



APPENDIX **C**

SCOPING SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

CEDAR CREEK AND BELLE GROVE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK



Appendix C

Scoping Summary and Analysis

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

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

Following each interest or concern listed the number in parentheses is the number of times the issues was raised during scoping meetings.

1.0 Interests and Concerns that are Appropriately Addressed by the GMP

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

Cedar Creek Battlefield

- 1.1.1 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.
- 1.1.2 The old subdivision in Middletown is a depression era subdivision and it encompasses the area of final forward Confederate movement.
- 1.1.3 Reenactments can be damaging to the resource, e.g., contemporary percussion caps are almost identical to those used in Civil War.
- 1.1.4 Opinions differ as to whether reenactments should be contained to present locations or expanded.
- 1.1.5 If NPS were not involved in CEBE, SVBF would probably be doing a battlefield preservation plan for the area within the park.

Archeological Resources

- 1.1.6 Archaeological resources and sites.
- 1.1.7 There are Indian mounds within the park.
- 1.1.8 CCBF owns Panthers Cave, a natural area with archaeological resources used by local colleges, and it should be part of the park.
- 1.1.9 CCBF lands include four prehistoric, largely undisturbed sites.
- 1.1.10 Shenandoah River bottoms were probably used as camping grounds by Native Americans.

Road Traces, Earthworks, and Old Valley Turnpike

- 1.1.11 The Valley Pike as an original roadway - its narrow character as it passes through the towns in the northern Valley.
- 1.1.12 Valley Pike has been a major transportation route historically, dating back to prehistory.
- 1.1.13 Importance of towns along the Valley Pike.
- 1.1.14 Towns as gateways, i.e., "string of pearls" along the Valley Pike.
- 1.1.15 Historically, Middletown was a wagon town -- all the stuff is still there.

Park Features that Help Interpret Battles and Deployments

- 1.1.16 The landscape was fundamental to Jackson's 1862 campaign, e.g., the Valley was an avenue of invasion to Washington, DC.
- 1.1.17 Importance of topography and the Shenandoah Valley to the Civil War.
- 1.1.18 The park has important areas such as the infantry contact area and cemetery hill.
- 1.1.19 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.
- 1.1.20 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.
- 1.1.21 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.
- 1.1.22 Monuments within the park.

Geography, Topography and Landscape Features of the Region

- 1.1.23 Important natural and cultural landscapes and their interrelationships. (3)

Cultural Landscapes, Historic Buildings, and Historic Structures

- 1.1.24 Belle Grove is the last surviving example of a plantation and was a focus of the movement in the valley that supported secession.
- 1.1.25 Harmony Hall as an icon of early Valley settlement.
- 1.1.26 The architectural integrity of Belle Grove and Harmony Hall.

Limestone and the Limestone Geologic System that Creates the Region's Waterways

- 1.1.27 Limestone and its importance to agriculture, early settlement and economic development.
- 1.1.28 The Valley's limestone is the source of its fertile soils as well as building material.

Cedar Creek

- 1.1.29 The waterways in the park.
- 1.1.30 Cedar Creek is a high quality stream, and water supplies for Winchester are drawn from the Shenandoah River below Cedar Creek.

Landscapes and Panoramic Views

- 1.1.31 Important views and viewsheds, particularly those that have not changed much since the Civil War.
- 1.1.32 Integrity of the park's landscapes.
- 1.1.33 Landscapes and views.
- 1.1.34 Viewsheds should be one of the criteria for land protection planning.
- 1.1.35 Park viewsheds and landscapes are very important.
- 1.1.36 Landscapes and scenery are important, i.e., views of the Blue Ridge, Massanutten and Allegheny Mountains
- 1.1.37 Identify scenic resources.
- 1.1.38 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.
- 1.1.39 Very hard to see the original landscape, although there are exceptions such as the Heater House.

Natural Resources of the Shenandoah Valley

- 1.1.40 The park has excellent bird habitat.
- 1.1.41 The Valley's natural resources had a major effect on settlement patterns.
- 1.1.42 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.
- 1.1.43 The area has unique flora and fauna, and it is used by Shenandoah University and Lord Fairfax Community College for training natural history students.

Stories – Battle of Cedar Creek and the Civil War

- 1.1.44 Connect the battle of Cedar Creek to the rest of the entire Civil War.
- 1.1.45 Story of the Shenandoah Valley's importance to the Civil War and the significance of the Battle of Cedar Creek.
- 1.1.46 The Civil War, battle of Cedar Creek and their many stories.
- 1.1.47 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.
- 1.1.48 How can we get people to think at the level that Early and Sheridan were thinking, i.e., the bigger scale of the battle?
- 1.1.49 Story of Signal Knob and its importance. (2)
- 1.1.50 Experience of visiting the reenactment and a Civil War landscape.
- 1.1.51 The Hotchkiss maps and Taylor sketches.
- 1.1.52 Entire Heritage District offers opportunity to tell the Civil War story.
- 1.1.53 Cedar Creek should tell the story not told at other battlefield sites or parks, including communities and civilians who experienced the Shenandoah Valley battles.
- 1.1.54 How should CEBE provide a broader interpretation of social history and the Civil War?

- 1.1.55 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.
- 1.1.56 People visiting the valley have images in mind, and they will be drawn to the park to have those images fulfilled.
- 1.1.57 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.
- 1.1.58 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.
- 1.1.59 SVBF's interest is to have visitors experience the Shenandoah Valley through visits to the valley's communities and approximately 30 museums.
- 1.1.60 Need interpretive enclaves outside of the park.

Stories – The Shenandoah Valley as Breadbasket

- 1.1.61 Agriculture and the Valley as a breadbasket. (2)
- 1.1.62 19th century agriculture.

Stories – Native Americans

- 1.1.63 The Native American story is important.
- 1.1.64 Story of the Shenandoah Valley as America's first frontier, with sensitivity given to the Native American perspective.

Stories – Cultural History of the Valley

- 1.1.65 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.
- 1.1.66 The valley's transition from prehistoric to modern times.
- 1.1.67 Scope of history – span from pre-European to Civil War to modern.
- 1.1.68 Interpretation of the valley's early history, Valley Pike history and Civil War history.
- 1.1.69 Whereas the SVBF is focusing on the Civil War, CEBE should provide a window into 200 years of history.
- 1.1.70 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.
- 1.1.71 Pre-Civil War history of the area is important.
- 1.1.72 Interaction between and effect of the natural environment on settlement life.
- 1.1.73 Transportation, commerce and the movement of people - the transitory nature of people moving from the East to the interior USA.
- 1.1.74 Story of Valley Pike's history and importance.
- 1.1.75 Transportation, commerce and the settlement pattern in the Northern Valley.

- 1.1.76 Middletown Heritage Society members want a broader interpretation of the area than the Civil War, e.g., local 18th century iron forge.
- 1.1.77 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.
- 1.1.78 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.
- 1.1.79 People in the valley lived in a "happy state of mediocrity".
- 1.1.80 Belle Grove provides an excellent opportunity to tell the story of the republican style landscape.
- 1.1.81 Settings and stories associated with Belle Grove and Harmony Hall.
- 1.1.82 Belle Grove and plantation life and culture.
- 1.1.83 Fort Bowman (Harmony Hall) and Belle Grove would best tell the colonial stories. (2)
- 1.1.84 Belle Grove can be misunderstood as a presentation similar to those of eastern VA. It was more of a big farm than a plantation.
- 1.1.85 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.
- 1.1.86 The economic world that developed by 1800 would sell very well to the Civil War visitor.
- 1.1.87 Plantation culture, valley settlement, George Washington's relationship to the area, and stories of how the Civil War affected everyday people.
- 1.1.88 The park area may be seen as representing a middle class, with Belle Grove being the exception.
- 1.1.89 Relationships in a plantation society, i.e., free and slave labor.
- 1.1.90 The stories of the Hites, Bowmans, Heaters and other families. (2)
- 1.1.91 West side of Warren County was settled by Germans, which is different than the English dominance in the tidewater area.
- 1.1.92 Long Meadow Farm was large enough to have slaves and was tied somewhat with the culture of eastern Warren County.
- 1.1.93 German heritage remained until the Revolution.
- 1.1.94 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.
- 1.1.95 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.
- 1.1.96 Cannot tell the full story of the area without including the stories of the towns.

Stories - Slavery

- 1.1.97 The African American/slave experience in the Northern Valley is a very important story.

- 1.1.98 Slavery is a complicated issue in the valley. Slaves were used on small farms but they were fewer in number than elsewhere.
- 1.1.99 The area began growing wheat in the 1850s, using slaves.
- 1.1.100 Story of slavery, the plantation community and relationship between slaves and their owners.

1.2 Resource Protection

- 1.2.1 What will be the strategy for protecting the privately-owned the Vermont monument?
- 1.2.2 How can CEBE assist Middletown with its proposed historic preservation ordinance?
- 1.2.3 How will the existing NPS 7-acre property be treated in the GMP?
- 1.2.4 Core area of the Cedar Creek battlefield encompasses approximately 15,000 acres.
- 1.2.5 The GMP must protect vistas and the park's setting, which may be the most important aspect of the area.
- 1.2.6 The value of the area will be diminished exponentially if the landscape becomes cluttered.
- 1.2.7 Different sites have differing carrying capacities. The GMP should cover this.
- 1.2.8 Proposed expansion of I-81 will impact Harmony Hall.
- 1.2.9 Land that key partners have cobbled together now extends from Bowman's Ford to Middletown.
- 1.2.10 There has never been a broad understanding of the area's important resources.
- 1.2.11 Stickley Farm and Cemetery area should be acquisition priorities.
- 1.2.12 Protect Shenandoah River and Cedar Creek.
- 1.2.13 Concerns for the expansion of Chemstone quarry, pollution of Cedar Creek.
- 1.2.14 Preservation of historic houses.
- 1.2.15 Environmental restoration.
- 1.2.16 Possibility of losing the park's viewsheds.
- 1.2.17 Water quality of Cedar Creek.
- 1.2.18 Preservation of scenic resources and living history (e.g. reenactments).
- 1.2.19 Reconstruction of spring house near Heater House.
- 1.2.20 Preservation of Route 11 corridor.
- 1.2.21 Future of significant sites outside park boundary.

1.3 Visitor Use and Experience

- 1.3.1 Will NPS own sufficient contiguous land to enable a meaningful visitor experience?

- 1.3.2 How would CEBE approach the visitor experience with no further land acquisitions?
- 1.3.3 Strasburg would like to see Civil War reenactments south of I-81.
- 1.3.4 What are the NPS management implications of CEBE not having a significant land base?
- 1.3.5 Partners must develop a coordinated interpretive plan for visitors.
- 1.3.6 A visitor center can serve as a starting point for visitors.
- 1.3.7 Visitors should receive information at Belle Grove, and through individual and group touring by vehicles and foot.
- 1.3.8 Favorable view of the cluster concept as depicted in the SVBF plan.
- 1.3.9 Use interpretative themes as an umbrella to connect us.
- 1.3.10 The park's visitor center could be the principal gateway to the Signal Knob Cluster and function as the introduction to the entire region.
- 1.3.11 The park might be more densely interpreted than the Shenandoah Valley Historic District.
- 1.3.12 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.
- 1.3.13 Belle Grove has many visitors who ask about the full range of recreation opportunities in the area.
- 1.3.14 Electronic media should be explored for interpretation.
- 1.3.15 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.
- 1.3.16 Belle Grove Inc. envisions Harmony Hall as another Horne Museum with public access.
- 1.3.17 CEBE is the center of the Shenandoah Valley heritage area. It is the first place you come to and it should be a gateway.
- 1.3.18 Middletown is interested in becoming a better gateway community.
- 1.3.19 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.
- 1.3.20 CEBE is a critical component of the tourism industry, which is very important to the region.
- 1.3.21 Warren County portion of the park is very rural and presents opportunities for a park experience.
- 1.3.22 Marketing will help the visitor understand the difference between the heritage area and the park.
- 1.3.23 Worst case scenario for the park will be if the public only sees it as the Battle of Cedar Creek.
- 1.3.24 Middletown Heritage Society created in 1996 to develop a walking tour.
- 1.3.25 Middletown should be a gateway community to the park.
- 1.3.26 Would like to see a visitor center in Middletown.

- 1.3.27 Permanent small scale reenactment activities, e.g., a settler's wagon, cannon/musket demonstration, fife-and-drum unit, bring history to life and tend too draw return visitors.
 - 1.3.28 Possible permanent host to seasonal arts/crafts/theme festivals/events, in conjunction with nearby towns/communities.
 - 1.3.29 Selected leasing of non-conflicting hunting areas; especially for safe low-noise/impact bow, shotgun and muzzle-loading.
 - 1.3.30 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.
 - 1.3.31 State tourism surveys suggest public's interest in the big broad context of history.
 - 1.3.32 Need to interpret what has been preserved as well as other things peripheral to it.
 - 1.3.33 Differing perspectives among partners on military versus cultural themes. However, most visitors initially will come because it is a Civil War site.
 - 1.3.34 Branding the park as a broader social history park would distinguish it from the Historic District.
 - 1.3.35 Many battlefield park visitors are attracted to the battle areas and blood-soaked ground, and they pay less attention to period structures.
 - 1.3.36 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.
 - 1.3.37 Traffic issue on Route 11 and all roads in park during reenactments.
 - 1.3.38 Charm of small towns and rural roads will be lost if widened to accommodate visitors.
 - 1.3.39 Positive economic stimulus – what is attraction of the park?
 - 1.3.40 How do we offer access, transportation, history, information, entertainment and education to the public?
 - 1.3.41 Future use of Keister Tract.
 - 1.3.42 How to preserve visitor experience in face of I-81 expansion and quarry expansion?
 - 1.3.43 Public access to Cedar Creek.
 - 1.3.44 Need to balance historical interpretation – prehistoric through post Civil War.
 - 1.3.45 Signage should include historical markers, directions to important sites, and audio tapes for driving tours.
- 1.4 Partnerships and Organizational Effectiveness**
- 1.4.1 What is CEBE Advisory Commission's long-term role?
 - 1.4.2 How can a partnership concept be used to manage the park?
 - 1.4.3 How can NPS develop a shared vision of the park with its partners?

- 1.4.4 Should NPS partners be encouraged to adopt NPS general management policies?
- 1.4.5 How will CEBE work with local governments?
- 1.4.6 Will the GMP consider different partnership alternatives?
- 1.4.7 The partnership must be seamless at the visitor center where the overview story is presented.
- 1.4.8 Key partners interested in a potential "hub-and-spoke" management relationship with NPS.
- 1.4.9 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.
- 1.4.10 What long-term role will the CEBE Advisory Commission have?
- 1.4.11 Can CEBE and its partners agree on a common set of guiding principles?
- 1.4.12 We should encourage consistency among partners and NPS in their policies and permissible activities.
- 1.4.13 Park partners must look at overlap of mutual interests.
- 1.4.14 Partners must coordinate efforts but not be involved in managing one another's properties.
- 1.4.15 We need a management entity or representative body to handle management of mutual interests.
- 1.4.16 We must look at other NPS partnership models when developing alternatives.
- 1.4.17 NPS should be the anchor that ties partners and lands together.
- 1.4.18 NPS should be more focused on coordination, technical and financial support than a traditional operation.
- 1.4.19 NPS should be a coordinator among partners.
- 1.4.20 The park should be a hybrid between traditional and non-traditional NPS operations.
- 1.4.21 CEBE partners should not share individual property maintenance and management, but should share land protection, scheduling of events, interpretation, and shared infrastructure.
- 1.4.22 A visitor center might be multi-use and shared among the partners.
- 1.4.23 It is important that partners have the financial resources to sustain their own operations.
- 1.4.24 How to get "buy-in" of the GMP among the various partners and stakeholders? Possibly there should be a legal document.
- 1.4.25 One possible management entity may be a foundation with a board and voting members including the key partners.
- 1.4.26 There must be a management entity for the park. SVBF could serve as an example.
- 1.4.27 Local governments must buy-in to whatever management entity is created for the park.
- 1.4.28 To what extent are we talking about managing each other's operations or are we talking about managing our own operations and collaborating?

- 1.4.29 GMP should have general principles for how the stakeholders will collaborate.
- 1.4.30 Cooperative agreements could be instruments for the implementation of the GMP.
- 1.4.31 For partners to cede some level of autonomy, there would have to be something that they get back in return.
- 1.4.32 An important aspect of the partnership will be private landowners within the park. What voice will they have in creating the GMP?
- 1.4.33 What does "park community" mean in CEBE's legislation?
- 1.4.34 There are partners other than the "The Cornerstones." How do we involvement them?
- 1.4.35 We are fortunate that the partners are currently self-sufficient.
- 1.4.36 One way to protect landscapes is through partnerships.
- 1.4.37 One way to engage local governments is to show them that the park can bring revenue.
- 1.4.38 Think of partners as "overlapping spheres".
- 1.4.39 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.
- 1.4.40 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.
- 1.4.41 We need to help the visitor understand the roles of the various partners.
- 1.4.42 Management and operations - what activities will we do together? Education and interpretation, sharing staff and volunteers, security and law enforcement, ticketing, tours.
- 1.4.43 Certain partners may have the lead on certain issues, but not on others. We will have niches.
- 1.4.44 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?
- 1.4.45 The mechanism for decision-making must be in the GMP.
- 1.4.46 Will the management entity be advisory? What degree of autonomy will each partner retain?
- 1.4.47 Partners to have cooperative agreements with NPS to formalize their participation in the management entity.
- 1.4.48 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.
- 1.4.49 Key issues would be run through the management entity.
- 1.4.50 Do partners have responsibility to each other or just to NPS?
- 1.4.51 Would the management entity be staffed?
- 1.4.52 How will partnership conflicts be resolved?

- 1.4.53 Partners to have a limited and voluntary role outside their properties.
- 1.4.54 The management entity will be a forum or congress for decision-making.
- 1.4.55 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?
- 1.4.56 NPS operation should fall somewhere between a traditional operation and a strict coordination role. Partners are interested in a quasi-traditional role for NPS.
- 1.4.57 Should a "coordinator-only" role be an alternative in the GMP?
- 1.4.58 Belle Grove is interested in NPS conducting interpretive programs.
- 1.4.59 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.
- 1.4.60 Need a vision allowing NPS to assume a reasonable level of ownership and staffing.
- 1.4.61 The GMP should not give the impression that the park sprang from the SVBHD Plan.
- 1.4.62 It is important that the GMP resolve partner responsibilities, working relationships with NPS, and how partner issues will be resolved.
- 1.4.63 Cooperative agreements between NPS and its partners are important and should be informed by the GMP.
- 1.4.64 Cooperative agreements between NPS and its partners are important and should be informed by the GMP.
- 1.4.65 Big challenge at the park is to educate landowners regarding the difference between SVBF and NPS.
- 1.4.66 SVBF has had to work to explain difference between the heritage district and the park.
- 1.4.67 SVBF has started work on a cluster plan for the Strasburg area, likely to be called the Signal Hill Cluster group.
- 1.4.68 There is an opportunity at Cedar Creek to engage partners in preservation activities.
- 1.4.69 A matrix might be used to show a management framework that provides the basis for seeking and allocating funds.
- 1.4.70 Belle Grove Inc. is accustomed to working with many partners.
- 1.4.71 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.
- 1.4.72 The National Trust for Historic Preservation strongly supports its partnership with the NPS in managing the park.
- 1.4.73 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.
- 1.4.74 There was a lot of energy and anticipation when CEBE was created, but not much has happened and the energy needs to be rejuvenated.

- 1.4.75 Frederick County officials will not take actions to support the park unless they feel they have public support.
- 1.4.76 Shenandoah University can potentially provide volunteers, interns, educational programs, student involvement, and research projects.
- 1.4.77 Lord Fairfax Community College can provide support and facilities for the GMP planning effort.
- 1.4.78 The GMP should address student internships.
- 1.4.79 Lord Fairfax Community College can integrate park needs into its curriculum.
- 1.4.80 How can Lord Fairfax Community College use the park as a laboratory for land use and preservation studies?
- 1.4.81 Creation of a park "sustainability" subcommittee in conjunction with Shenandoah University's History/Tourism program and Byrd School.
- 1.4.82 CCBF has been acting as a land trust. It could operate as a "friend of the park" to buy land when NPS cannot.
- 1.4.83 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.
- 1.4.84 CCBF has many supporters who are diverse but not particularly wealthy.
- 1.4.85 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.
- 1.4.85 Virginia Canoe Association very interested in preserving Cedar Creek as a canoe route.
- 1.4.86 UK Civil War Roundtable is a consistent supporter of the CCBF.
- 1.4.87 More things bind the CEBE partners than separate them. They don't compete for the same sources of money.
- 1.4.88 Belle Grove is likely to remain as an autonomous entity but CCBF could become a friends group for the park.
- 1.4.89 Local colleges and universities can help educate people about the park.
- 1.4.90 An interdisciplinary masters degree program should be created, involving park management, history and education.
- 1.4.91 Coordination by NPS with towns and counties.
- 1.4.92 Communication among NPS, local residents and communities.
- 1.4.93 Time it takes for NPS plan – by 2008 will there be anything left?
- 1.4.94 Continuing communication among stakeholders and the park.
- 1.4.95 NPS voice in local government to influence growth and development, and to protect viewscapes.
- 1.4.96 Coordinated visitor services with regional visitor services partners.

1.5 Park Operations and Facilities

- 1.5.1 How will the GMP address the need for a park visitor center?

- 1.5.2 Interest in developing trails connecting Keister Park with Signal Knob, the National Forest and Belle Grove.
- 1.5.3 NPS partners are interested in a CEBE visitor center.
- 1.5.4 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.
- 1.5.5 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.
- 1.5.6 Belle Grove is seeking help from NPS in interpreting natural resources.
- 1.5.7 NPS should provide consistency for trails throughout the park.
- 1.5.8 What will be NPS policy on trail maintenance?
- 1.5.9 Will there be recreational non-interpretive trails, e.g., at the Keister property?
- 1.5.10 We need to provide access to the park for the mobility impaired.
- 1.5.11 A park visitor center should be in a central location.
- 1.5.12 The visitor center should have a panoramic view of the battlefield and park.
- 1.5.13 Are there existing facilities that could be used for the visitor center?
- 1.5.14 NPS should own visitor center and enough land to be a presence.
- 1.5.15 Visitor center issues: hub of park, staffing, potential political concerns about its location and funding sources.
- 1.5.16 NPS needs a central location and high visibility in the area.
- 1.5.17 The GMP does not need to identify a specific site for the visitor center.
- 1.5.18 There is an interest in where the visitor center will be located.
- 1.5.19 Local partners should have a strong say in where and how the visitor center will be built.
- 1.5.20 The visitor center for the "Signal Hill" cluster will likely be within the park.
- 1.5.21 "Points of visitor contact" in the CEBE legislation is assumed to mean visitor center.
- 1.5.22 There is a need for visitor wayfinding from Route 11.
- 1.5.23 Belle Grove's Overseer's Cottage is not suitable as a visitor center site.
- 1.5.24 If the park is to have a trail system, it should be located along original road beds.
- 1.5.25 Shenandoah County would like the GMP process to incorporate the County's plan for Keister Park.
- 1.5.26 Although it could probably not sell the property to NPS, Shenandoah County would consider NPS taking over the management of Keister Park.
- 1.5.27 Middletown Town Council would like to see an NPS visitor center in or near Middletown.
- 1.5.28 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.

- 1.5.29 The visitor center should not be at Belle Grove because it would focus the experience too much on the Belle Grove story.
- 1.5.30 Middletown needs to update its infrastructure and accommodate some growth if it is to be vibrant and have an economic base.
- 1.5.31 The old Middletown School building would have been a good orientation site.
- 1.5.31 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.
- 1.5.32 What are the research needs for the park?
- 1.5.33 Wireless internet capability (WIFI) should be provided throughout the park for interactive sharing of information with visitors.
- 1.5.34 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.
- 1.5.35 CCBF has done a second reenactment in summer 2006 to generate cash, but it has been a drain on volunteers.
- 1.5.36 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.
- 1.5.37 Establishment of park headquarters (role, size, location, and mission).
- 1.5.38 Address alternative transportation.
- 1.5.39 Transportation/buses on narrow unpaved roads.
- 1.5.40 No parking at Ranseur Monument.
- 1.5.41 Location of visitors center.
- 1.5.42 Road problems – too small for traffic, paving, maintenance – park traffic versus commuter/local traffic.
- 1.5.43 Traffic issues with tourists (buses).
- 1.5.44 Public outreach and communications.
- 1.5.45 Visitor center – will there be one?
- 1.5.46 Future hunting and fishing in the park.
- 1.5.47 Future road changes in the park.
- 1.5.48 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

- 1.6.1 How will NPS approach scenic easements outside the park?
- 1.6.2 Should the GMP include a land protection plan?
- 1.6.3 How will CEBC address resource protection in the context of encroaching development?
- 1.6.4 Should the GMP prescribe a general phasing plan tied to future land protection?
- 1.6.5 How will CEBC deal with the potential impacts of an I-81 expansion?

- 1.6.6 What will be the framework for decision-making related to land protection?
- 1.6.7 How will the CEBE Advisory Commission address lands outside the CEBE boundary?
- 1.6.8 How should CEBE work with developers to minimize negative impacts on the park?
- 1.6.9 Should CEBE work directly with the Town of Strasburg regarding their growth policies?
- 1.6.10 Local communities do not necessarily see the need to preserve more land in that Belle Grove and Cedar Creek Foundation already have substantial holdings.
- 1.6.11 NPS may have to acquire additional land to preserve and interpret the area's history.
- 1.6.12 NPS should purchase lands in the park.
- 1.6.13 NPS should be a major player in the preservation of land.
- 1.6.14 Private land can be protected through easements and zoning.
- 1.6.15 We must make sure that the rights of private property owners are respected, particularly with regard to park visitors.
- 1.6.16 Landscapes and views are influenced by forces within and outside the park.
- 1.6.17 Proposed expansion of I-81 may take 320 acres within the authorized park boundaries.
- 1.6.18 Land protection must be done now and should be a major issue in the GMP.
- 1.6.19 Need to distinguish between public and private interests in the park.
- 1.6.20 Land protection is critically important.
- 1.6.21 Some people believe that land protection is more important than the visitor center.
- 1.6.22 Land protection is critically important and it should be funded to its fullest extent.
- 1.6.23 All involved in the GMP planning process should address landowner concerns, including those of the partners and private property owners in the park.
- 1.6.24 SVBF management plan calls for building relationships with landowners.
- 1.6.25 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.
- 1.6.26 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.
- 1.6.27 It would probably be difficult to change CEBE boundaries because of political obstacles, the possible exception being Warren County.
- 1.6.28 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.

- 1.6.29 More land is being preserved in the Cedar Creek area than elsewhere in the heritage area.
- 1.6.30 Time has come for SVBF to become more creative with limited funding, e.g., exploring purchase and resale with conservation easements.
- 1.6.31 SVBF has not thought much about using limited development techniques; might be hard for the SVBF board and the public to accept.
- 1.6.32 Private property rights interests have indicated concerns that the SVBF is putting pressure on local governments to adopt regulations to restrict private property rights.
- 1.6.33 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.
- 1.6.34 Shenandoah County is now working on acquiring other properties for park purposes.
- 1.6.35 Land protection is critically important.
- 1.6.36 Conservation easements should be used more aggressively, with assistance of Piedmont Environmental Council and the Potomac Conservancy.
- 1.6.37 Connecting protected land along US 11 is critical, e.g., Harmony Hall should be connected with Belle Grove to create a more cohesive park.
- 1.6.38 NPS and its partners must get land conservation groups involved in the park.
- 1.6.39 NPS needed to start acquiring land 15 years ago. It will have problems acquiring land today.
- 1.6.40 Housing developments will be the biggest threat in terms of changing the area's landscape and culture.
- 1.6.41 Perhaps Middletown could use annexation to bring the park into town to provide better development controls, e.g., through a historic protection ordinance.
- 1.6.42 Land protection is very important, i.e., the battlefield should not be developed.
- 1.6.43 Middletown Town Council wants to work with private landowners to promote land protection, with assistance from NPS.
- 1.6.44 NPS should consider conservation easements as a land protection tool.
- 1.6.45 Middletown concerned about the expansion of I-81 and the Chemstone quarry.
- 1.6.46 Land protection is very important. We will not have a viable park without an appropriate land base. Can towns and counties help?
- 1.6.47 Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors supports the use of conservation easements as a means of controlling growth.
- 1.6.48 Shenandoah County Board of Supervisors is concerned about land protection.
- 1.6.49 Concern for encroaching development, especially in the Strasburg area.
- 1.6.50 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.

- 1.6.51 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.
- 1.6.52 Frederick County government and its regulations are sensitive to property rights issues.
- 1.6.53 Frederick County recently established an authority to work on conservation easements.
- 1.6.54 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.
- 1.6.55 Frederick County's rural-by-right provisions allow 1 dwelling/5 acres, with clustering at the same density and 40% open space set aside.
- 1.6.56 What is happening on the periphery of the park poses the greatest impediment to understanding what is important and significant about the park.
- 1.6.57 The park is already compromised by I-81.
- 1.6.58 The nearby "mountainscapes" are already protected by federal ownership.
- 1.6.59 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.
- 1.6.60 Warren County should consider working with landowners along Bowmans Mill Road and Long Meadow Road, and rezone for preservation.
- 1.6.61 There has been a lot of real estate speculation in Middletown in recent years, but recently it has cooled off.
- 1.6.62 Middletown working on a "traditional neighborhood design" option for new development, e.g., with grid design and mixed housing.
- 1.6.63 Strasburg needs to develop a new vision for its growth, considering an urban growth boundary.
- 1.6.64 I-81 is often viewed as a negative but it can also be viewed as an economic benefit.
- 1.6.65 Land protection is critically important.
- 1.6.66 We must protect enough land for interpretation, and we can work with developers if necessary.
- 1.6.67 The GMP must address a coordinated approach for dealing with external threats and land protection issues.
- 1.6.68 I-81 often viewed as negative but it can also be viewed as a potential revenue stream.
- 1.6.69 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.
- 1.6.70 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.
- 1.6.71 Need conservation easements on lands within the park's viewsheds.
- 1.6.72 Working relationships need to be established with landowners and developers to plant vegetation screens and use earth tones in building materials.

- 1.6.73 Currently there is no vehicle in place for communities to inform and educate developers regarding the resources on their properties.
- 1.6.74 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.
- 1.6.75 Land protection is of paramount importance.
- 1.6.76 Growth and development - impact on park.
- 1.6.77 Concern for potential restrictions on landowners within park.
- 1.6.78 Historical conservation easements.
- 1.6.79 Protecting viewsheds and improving buffers.
- 1.6.80 Coordination between NPS and local government.
- 1.6.81 Land protection efforts undertaken by local governments.
- 1.6.82 How much of CCBF's lands will be accessible to the public?
- 1.6.83 Growth and development impacts on the park.
- 1.6.84 Balance between public value and private property rights.
- 1.6.85 Preservation of natural resources and viewsheds.
- 1.6.86 Land acquisition – concern for potential condemnation by NPS.
- 1.6.87 Do property owners have a voice in park?
- 1.6.88 Boundary adjustments – concern about property rights.
- 1.6.89 Local governments need guidance on development issues.
- 1.6.90 Allowance for continued current uses.
- 1.6.91 Communication needed with park private landowners and homeowners associations.
- 1.6.92 Landowners' rights – restrictions – passing to inheritance (children) – farming.
- 1.6.93 Input from landowners – how were boundaries drawn?
- 1.6.94 Maintaining scenic views/improving current viewshed challenges.
- 1.6.95 Effect of possible quarry rezoning on the park.
- 1.6.96 How will park affect private property and owners?
- 1.6.97 Maintain agrarian community.
- 1.6.98 What's going to happen to property adjacent to the Park?
- 1.6.99 Enforcement of viewshed pollution on adjacent properties.
- 1.6.100 Protection of scenic resources outside of park boundaries.
- 1.6.101 Future of private lands in park.
- 1.6.102 Building regulations on private lands in the park?

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

- 2.1 How will CEBE and its partners manage visitors fees?
- 2.2 Can NPS be legally bound to a voting board?
- 2.3 Can the Park Advisory Commission have a long-term role in managing the park?
- 2.4 The GMP and planning process need to stick to a broad vision. Then the partners and other stakeholders contribute resources toward the vision.
- 2.5 Will management entity meetings be open to the public?
- 2.6 More NPS funding is likely if NPS owns more land, which in turn translates to more ability to assist partners.
- 2.7 What NPS funds will be available for use by partners?
- 2.8 There is an understanding of the strong correlation between having a land base and NPS funding.
- 2.9 SVBF is interested in owning land and having NPS manage it for them. Shenandoah County may be interested in this as well.
- 2.10 How will NPS and key partners affect private landowners?
- 2.11 Can NPS rangers work with partners on law enforcement matters?
- 2.12 NPS current funding realities must be incorporated into the planning process.
- 2.13 We need various contingencies for potential park funding levels.
- 2.14 Can NPS accept donations of land or money?
- 2.15 Will there be adequate federal funding for the park?
- 2.16 Can NPS buy land outside of its boundary?
- 2.17 The results of the land protection plan will greatly impact funding needs.
- 2.18 How and why were park boundaries decided, and are they permanent?

3.0 Interests and Concerns that should be Addressed in Implementation Plans

- 3.1 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.
- 3.2 Interpreting troop movements and military history is important but we must be careful not to clutter the landscape with signs, perhaps using technology.
- 3.3 Some places will require a live interpreter so that tours can be tailored to the audience.
- 3.4 Partners should coordinate hours of use and events.
- 3.5 The park should have its own unique "branding" with consistent signage.
- 3.6 "A Partnership Park" should be a byline in all marketing materials. (2)
- 3.7 Partners can collaborate on training staff to give a consistent message.

- 3.8 How to integrate partnership with NPS policies (e.g., what to do when NPS policies differ from partner policies)? For example, hunting.
- 3.9 How should different partners positions be handled, e.g., with respect to hunting policies?
- 3.10 Hunting policy on NPS and partner lands is a huge issue.
- 3.11 A possible interim solution for the visitor center would be Lord Fairfax College.
- 3.12 Need to obtain a commitment for staffing the park at the program level.
- 3.13 Shenandoah County would like the visitor center. The only visitor center it has now is in New Market, run by the Shenandoah Valley travel organization.

4.0 Interests and Concerns that are Beyond the Scope of the GMP or Future Implementation Plans

- 4.1 How will CEBE address some negative community attitudes towards NPS?
- 4.2 What will be the sources of NPS funding for future land acquisitions? (3)
- 4.3 Adequacy of future funding for key partners.
- 4.4 Potential new key partners might be added over time.
- 4.5 What if other organizations (i.e., a land trust) protect land within the park. Are they eligible to become key partners?
- 4.6 Public safety/traffic issues/control of truck traffic on Route 11.
- 4.7 Key partners as well as Shenandoah County and Middletown have taken the position of finding "reasonable solutions" for an expanded I-81.
- 4.8 Chemstone has proffered to give Belle Grove the original mill.
- 4.9 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.
- 4.10 Belle Grove is interested in acquiring public water from Middletown.
- 4.11 Middletown has a state-recognized historic district and is developing its own historic district ordinance.
- 4.12 Frederick County has done a lot of work to protect Civil War sites.
- 4.13 Virginia tax credits for conservation easements are critically important.
- 4.14 Tax incentives should be offered to conservation easements placed on battlefield lands.
- 4.15 How many reenactments should occur yearly?