation probably will increase visitation considerably.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

PREHISTORY

Native Americans have been present in the Monocacy National Battlefield area since the earliest human occupation of North America. Although a complete archeological survey of the battlefield has not been undertaken, surveys of Frederick County have shown that the Monocacy Valley experienced intensive Native American settlement, particularly along the Monocacy River (Kavanaugh 1982). It is likely that the prehistoric occupations on the battlefield's component properties reflect this pattern. Native American occupations spanning over 10,000 years and ranging from Early Archaic to late Woodland period short-term base camps and lithic scatters have been documented at the Best, Thomas, and Worthington farms (Beasley 2003, 2004; Little 1994, 61).

INITIAL EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT AND EARLY GROWTH, 1715–1860

European explorers and traders may have arrived in the Maryland Piedmont region as early as 1715 (Scharf 1882, 58). The earliest land surveys in Frederick County were made in the 1720s; they are generally characterized by land speculation ventures that were subdivided and leased or sold to tenants (NPS 2000, 2.3; Paula S. Reed & Assoc., Inc. 1999, 11). Increasing competition for available land and economic opportunities in southern Maryland and the Eastern Shore area facilitated the westward movement of English settlers, many of whom brought enslaved laborers with them into the Monocacy region. Pennsylvania Germans from

Philadelphia and southeastern Pennsylvania also migrated into Frederick County.

Two distinct agricultural systems had developed in the Monocacy region by the mid-18th century, arising out of the predominantly English and German migrations into the area. German settlers generally farmed smaller tracts of land, cultivating corn and wheat and other subsistence crops (Paula S. Reed & Assoc., Inc. 1999, 11; Tracey and Dern 1987, 131). Conversely, British settlers initially sought to replicate the tobacco and slave economy of the tidewater area; however, climate differences and market fluctuations eventually precipitated greater reliance on commercial grain cultivation in the Monocacy area, even among slaveholders (Paula S. Reed & Assoc., Inc. 1999, 11, 14).

The onset of the French and Indian War in 1756 deferred western expansion substantially, although some land speculation and settlement continued to occur in the Monocacy area. In 1759, for example, a Scottish merchant named James Marshall began acquiring large amounts of land along the western bank of the Monocacy River. In 1793, Marshall patented an additional 881 acres on the eastern bank of the Monocacy; in fact, much of the present-day Monocacy National Battlefield encompasses lands that originally were owned by James Marshall. Marshall also is credited with having constructed the large ca. 1780 brick manor house on the Thomas Farm.

Marshall engaged in extensive land speculation and development in the Monocacy area. In 1798 he sold 291 acres of land on the west side of the Monocacy River to Victoire Vincendière, a French planter who came to Frederick County with her family in 1793 from the Caribbean colony of Saint-Domingue. The Vincendière family assembled a 748-acre plantation known as L'Hermitage, and also owned as many as 90 slaves. The Best Farm comprises the southern 274 acres of L'Hermitage plantation, and the Vincendière family built several structures on the property that are still extant, including the main house, a smaller secondary dwelling, and a stone barn.

By the close of the 18th century, Frederick was a bustling agricultural community, and it also exhibited significant industrial development. Increased population fueled agricultural expansion; in fact, by 1790, Frederick County was the largest wheat producer in the United States and also supported the cultivation of flax, corn, orchard fruit, rye, oats, potatoes, and hay. Industry expanded as well. Taking advantage of the abundant water power in Frederick County, a number of flour mills processed grain into more easily transportable and marketable flour or meal. Other important industries developed in the Monocacy area during the 18th and early 19th centuries, including sawmills, iron furnaces, and glass production.

As population, commerce, and agricultural output expanded in Frederick County, the development of trans-

portation systems became increasingly important. For example, in the 18th century a number of river crossings were established at low places on the banks of the Monocacy River. One such ferry, Middle Ford ferry, crossed the Monocacy River within the battlefield boundaries a short distance downstream of the current MD 355 highway bridge (HABS MD-10S 1199 1, 15–16). A ferry operated at this location as early as 1749, and the ferry landing remained a prominent landscape feature well into the 19th and 20th centuries. In fact, its location is still reflected in recent property boundaries (Varle 1808; Paula S. Reed & Assoc., Inc. 1999, 72; Monocacy NB Tract Map 1995).

The need to transport goods between western Maryland and the port towns of Georgetown, Baltimore, and Annapolis, as well as the absence of navigable inland water routes, led to the development of a regional road system, including the Georgetown Pike (present-day MD 355), which was chartered by the state of Maryland in 1805. Known at various times as the Washington Pike or the Urbana Pike, the Georgetown Pike followed the alignment of an earlier road and intersected with the Buckeystown Pike just south of Frederick (Griffith 1794). A wooden bridge carrying the Georgetown Pike over the Monocacy River was constructed sometime in the first half of the 19th century, rendering the Middle Ford ferry obsolete.

More transportation improvements came in 1828, when construction began on America's first railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio (B&O). The B&O

Railroad reached the Monocacy area in 1830, and in 1831 a spur line to Frederick was completed (Scharf 1882, 44; Whitmore 1981, 38). The intersection of the main and spur lines formed a triangular-shaped junction that remains in place today within the national battlefield boundaries. It was known at different times as the Frederick, Araby, or Monocacy Junction. A wooden bridge originally carried the B&O Railroad over the Monocacy River, but it was replaced by a cast-iron bridge in the 1850s (NPS 2000, 2.10). Still an active segment of the CSX Railroad, the current truss bridge rests on the original abutments and stone piers of these earlier bridges (Bearss 1978, 91–92).

Beginning in 1812, Col. John McPherson, Sr., an entrepreneur, bought 415 acres of land on the west side of the Monocacy River from James Marshall's heirs. Over the next two decades, Col. McPherson and his son John began to assemble the various land tracts that composed a 1,111-acre property known as Araby. These land parcels were tied to the crossroads created by the passage of the Georgetown Pike over the Monocacy River and encompassed land that was eventually subdivided to form the Thomas, Lewis, Worthington, and Baker farms, as well as the Gambrill Mill property.

On the east side of the Monocacy River, Victoire Vincendière sold L'Hermitage in 1827. The property eventually was acquired by the Trail family and subdivided into northern and southern parcels. The South Hermitage parcel encompassed the property that eventually became known as the Best

Farm, after the tenant family that was living there at the time of the Battle of Monocacy. Thus, by 1860, as a result of the sale and subdivision of James Marshall's and Victoire Vincendière's lands, the properties that would one day make up Monocacy National Battlefield were essentially in the form that remains recognizable today.

THE CIVIL WAR, 1861–1865

By the mid-19th century, Frederick, Maryland, was a prosperous community. Major highways leading to Washington and Baltimore converged there, and the B&O Railroad passed nearby. This transportation corridor not only contributed to the development of the area, but it also became a target for Union and Confederate armies throughout the Civil War because it facilitated movement of troops and supplies. The six farms that compose Monocacy National Battlefield were directly affected by these actions.

In 1862, Union and Confederate armies used the Georgetown Pike as a major route for troop movement. To protect the junction, the B&O Railroad authorized the construction of two blockhouses: one south of the railroad tracks near the turnpike bridge and one north of the railroad, just east of the river. Soldiers from the 14th New Jersey Regiment established an encampment nearby on the north side of the railroad tracks. Camp Hooker, as it became known, housed between 800 and 1,000 soldiers. It consisted of quarters for field and line officers, tents for enlisted men, ten cookhouses, two guardhouses, a commissary, and a stable. A sketch map

of the camp also indicates the locations of a hospital, a bakery, and a storehouse.

Although no aboveground evidence remains, the footprint of Camp Hooker has been identified archeologically. Soldiers from that encampment also constructed earthworks on the high ground north and east of the railroad, above the junction. These consisted of a gun battery, rifle pits, and a powder magazine, the remains of which are still extant in the national battlefield's Civil War defenses area.

During the September 1862 Maryland Campaign, which culminated in the Battle of Antietam, Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee and his forces camped on the Best Farm. It was there that Lee wrote Special Order 191, which detailed his plans to divide his army and capture Harpers Ferry. A few days later, Union troops set up camp in the area previously occupied by their counterparts and discovered a lost copy of the special order. The plans were soon revealed to Union Gen. George B. McClellan, who hastened his pace to encounter the Confederates at nearby South Mountain and Antietam.

As Union troops moved through the area in late June 1863, before the Battle of Gettysburg, Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock made the Thomas House his headquarters for three days. Once again, the Best Farm was a site for soldier encampments.

In 1864, the farms surrounding Monocacy Junction became the focal point in a delaying action that would later become known as "the battle that saved Washington." When judged by its consequences, rather than its size, the

Battle of Monocacy ranks among the important battles of the Civil War. On July 9, 15,000 Confederate forces under the command of Lt. Gen. Jubal Early clashed with 5,800 Union forces under Maj. Gen. Lew Wallace.

Jubal Early's invasion in the summer of 1864 was the third and final time the South tried to bring the war into the North. The opportunity arose when Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant moved most of the Union troops defending the nation's capital to Petersburg, Virginia. Seizing the opportunity, General Lee devised a bold and daring invasion with four objectives: first, to clear the lower Shenandoah Valley of Union Forces; second, to divert Union forces away from Lee's army at Petersburg, Virginia; third, to threaten Washington, D.C., or possibly to capture it in an attempt to deal a death blow to the sagging Union support; and fourth, to reduce the chances of reelection for President Abraham Lincoln.

On June 13, Jubal Early moved west from Petersburg. Union Gen. David Hunter retreated into West Virginia after he was defeated in battle at both Lynchburg and Lexington, Virginia. The path through the Shenandoah Valley to Washington was virtually undefended. After reorganizing his army at Staunton, Virginia, and preparing it for a fast march, Early proceeded north, arriving at Harper's Ferry on the Fourth of July.

Agents along the B&O Railroad had been tracking Early's army and reporting to the railroad president, John Garrett, in Baltimore. Garrett notified Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, in Washington, many times of the

developing emergency. Grant responded that Early was in front of him at Petersburg, Virginia, and that no large force was moving in the valley.

By July 3 Garrett, frustrated by the slow response from the administration in Washington and from Grant, turned to Lew Wallace, Commander of the 8th Army Corps and the Middle Military Department. Acting on his own accord, Wallace gathered all available forces, approximately 2,800 mostly new recruits and 100-days men. They proceeded west to Monocacy Junction to prepare for a possible engagement with Confederate forces.

Part of Wallace's force, under the command of Gen. Erastus Tyler, was sent north to Jug Bridge along the National Pike. Tyler's orders were to hold the approach across the Monocacy River. The rest of the command was concentrated at Monocacy Junction.

Late on July 5, after several Confederate deserters reported that Early was on the move, Grant realized something was wrong. Although he was not convinced of the severity of the situation, he ordered the 3rd Division of the 6th Army Corps under the command of Brig. Gen. James Ricketts to move north.

On July 7 and 8, in the mountain passes and on the outskirts of Frederick, Wallace's troops skirmished heavily with the advancing Confederate forces. Wallace had three objectives: first, to make the Confederates disclose their strength; second, to make them disclose their objective (Washington, D.C., or Baltimore); and third, if they were going to Washington, as he suspected, to delay them long enough to enable reinforce-

ments to reach the defenses of the nation's capital.

Wallace received welcome assistance when Ricketts's veteran division arrived by train on July 8. Upon learning of the impending situation Ricketts put himself and his troops at Wallace's disposal. The veterans were placed along the road to Washington, where it was suspected that the main attack would come.

On the morning of July 9, Confederate Gen. Stephen Ramseur's division encountered Union forces on the Georgetown Pike at Monocacy Junction. Realizing that a direct frontal assault across the Monocacy River at the junction would be too costly, Early sent Gen. John McCausland and his cavalry to find an alternate crossing so that they could outflank the Union line.

McCausland's troops crossed the river at the Worthington-McKinney Ford, a mile downstream from Monocacy Junction, and encountered Ricketts's veteran division, which had repositioned to the left to meet the new assault. When they clashed at a fence separating the Worthington and Thomas farms, the Confederate cavalry was driven back. The Confederates regrouped, and around 2:30 p.m. they attempted to flank the left of the Union line. This time they succeeded in pushing the Union soldiers from the Thomas House. However, Union forces counterattacked and drove the Confederates from the field of battle.

As the Confederate second attack was taking place, Maj. Gen. John Gordon was ordered to cross the river with his infantry division and form up. He initiated a three-pronged attack along

the entire Union line with Brigadier Generals Terry, York, and Evans. Some of the heaviest fighting of the day occurred in this part of the battle. At roughly 4:30 p.m., Wallace's troops were pushed back and forced to retreat toward Baltimore, leaving behind roughly 1,300 men killed, wounded, and missing. Although beaten militarily, they had succeeded in holding their position all day against superior numbers. The Confederates spent the night on the field of battle before resuming their march to Washington. The battle cost the Confederates a day in time and about 900 men killed, wounded, and missing.

By the time Jubal Early's forces reached Washington on July 11, reinforcements from Petersburg had begun to arrive in the capital. However, they were exhausted from their long march and could not make a concerted attack until the following day. Although sporadic fighting took place in the Fort Stevens area throughout July 12, Early realized the futility of his plan and turned away from Washington.

One month after the Confederate victory at Monocacy, Grant designed a Union campaign to bring total destruction upon the Shenandoah Valley, end the war by any means necessary, and gradually force the Confederates back to Petersburg. The plan was revealed at a "council of war" between Union Generals Grant, Sheridan, Hunter, Crook, Ricketts, and others in one of the upper rooms of the Thomas House. The resulting Shenandoah Valley Campaign was devastating to Lee's Army and

would contribute to his decision to surrender in April 1865.

POSTWAR RECOVERY AND MODERNIZATION, 1865–1951

In the years that followed the Civil War, Frederick County quickly regained its agricultural prosperity. This resulted from its transportation arteries and high-quality farmland (Whitmore 1981, 62). Corn and wheat production remained high, and the production of dairy goods, fruit, and vegetables increased. In fact, the income from dairying significantly outdistanced the income from wheat production by the third decade of the 20th century (Grisby and Hoffsommer 1949, 12; Paula S. Reed & Assoc., Inc. 1999, 30, 38; Wesler et al. 1981, 144).

Agricultural production thrived, but industrial expansion did not increase as quickly after the Civil War, although existing industries continued to operate and prosper. James Gambrill's Araby Mill operation, for example, expanded in the 1870s. The expansion made it one of Frederick County's top three flour producers. Eventually, however, as large-scale milling operations began in the midwestern United States, production decreased at Araby Mills, and Gambrill was forced to sell the mill property in 1897 (Paula S. Reed & Assoc., Inc. 1999, 31).

Mechanization increased at the beginning of the 20th century, leading to a reduction in the need for manual labor. Rural populations began to decline as county residents moved to nearby cities in search of work (Whitmore 1981, 63). The closure of foreign markets during

World War I and the rising cost of agricultural mechanization forced many area farmers out of business, but the county's agricultural output remained high even during the Depression (Wesler et al. 1981, 144). Nevertheless, Frederick County's lack of industry led to a slow recovery from the Great Depression (Whitmore 1981, 100).

The transportation system that influenced development of the Monocacy area in the 19th century continued to be important in the 20th century. Although the railroad remained essential for delivering goods to markets, the introduction and increased use of automobiles led to significant improvements in public roads. In the 1920s the county realigned the Georgetown Pike to eliminate a sharp turn near the entrance to Araby Mills. This created a new, more streamlined segment that ran north-south across the west corner of the Gambrill property. The original segment of the Pike was renamed Araby Church Road.

A significant change in the Monocacy landscape occurred in 1951 with the construction of Highway 240, now known as Interstate 270. The four-lane highway bisected the heart of the battlefield, causing significant alterations to the landscape. Property boundaries were reconfigured, new access roads were built to replace blocked historic lanes, and all connection between the Worthington and Thomas farms was lost. In sum, the highway cut the battlefield landscape virtually in two, destroying the integrity of the setting of the final phase of the battle. The completion of the interstate highway

also encouraged additional suburban growth in the region, as it became the primary north-south commuting route between Washington and Frederick. The Georgetown Pike, which had been renamed Maryland Route 355 by 1937, ceased to serve as the primary road between Washington, D.C., and Frederick.

COMMEMORATIVE EFFORTS, 1889-PRESENT

Organized commemoration of the Battle of Monocacy began in 1889, when veterans formed a national association to coincide with the 25th anniversary of the battle. In 1897 an advertisement placed by James Gambrill for the sale of the Gambrill House emphasized the "magnificent view of the historic field of the Battle of Monocacy," suggesting that by the end of the century the local community perceived a distinct landscape called the "Monocacy Battlefield" (HABS MD-LOS 1 1991, 13).

More reunions of veterans took place over the years, but the first monument was not erected until 1907, when the state of New Jersey put up a statue on the Best Farm to honor the 14th New Jersey Regiment (Cooling 1997, 236). By 1915, three more monuments had been placed, including the State of Pennsylvania Monument (1908) on the east side of the original Georgetown Pike near the Thomas Farm entry lane; the Confederate Monument (1914), erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy on the west side of the Georgetown Pike at the northern end of the Best Farm; and the State of Vermont Monument (1915) at the corner of the old Georgetown Pike (now Araby

Church Road) and Baker Valley Road, at the southeast corner of the Thomas Farm (NPS 2000, 2.31–32).

Interest in creating a national battlefield at the site began with the formation of the Monocacy Battle Field Memorial Association by a group of prominent Frederick County citizens. In 1928, the association lobbied Congress for legislation to make the Monocacy Battlefield a national battlefield. The proposed plan for the development of Monocacy Battlefield called for roads that would allow access to important areas of the battlefield. Two more monuments were included in the proposal; one on the Thomas Farm and a Confederate monument to be placed on the Worthington Farm. Establishing a national battlefield was proposed not only to preserve it as a historic site, but also to serve as a picturesque riverside public park.

Congress passed legislation on June 21, 1934, creating Monocacy National Military Park. However, no funds were set aside for the purchase of land, and anticipated land donations did not materialize. In the years immediately after the establishment of Monocacy National Military Park, the National Park Service conducted several field investigations of the area (Thompson 1937). These investigations resulted in the creation of a land acquisition plan, which included a proposal to construct a road that would allow visitors to tour the battlefield site. However, the proposal never was accomplished because Congress again did not appropriate any funds.

In 1964 the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission placed a marker popularly known as the Maryland Monument on the Best Farm to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Monocacy. As development and urbanization continued to increase, a group of concerned citizens met with local politicians and NPS representatives in 1971 to discuss concerns about preserving the battlefield site. They initiated a campaign to give the National Park Service the authority to establish the boundary of the national battlefield and initiate land acquisitions.

Soon thereafter, the National Park Service and local elected officials began working to designate Monocacy Battlefield as a national historic landmark. It received this designation in late 1973, and on February 4, 1975, Monocacy National Battlefield was officially placed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register nomination 1975; Antietam Administrative History 1979, 1).

By the 1980s, the National Park Service began acquiring and protecting Monocacy National Battlefield lands through fee simple purchases and scenic easements. A small visitor contact station was opened in 1991, and now the National Park Service owns all six of the Battlefield's component properties. A superintendency for the battlefield was established in 2003.

ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

Monocacy National Battlefield can be reached from Interstates 70 and 270, from U.S. Highway 15/340, and from Maryland Highways 85 and 355. From I-

70, visitors can exit onto southbound MD 355 and drive about 2 miles to the northern boundary of the national battlefield. Visitors approaching from I-270 must exit onto eastbound I-70 and then onto southbound MD 355. From eastbound U.S. 15/340, one must exit onto eastbound I-70, going south onto Maryland 355. A person coming from MD 85 can drive north to the intersection with MD 355, and then turn right onto MD 355 southbound. The national battlefield is approximately 1 1/2 miles south of the interchange of I-70 and MD 355. The visitor center lies just inside the north national battlefield boundary.

Visitors to Monocacy National Battlefield can begin at the new visitor center,

where they receive directions to each feature of the battlefield. The tour road follows the existing MD 355, Araby Church Road, and Baker Valley Road, all paved two-lane roads.

There are two trails in the national battlefield. A trail about 0.5 mile long runs from the Gambrill Mill along the Monocacy River, where one can see key battlefield features. A second trail system on the Worthington farm gives access to the battlefield and natural areas. It consists of two loops, one up Brooks Hill and one along the Monocacy River.

PURPOSE, NEED, AND IMPLEMENTATION

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of this *Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* is to guide the decision making and problem solving related to resource protection and the visitor experience at Monocacy National Battlefield. The plan, which will set forth strong direction concerning the desired future conditions to be achieved at Monocacy National Battlefield, will be the primary document for managing the national battlefield for the next 15 to 20 years. The approved plan will provide a framework for proactive decision-making, including decisions about visitor use and the management of natural and cultural resources and development. That framework will allow managers to address future opportunities and problems effectively.

This plan will prescribe the resource conditions and visitor experiences that are to be achieved and maintained in the national battlefield over time.

Management decisions must be made when laws, policies, and regulations do not provide clear guidance or when limitations must be based on the national battlefield's purpose, public input and desires, resource analysis, and the evaluation of environmental consequences and costs.

NEED FOR THE PLAN

This plan for Monocacy National Battlefield is needed because the last comprehensive planning effort for the national battlefield was completed in the late 1970s, before land acquisition. That

effort was largely designed to plan for the opening of the national battlefield and the purchase of property, as well as to identify staff needs and to develop an interim visitor facility. Since then, the national battlefield has acquired an interest, either in fee or scenic easement, in nearly all the properties within the boundary. Thus, this is an appropriate time to determine how the battlefield should be managed and to what degree it should be opened to the public. There are major implications for how visitors can access the national battlefield and circulate within it, the facilities needed to support those uses, the way resources are managed, and how the National Park Service manages its operations.

Since the 1970s the population of Frederick County has grown significantly. This has led to the development of commercial property along the north and northwest boundary and extensive residential development to the south, in Urbana. This growth outside the national battlefield has resulted in visual impacts as modern development has intruded on the historic views of the battlefield. Increased commuter and commercial traffic through the battlefield, with its attendant noise and safety concerns, has affected the battlefield's ambiance. There has been pressure to allow more utility and road corridors through battlefield lands; vegetation has been affected by the introduction of exotic species; and open space, habitats, and corridors for wildlife have been lost. All these influences have placed more pressure on existing battlefield resources.

A general management plan also is needed to meet the requirements of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 and NPS policy, which mandate development of a general management plan for each unit in the national park system.

THE NEXT STEPS

After this *Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* is distributed, there will be a 60-day public review and comment period. Then the NPS planning team will evaluate the comments it has received from organizations, businesses, individuals, and other federal agencies. Appropriate changes will be incorporated into a *Final General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement*. The final plan will include letters from governmental agencies, any substantive comments on the draft document, and the responses of the National Park Service to those comments. The distribution of the final plan will be followed by a 30-day no-action period. Then a record of decision approving a final plan will be signed by the NPS regional director. The record of decision documents the NPS selection of an alternative for implementation. With the signing of the record of decision, the plan can then be implemented.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN

As was described previously, the purpose of a general management plan is to provide an overall vision for decision-making. Implementing the approved plan for Monocacy National Battlefield will depend on future funding. The approval of a plan does not guarantee

that the funding and staffing needed to implement the plan will be forthcoming. Full implementation of the approved plan could be many years in the future.

A general management plan does not describe how particular programs or projects should be prioritized or carried out. Those decisions will be addressed during the more detailed planning associated with program plans (e.g., resource stewardship plans), strategic plans, and implementation plans. Carrying out the approved plan also will depend on the completion of additional feasibility studies and more detailed planning and environmental documentation related to the major actions proposed.

GUIDANCE FOR THE PLANNING EFFORT

Purpose

The *purpose* for a unit of the National Park Service is the reason for which it was set aside and preserved by Congress. The purpose statement, which is based on interpretation of the unit's authorizing legislation, supplies the fundamental criteria against which the appropriateness of all planning recommendations, operational decisions, and actions are evaluated. (The authorizing legislation for the national battlefield is reproduced in appendix A.) The purpose of Monocacy National Battlefield is as follows:

- to preserve the breastworks, earthworks, walls, and other defenses and shelters used by the Confederate and Union armies on July 9, 1864, as well as the buildings, roads and outlines of the battlefield

- to commemorate the Battle of Monocacy
- to provide opportunities for visitors to understand and appreciate the significance of the Battle of Monocacy within the full context of the Civil War and American history

Significance

Significance statements define what makes the national battlefield important enough to our cultural heritage to warrant designation as a unit of the national park system. Statements of significance are a tool for setting resource protection priorities and for identifying interpretive themes and appropriate visitor experiences. They help focus efforts and funding on the resources and experiences that matter most. Monocacy National Battlefield is nationally significant as the site of the following:

- The July 9, 1864, battle where a small Union army successfully delayed a larger Confederate army's advance on Washington, D.C., thereby providing sufficient time for Gen. Ulysses S. Grant to send federal reinforcements to the U.S. capital and prevent its capture. This Confederate campaign, its third and final attempt to bring the war to the North, also was designed to divert pressure from Gen. Robert E. Lee's besieged army at Petersburg, Virginia, and to lessen President Abraham Lincoln's chances for reelection.
- Other important events associated with the Civil War, including the 1862 Maryland Campaign and

finding of Gen. Robert E. Lee's Special Order 191 outlining his plan of attack, the 1863 Gettysburg Campaign, and the August 1864 meeting of Generals Grant and Sheridan at the Thomas House to plan the Shenandoah Valley Campaign.

- A national battlefield where visitors can experience a historic landscape, structures, and transportation corridors that have changed little since the Battle of Monocacy. As a result, it offers many opportunities for understanding the evolution of settlement in the region and the Civil War within the broader context of American history.

Primary Interpretive Themes

Interpretive themes define the primary interpretive messages or stories that will be emphasized at Monocacy National Battlefield through exhibits, interpretive talks, brochures, and publications. The themes will help visitors to understand the battle of July 9, 1864. The national battlefield will use the following seven themes as the foundation of its interpretive program:

- The defeat of federal forces at the Battle of Monocacy prevented a successful attack on the U.S. capital by the Army of Northern Virginia during its third and last offensive in the North.
- By virtue of its crossroads location, Monocacy Junction was the site of many important events during the Civil War.
- The Monocacy battlefield landscape is rich with historical and geographic

elements relative to the events and issues of the Civil War in Maryland.

- The Battle of Monocacy, fought in a border state, revealed the divided loyalties of Maryland citizens during the Civil War.
- Confederate Gen. Jubal Early's tactical success at Monocacy ironically resulted in a strategic loss by failing to capture the U.S. capital and by enhancing President Lincoln's popularity, which had been declining, shortly before the presidential election.
- After the Confederate victory at Monocacy, a Union campaign was initiated to bring total destruction upon the Shenandoah Valley, end the war by any means necessary, and gradually force the Confederates back to Petersburg.
- Monocacy National Battlefield, initially commemorated by Civil War veterans in the early 1900s, serves as a focal point for memorializing those who fought in the battle of July 9, 1864.

MANDATES, LAWS, AND OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS

SPECIAL MANDATES AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENTS

Special mandates and administrative commitments refer to park-specific requirements or those that affect several park units. These formal agreements often are established concurrently with the creation of a unit of the national park system or as a result of Congressional action. Monocacy National Battlefield has entered into several administrative commitments, as described in the following paragraphs.

Memorandum of Understanding with the Historic Preservation Training Center

The National Park Service completed a study in December 1994 titled *Development Concept Plan / Environmental Assessment: Relocation of Historic Preservation Training Center, Bush Creek Tract, Monocacy National Battlefield*. This report contained analyses of alternatives for relocating the Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC), a NPS organization dedicated to teaching preservation and project management skills, from C&O Canal National Historical Park property in Williamsport, Maryland, to Monocacy National Battlefield.

The analysis determined that the Gambrill House would be a suitable site for administrative offices and classrooms, but that a different location would be needed for an associated workshop facility and storage area that would need to occupy approximately

20,000 square feet. It also found that the only suitable area on the property to develop such a facility was the top of the hill behind, or generally south of, the Gambrill House. As a result, the three alternatives focused on access to this proposed facility. The preferred alternative recommended a two-lane access road from Ball Road and a paved pathway between the shop facility and the house.

After that *Development Concept Plan* was completed, Monocacy National Battlefield signed a memorandum of understanding with the Historic Preservation Training Center to locate the training center's administrative headquarters in the historic Gambrill House. Under the terms of the agreement, the training center rehabilitated the structure and continues to maintain it. In return, the national battlefield maintains the grounds around the house. For a variety of reasons, the new shop facility was not constructed, and the training center located its workshop in leased space in the city of Frederick. The memorandum of understanding was renewed in autumn 2003 for ten more years.

Lease and Agreement with the State of New Jersey

The National Park Service entered into a lease and agreement with the state of New Jersey in 1997 for protecting, interpreting, and maintaining the 14th New Jersey Monument, which remains under the ownership of that state. Under the terms of this lease, the state of New Jersey provides funding yearly, based on availability, for performing

routine grounds and statue maintenance. Every third year, the state generally provides additional funding to clean and repair the monument.

Memorandum of Understanding with the State of Vermont

The National Park Service entered into a memorandum of understanding with the state of Vermont in 1996 for the preservation and protection of the 10th Vermont Monument, which remains under the state's ownership. Under this agreement, the battlefield provides all maintenance for the monument and surrounding grounds and can conduct law enforcement activities.

Memorandum of Understanding with the Catoctin Center for Regional Studies

In 1998 Monocacy National Battlefield and other surrounding NPS units signed a memorandum of understanding with the Catoctin Center for Regional Studies, housed at Frederick Community College. The Catoctin Center is a collaborative educational project of the National Park Service and Frederick Community College to foster research and study of the history and culture of mid-Maryland and the surrounding region. Under this agreement, the national battlefield works jointly with the Catoctin Center to help the latter achieve its mission; in fact, an employee of the battlefield serves as the NPS liaison with the Center.

SERVICEWIDE LAWS AND POLICIES

In this section, actions are identified that must be taken at Monocacy National Battlefield to comply with federal laws and with the policies of the National Park Service. Many management directives are specified in laws and policies guiding the National Park Service and are therefore not subject to alternative approaches. For example, there are laws and policies about managing environmental quality (such as the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and Executive Order (EO) 11990 "Protection of Wetlands"); laws governing the preservation of cultural resources (such as the National Historic Preservation Act and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act); and laws about providing public services (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act) — to name only a few.

In other words, a general management plan is not needed to decide, for instance, that it is appropriate to protect endangered species, control exotic species, protect archeological sites, conserve artifacts, or provide access for visitors with disabilities. Laws and policies already exist to regulate those and many other things (see appendix B, "Federal Laws, Regulations, and Policies.")

Although attaining some of the conditions set forth in the laws and policies may have been temporarily deferred in the national battlefield because of funding or staffing limitations, the National Park Service will continue to strive to achieve these requirements

with or without a new general management plan.

Some laws and executive orders are applicable solely or primarily to units of the national park system; for example, the 1916 Organic Act, which created the National Park Service, the General Authorities Act of 1970, the act of March 27, 1978, relating to the management of the national park system, and the National Parks Omnibus Management Act (1998). Other laws and executive orders have much broader application, such as the Endangered Species Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and EO 11990, which addresses the protection of wetlands.

The NPS Organic Act (16 USC §1) provides the fundamental management direction for all units of the national park system, as follows:

[P]romote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations. . . by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of said parks, monuments and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

The National Park System General Authorities Act (16 USC §1a–1 et seq.) affirms that while all national park system units remain “distinct in character,” they are “united through their interrelated purposes and

resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage.” The act makes it clear that the NPS Organic Act and other protective mandates apply equally to all units of the system. Further, amendments state that NPS management of park units should not “derogate . . . the purposes and values for which these various areas have been established.”

The National Park Service also has established policies for all units under its stewardship. These are identified and explained in the NPS guidance manual called *Management Policies 2006*. The alternatives considered in this plan incorporate and comply with the provisions of these mandates and policies.

To truly understand the implications of an alternative, it is important to combine the servicewide mandates and policies with the management actions described in an alternative. The actions and conditions prescribed by laws, regulations, and policies most pertinent to the planning and management of the national battlefield are detailed in appendix C.

RELATIONSHIPS OF OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS TO THIS GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Monocacy National Battlefield is in Frederick County, Maryland. Several plans prepared by or under preparation by the county, the state, or other public entities have influenced or will be influenced by this plan, as will some other NPS plans. This section includes brief descriptions of these related plans and their relationship to the battlefield’s *General Management Plan*.

Environmental Assessment: Relocating the Visitor Center

The National Park Service completed an environmental assessment in August 2002 for relocating the existing visitor contact station from the Gambrill Mill. When it opened in 1991, the Gambrill Mill facility was meant to be temporary. The building did not meet many life safety codes, nor did it contain adequate facilities to support safe and efficient national battlefield operations. In addition, the structure is in the 100-year floodplain and has been flooded several times.

The environmental assessment evaluated two action alternatives for relocating Monocacy National Battlefield's visitor contact station and upgrading it to a visitor center. One alternative placed the visitor center in a mid-20th century dairy barn on the Best Farm (identified in the 1996 *Interpretive Prospectus* but demolished in 2005); the preferred alternative placed it in a new building on the north end of the Best Farm on the east side of Route 355. The preferred alternative was selected because it was determined that placing the visitor center in a new building on the north end of the Best Farm would result in fewer impacts on the battlefield landscape and would provide better access to road and utility infrastructure.

Construction of the new visitor center, now complete, and the relocation of some battlefield offices allows consideration of new uses for the Gambrill Mill.

I-270 / U.S. 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study (Section 4(f) Evaluation)

Approximately 2 miles of Interstate 270 pass through Monocacy National Battlefield, bisecting the battlefield. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended, (Public Law [PL] 89-670), 49 USC 303) says that the secretary of transportation

may approve a transportation program or project requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, . . . or . . . historic site only if (1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and (2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, . . . or historic site resulting from the use.

In 2002, the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, and the Maryland State Highway Administration, Maryland Department of Transportation, released the *I-270 / U.S. 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study, Frederick and Montgomery Counties, Maryland: Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation*. The study included several alternatives for widening I-270 through the national battlefield. The alternatives range from constructing one more lane in each direction — for a total of six lanes — (alternatives 3 and 4) to adding two lanes in each direction — for a total of eight lanes (alternative 5). The national battlefield acreage required for the new lanes was initially calculated at 11.74 for alternatives 3 and 4, and up to 22.52 acres for alternative 5.

The document included consideration of three measures for minimizing impacts on the battlefield: steeper slopes, retaining walls, and reduced width of the inside shoulders. These measures would reduce the battlefield acreage required for road construction to a little more than 5 acres under alternatives 3 and 4, and from 0.07 to 2.92 acres for alternative 5. However, reducing the acreage under alternative 5 would require the use of substantial retaining walls averaging 7 feet in height. Other mitigating measures considered since the release of the draft document are shifting the interstate toward the west (away from the most sensitive battlefield areas on the Best and Thomas farms) and constructing a deck or bridge over I-270 to reconnect the two halves of the battlefield. Shifting the interstate also would reduce the acreage required from the national battlefield (also see page 84).

In summer 2004, the Maryland State Highway Administration proposed constructing express toll lanes on I-270. Since these lanes would lie within the footprint involved in alternative 5, additional environmental review was deemed unnecessary. The study has yet to be finalized.

The planning teams for the I-270 project and the general management plan for Monocacy National Battlefield have coordinated their efforts to ensure that the actions proposed in this plan will be coordinated with potential mitigating measures that may be proposed under section 4(f).

Frederick County Comprehensive Plan

The Frederick County Planning Commission revised the county's comprehensive plan in 1998. This plan affords long-range guidance for growth, land use, and development decisions in the county. In the plan, Monocacy National Battlefield's importance as a significant historic resource is acknowledged, but the county's plan does not contain specific mechanisms for preserving it.

The *Frederick County Comprehensive Plan* divides the county into eight planning regions, with boundaries primarily following waterways. As a result, Monocacy National Battlefield falls within three separate regions —

New Market, Frederick, and Urbana. The New Market Region encompasses the small portion of the national battlefield that lies north of Bush Creek on the east side of the Monocacy River. The Best Farm, on the west side of the river, lies within the Frederick Region. Most of the national battlefield lies in the Urbana Region, on the south side of Bush Creek and the Monocacy River.

A plan has been prepared for each of the eight regions. These plans give more details about land use, zoning, community facility needs, and transportation improvements. Of these plans, the recently updated *Urbana Region Plan*, approved in June 2004, has the most direct effect on the national battlefield. It focuses on the development of Urbana, 3 miles south of the battlefield, as a regional community with a 20-year build-out population of approximately 31,200 people. It identifies a future growth area for this community that

may be considered beyond the present 20-year growth area, which would consist of 1,300 acres on the north side of the present growth area. This would place new development adjacent to the rural community of Araby Church and within 1 mile of the battlefield.

With the exception of the Araby Church community, the land surrounding the battlefield is zoned “agricultural.” The Urbana Region Plan supports the preservation of agricultural land between Monocacy National Battlefield and Urbana to protect the national battlefield’s integrity and to provide an open space buffer between Urbana and Frederick. As part of this, the county has initiated the acquisition of easements along the Baker Valley Road corridor.

In conjunction with the county’s comprehensive plan, the *Urbana Region Plan* identifies a transitway alignment along the east side of Interstate Highway 270. This alignment is depicted as traversing the Lewis, Thomas, and Best farms, but the plan recommends further study of the I-270 transitway alignment to determine its feasibility, in part because of its potential impact on the battlefield. In recognition of the national battlefield’s significance, it also indicates that MD 355 should be maintained as a two-lane roadway through Monocacy National Battlefield.

Frederick County Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Plan

In November 2001, Frederick County completed a comprehensive proposal for long-term water and wastewater infrastructure based on growth projections in its 1998 countywide compre-

hensive plan. The first stage of the Frederick County Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Plan (McKinney Wastewater Treatment Plant) includes the construction of a 42-inch water transmission main through the Best Farm on Monocacy National Battlefield, roughly within a preexisting sewer line right-of-way, primarily to serve areas east of the city of Frederick. Construction of this line began in summer 2005.

The plan also contains a long-term (2020–2040) proposal to construct a 36-inch water transmission main along Baker Valley and Araby Church roads, through portions of the Baker and Thomas farms. It would cross the Monocacy River and connect with the 42-inch water line on the Best Farm, adjacent to Monocacy Junction.

Chesapeake Bay Program

The Chesapeake Bay Agreement was signed in 1983 by the governors of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia; the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, representing the federal government. This landmark agreement formalized a regional partnership dedicated to improving the living resources of the Chesapeake Bay — the largest estuary in the United States. Through subsequent agreements, the Chesapeake Bay Program has defined goals and objectives for the future, including improving vital aquatic habitat and water quality for the Bay and its watershed.

The National Park Service became a formal partner in the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) in 1993 through a memorandum of understanding with

the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Through this agreement, the National Park Service committed to furthering the restoration and conservation of the bay both within national battlefield boundaries and in concert with other communities and partners. As an agency whose primary mission is the preservation and conservation of resources, the National Park Service has a leadership role that includes continuing current resource stewardship in support of existing policies and mandates, as well as educating the public and partnering with local groups to meet established CBP goals.

To help meet these watershed objectives and fulfill NPS obligations under these agreements, the national battlefield is dedicated to reducing environmental impacts on its water resources and partnering with local entities. The national battlefield's active agricultural lease program requires permittees to obtain and follow conservation plans and nutrient management plans set out by the Maryland Department of Agriculture's local Soil Conservation District. These plans help to reduce soil erosion and the impacts of fertilizer and pesticide use.

The national battlefield also partners with the Maryland Department of Agriculture in establishing best management practices to reduce agricultural runoff into NPS water resources. Agricultural permittees also follow a strict integrated pest management approach to dealing with pest plants and animals.

National battlefield managers have contributed to a local watershed

advocacy group's publication on the environmental story of the Monocacy River watershed. This periodical is designed to educate the public about the ecological and historical importance of the region's significant water resources. These and other future activities will help demonstrate the national battlefield's continued support in meeting CBP conservation goals.

Monocacy Scenic River Study and Management Plan

The Monocacy River was designated a state scenic river in 1974 upon meeting conditions set out in the Maryland Scenic and Wild Rivers Act of 1968. This designation helps to protect waterways through natural resource inventory and monitoring and by sound land use planning. The National Park Service, through the National Rivers Inventory, identified 52 miles of the river as eligible for designation as a national scenic river, citing significant natural, cultural, and archaeological resources.

The *Monocacy Scenic River Study and Management Plan* (Monocacy Scenic River Local Advisory Board, 1990) contains an evaluation of the river's resources and value, along with recommendations for effective conservation and management of the river and its tributaries. While it is not a binding regulatory document, it serves as a reference for state and local governments to use in protecting these resources. The main objectives for the plan generally involve improving water quality, conserving sensitive riparian habitats, encouraging appropriate land and recreational uses in these areas, providing resource information for local

entities to use in planning, and promoting public awareness of the important values of these water resources.

Some general recommendations in the plan are improving the compatibility between land use and natural areas, increasing the enforcement of environmental laws and regulations regarding waste disposal, and establishing best management practices for agricultural uses. Also recommended are the encouragement of the maintenance and protection of existing forested buffers, the conservation of sensitive habitats and species, and the institution of public awareness programs and resources to further the public's understanding of important water resource issues.

To meet these and other broad recommendations, the national battlefield engages in sound management practices to reduce impacts on water resources. All agricultural permittees are required to obtain conservation plans and nutrient management plans through the Maryland Department of Agriculture's local Soil Conservation District. These plans mandate environmentally safe farming practices to reduce soil erosion, pesticide use, and nutrient use and runoff. Best management practices (in the form of stream fencing and buffers) are used to reduce impacts.

The resource management staff of the national battlefield uses an integrated pest management approach when dealing with pest plant and animal populations. This involves combining chemical, mechanical, and manual methods to control pest populations. Pesticide use is also controlled and

reviewed through the NPS integrated pest management (IPM) system. To ensure correct application method, timing, and appropriate use, the regional IPM coordinator reviews and pre-approves all pesticides before their use is allowed.

Frederick County Bikeways and Trails Plan

Frederick County funded a Monocacy River Greenway study in 1994 to develop a vision for a recreational trail system for the corridor from Walkersville south to the Potomac River. The trail would extend along the Monocacy River, connecting existing county parks, Monocacy National Battlefield, and the C&O Canal National Historical Park. The possibility of connecting to other county parks and the state-owned Monocacy Natural Resource Area also was proposed. Planning for the greenway has not progressed beyond one segment completed in the City of Frederick.

Also proposed in the *Frederick County Bikeways and Trails Plan* (Frederick County Dept. of Planning and Zoning 1999) is a Monocacy River Greenway for bicycle and pedestrian use on the south side of the river through the battlefield. Among other issues, the plan includes "protecting the riparian buffer along the river," and "assembling the right-of-way through easement or fee simple purchase."

A second trail proposed in the bikeways and trails plan would follow the Bush Creek corridor and the CSX railroad tracks for most of its length. Presumably the trail would connect with the pro-

posed Monocacy River Greenway in Monocacy National Battlefield. It would be for recreational use only, but it would accommodate hikers/walkers and equestrians. As with the Monocacy River Greenway, consultation with Frederick County to determine the desirability and impacts of such a greenway trail would be necessary before any development could take place.

Before the greenway concept could be accomplished, actions would have to be taken to comply with EO 11990 (“Protection of Wetlands”), NPS guidelines for wetlands and floodplains, state and federal laws related to endangered species, the Chesapeake Bay Program, and the Maryland Scenic Rivers Act (described under “Consultation and Coordination, Compliance with Specific Laws and Policies”). In addition, actions listed in a section about mitigating measures (p. 85) would have to be carried out to ameliorate the effects of the actions of any alternative of this plan. The Monocacy River Greenway could not be implemented in the national battlefield unless all these requirements were met and continued during the construction and use of the greenway.

Interstate 270 Overlook/ Demonstration Project

The Maryland Highway Administration developed an interpretive overlook on I-270 south of, and abutting, Monocacy National Battlefield. Interpretive panels at a parking area describe the area’s history, and there is a scenic vista of farmlands to the west and the church towers of Frederick to the north. No water or restroom facilities are available.

Planning is underway to construct an interpretive center and restrooms at the overlook. The interpretive center would take advantage of new technologies to make the site self-sustaining and an example of “green” site design. A variety of technologies would provide electricity, heating and cooling, and wastewater cleanup. The superintendent of Monocacy National Battlefield is participating in the planning and design of site facilities to ensure that they will be compatible and complementary with national battlefield values.

PLANNING ISSUES AND CONCERNS

A planning issue is defined here as an opportunity, conflict, or problem regarding the use or management of Monocacy National Battlefield. Members of the general public, NPS staff, and representatives from other agencies and organizations identified a number of planning-related issues through scoping meetings, newsletter responses, and discussions with representatives of other agencies and organizations.

Monocacy has been open to the public only since 1991, with few areas accessible to visitors. Therefore, these issues involved appropriate levels and methods of allowing visitor access to the battlefield while maintaining desired resource conditions, managing the battlefield landscape and associated historic structures, and the level and location of visitor and operational facilities. The alternatives of this plan include strategies for addressing the issues within the context of the national

battlefield's purpose and significance and NPS laws and policies.

Preserving the Battlefield Landscape

The landscape of Monocacy National Battlefield is composed of diverse natural and cultural elements. Its rolling agricultural fields and forests retain many of their 19th century characteristics, but the landscape is threatened by incompatible adjacent development, increased population growth, and the pressures that such growth creates (such as heavy traffic and the need for road widening and additional utilities). A shrinking agricultural base is likely to make farming on the battlefield less economically practicable. Developments can affect the visitor experience at the battlefield by introducing modern visual and auditory intrusions. At issue is finding ways to preserve the landscape and enhance the qualities that make it significant while at the same time minimizing effects on resources from surrounding development.

Another issue is determining how the historic battlefield landscape should be managed. This landscape is the key to understanding how the events of July 9, 1864, unfolded. Little documentation is available regarding the battlefield's 1864 appearance, but existing evidence suggests that most of its major features — the farmsteads, property and fence lines, field configurations, building settings, and circulation patterns — remain relatively intact. Parts of the battlefield landscape have been degraded, however, primarily by the construction of I-270. The highway bisected the battlefield in the mid-20th century, obscuring key viewsheds and property

lines, creating deep borrow pits, and obliterating parts of fields. During scoping for this plan, some people suggested that the National Park Service consider restoring the lost features of the battlefield to help facilitate interpretation. At issue is to what degree the National Park Service should rehabilitate or restore lost features of the battlefield landscape, and for what purposes.

The diverse natural and cultural resources of the national battlefield are in jeopardy from degradation caused by human-constructed features such as I-270, and some natural resource issues are at work that compromise the historic battlefield landscape and disrupt the ecological balance. Overbrowsing by white-tailed deer can alter the historic appearance by forcing farmers to change agricultural practices to those less favorable to the deer. Browsing also can alter regrowth in forested areas, further changing the prominent historic patterns and suppressing the regeneration of native trees.

The proliferation of invasive non-native plant species has introduced monocultures of species that are not congruent with the historic scene and threaten to take over areas that once supported only native plants. In addition, the national battlefield's water quality and aquatic resources are at risk from sedimentation and stream erosion, caused in part by poor agricultural practices and surrounding development. Riparian stream buffers are an effective solution to reduce these impacts, but they must be established in keeping with the historic landscape. There is a need to evaluate ways to improve environmental

conditions in the national battlefield while preserving the historic landscape. In sum, an underlying philosophy is needed to guide the management of these resources and landscapes.

Protecting Important Natural Resource Areas

Monocacy National Battlefield contains significant natural resource areas that require special management efforts. These areas possess considerable resource value aside from their important role in the cultural landscape. The primary management direction for the national battlefield is to protect and preserve the historical values; however, the natural resource areas also require considerable attention because they are important to the region's ecology.

Among the natural resources are forested areas on and around Brooks Hill and Bush Creek and the south end of the Lewis farm. These areas, the largest forested tracts in the national battlefield, offer resource benefits in the form of carbon cycling, locally significant plant communities, and interior forest and wildlife habitat. The presence of forest interior areas and their importance to sensitive forest interior dwelling species has been suggested in national battlefield research conducted by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). The populations of these area-sensitive species have been documented as declining on a regional and national scale. One of these large tracts, a limestone woods area, was identified by the MDNR as containing state-listed rare plants. The Maryland Department of Natural Resources also

identified this site as a conservation priority in the Frederick County area.

Orientation and Visitor Services

Although the national battlefield was opened to the public in 1991, most of the battlefield has remained inaccessible to visitors, and visitor facilities have remained minimal. In addition, substantial physical barriers — such as the Monocacy River, I-270, and CSX Railroad — hinder efficient circulation through the national battlefield and present a challenge for interpreting the battle effectively. A major issue concerns how more of the battlefield can be opened to visitors while preserving its significant resource values.

A final visitor services issue revolves around the appropriate level and kinds of visitor facilities on the national battlefield. Although the cramped, inadequate visitor contact station in the Gambrill Mill has been replaced with a new visitor center, questions remain concerning whether more visitor facilities should be placed in the national battlefield, and if so, where they might be located.

Commemorative Monuments

Five commemorative monuments are in Monocacy National Battlefield at present, three erected by Civil War veterans and two that were established on the battlefield during major anniversaries (50th and 100th). The congressional legislation for the national battlefield allows the placement of monuments on the battlefield by states whose troops fought in the battle. Some interest in erecting new monuments on

the battlefield has been expressed by outside groups. At issue is whether or not more monuments should be placed on the battlefield, and if so, at what locations.

Inadequate Administrative Facilities

As a relatively new area in the national park system, Monocacy National Battlefield has had to work with temporary and inadequate facilities for administrative offices, maintenance appurtenances, and storage. The permanent staff has grown from three people when the national battlefield opened in 1991 to fourteen. National battlefield operations clearly have outgrown their existing facilities, but questions remain about where new ones should be placed.

Historic Structures

Monocacy National Battlefield contains several historically significant houses, most particularly the Gambrill, Best,

Thomas, and Worthington houses. Of these four, the Thomas House has, until 2007, been occupied under a life estate, and the Gambrill House is used by the Historic Preservation Training Center under a long-term agreement with the national battlefield. The Best and Worthington houses, which are empty, require significant interior rehabilitation before they can be occupied. During scoping for this plan, members of the public expressed interest in providing public access into the national battlefield's historic structures. At issue is what should be done with these structures — preserve them as they are or rehabilitate all or parts of them for administrative or public use.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS NOT ADDRESSED IN THIS PLAN

All issues or concerns raised by the public have been addressed in this *General Management Plan*.

(blank)