

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

Cari Goetcheus, Assistant Professor

Department of Planning & Landscape Architecture, Clemson University

June 26, 2006

Introduction

The Department of Defense manages a variety of National Historic Landmarks and National Register of Historic Places designated and eligible historic buildings, archeological sites and historic districts that reveal the critical role it has played in United States expansion, settlement, development and continued protection of its soil and people. Yet, even with the cultural resources that it currently protects, only a portion of that story is being revealed; cultural landscapes can assist in telling the rest of the story.

Encompassed within the same legal mechanisms that provide direction for historic buildings and archeological resource conservation (i.e. 1935 Historic Sites Act, 1964 National Historic Preservation Act, etc.), since the early 1980s there has been a growing recognition of and appreciation for cultural landscapes within the field of historic preservation. As the agency that has expanded the discussion and philosophy of cultural landscapes the furthest, as well as defined their standards and guidelines, the National Park Service (NPS) *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* defines cultural landscapes as "a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values."¹

The NPS recognizes four cultural landscape categories, which are not mutually exclusive: *historic designed landscapes*, *historic vernacular landscapes*, *historic sites*, and *ethnographic landscapes*. These categories are helpful in distinguishing the values that make landscapes cultural resources and in determining how they should be treated, managed, and interpreted.

Historic designed landscapes are landscapes significant as a design or work of art; was consciously designed and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturist to a design principle, or by an owner or other amateur according to a recognized style or tradition; has a historical association with a significant person, trend, or movement in landscape gardening or architecture, or a significant relationship to the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Examples include The White House and its grounds, military bases that have officers quarters encircling parade grounds, the many city and county parks attributed to the design of Frederick Law Olmsted or the designed Blue Ridge Parkway.

Historic vernacular landscapes are landscapes whose use, construction, or physical layout reflects endemic traditions, customs, beliefs, or values; in which the expression of cultural values, social behavior, and individual actions over time is manifested in physical features and materials and their interrelationships, including patterns of spatial organization, land use, circulation, vegetation, structures, and objects; in which the physical, biological and cultural features reflect the customs and everyday lives of people. Vernacular landscapes are found in large rural areas and small suburban and urban districts. Agricultural areas, homesteads, fishing villages and mining districts are examples.

Historic sites are significant for their associations with important events, activities, and persons. Battlefields and presidential homes are prominent examples. At these areas, existing features and conditions are defined and interpreted primarily in terms of what happened there at particular times in the past.

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

Ethnographic landscapes are associated with contemporary groups and typically are used or valued in traditional ways. In the expansive Alaska parks, Native Alaskans hunt, fish, trap, and gather and imbue features with spiritual meanings. Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve illustrates the strong interrelationship between the dynamic natural system of the Mississippi Delta region and several cultural groups through many generations. Numerous cultural centers maintain ties to distinctive, long-established groups with ethnic identities.

As noted earlier, these types are not exclusive; it is very common for one cultural landscape type to be predominant, and associated with another subordinate cultural landscape type (s). For example, it is possible that within a 300 acre ranch (vernacular landscape), there is a 2 acre formal garden surrounding a residence (designed landscape), and that the entire ranch is located on the original lands of a Native American group (ethnographic landscape).

Essentially, a cultural landscape is a tapestry upon which other cultural resources, such as historic buildings or archeological sites reside. The tapestry is made of layers of information that all overlap; natural factors such as topography, hydrology, etc. are mixed with human factors such as past land uses and built/removed structures, etc. Each of these layers of information may remain in whole or only in part. The goal in understanding a cultural landscape is to tease out each layer of information and see what it reveals.

Similar to a building which can have pieces added or removed over time and the residual of those changes can be seen and understood, the same is true for a landscape. Cultural landscapes record land use change over time – if a new building is constructed forcing a path to change course, the outline of the former path remains; or if a lake is constructed then the dam removed, the impact of the former shoreline can still be seen. In addition to these static physical remnants that are layered over time, landscapes are composed of dynamic elements - rivers flow creating and cutting off channels over time; trees and shrubs grow and die leaving their mark which can be then be studied and understood.

Why would we want to study, understand and protect cultural landscapes? Because the physical remains of events that occurred in the landscape complete gaps in history that can not be understood solely from individual historic buildings or archeological sites. In many cases significant historic events happened in the landscape, such as battles, military training on parade grounds, food production on farmsteads within military bases and demonstrations in parks. As such, it is critical to protect these varied cultural landscapes such that the entire context of a historic event is remembered into the future, ultimately tying public history to the Department of Defense.

Evolution of Cultural Landscape Principles and National Register Guidance

Although study of historic landscapes, gardens and landscape archeology began in the NPS as early as the 1920s, NPS exploration of cultural landscapes intensified with a study of rural historic districts in 1984.ⁱⁱ Since then, several overarching guidance documents have been produced that offer a basic understanding of cultural landscape concepts including *Preservation Brief No. 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*.

Even though several different programs exist in the NPS to address cultural landscapesⁱⁱⁱ, the National Register of Historic Places program has played a key role by providing specific guidance on how to nominate cultural landscapes to the National Register. National Register Bulletins that can assist cultural landscape research directions and nomination creation include:

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes; Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes; Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America's Historic Battlefields; Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Cemeteries and Burial Places; Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering Historic Mining Properties; Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years; and Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties.

Over the past 25 years, the National Register has matured in its ability to provide assistance to more comprehensively incorporate cultural landscape information into nominations. When one looks to early National Register nominations there is an emphasis on documentation of the building, but rarely an adequate description of the relationship of that building to its site, its landscape context or any unique details of a designed or vernacular landscape. In most cases, if a landscape is mentioned it refers to a formally designed garden or landscape directly adjacent to the building. This comment is not to fault the nomination preparers of those times, but to reinforce that it is crucial in understanding the “whole story” that nomination preparers incorporate as much information as possible into each nomination form (i.e. archeological, architectural, landscape information).

Cultural landscapes are typically nominated to the National Register as either sites or in whole or part of a historic district. Additionally, the unique qualities of many vernacular landscapes have been identified via Rural Historic Districts. Examples of rural historic districts that have been successfully nominated to the National Register include tobacco farm settlements in Kentucky and North Carolina, historic farm valleys in western Virginia, and cattle ranches in the West.

National Register guidelines provide the framework and criteria for determining significance, integrity, boundaries, and contributing and non-contributing resources. To be eligible for the National Register a historic landscape must possess the quality of significance in American history, architecture (interpreted in the broadest sense to include landscape architecture and planning), archeology, engineering, and culture and integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

- A. be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Significance is determined by relating a landscape's history and existing characteristics and features to its historic context. The features, materials, patterns, and relationships that contribute to its historical significance must be present and have integrity. Because of the layers of information that overlap, it is common for cultural landscapes to have multiple periods of significance in whole or for individual parts.

The National Register criteria recognize seven aspects, or qualities, which, in various combinations, define integrity. Historic location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association must be considered in determining whether a landscape retains enough of its

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

important features to convey its historically significant appearance or associations. Landscapes have unique attributes that often complicate the evaluation of integrity, but the degree to which the overall landscape and its significant features are present today must be evaluated. In general, the researcher should ask the following questions when evaluating integrity: 1) To what degree does the landscape convey its historic character? 2) To what degree has the original fabric been retained? 3) Are changes to the landscape irrevocable or can they be corrected so that the property retains integrity?

The integrity of a cultural landscape is judged by the degree to which the characteristics that define its historical significance are present. Because some aspects such as vegetation and land use change over time, integrity also depends on how evident the general character of the historic period is and the degree to which incompatible elements are reversible. With some vernacular and ethnographic landscapes, change itself is a significant factor and must be considered in assessing their integrity. For example, in updating to current agricultural practices, how does that change impact the historic land patterns, hedgerows and boundaries of a vernacular farming landscape? Or how does continued collecting of specimens for a religious ceremony impact an ethnographic landscape?

In a designed landscape, a specific feature or area may survive in better condition than other equally important features or areas. In this case, an assessment of integrity should focus on the role of the individual feature in the overall historic design and the degree to which it contributes to the integrity of the design. In a similar way, as vegetation matures, the change in tree canopy, scale, and massing may affect the overall character of the landscape. It is important to consider how such changes affect the landscape as a whole and the degree to which they impact or obscure it.

Finally, within the existing National Register framework and terminology, it can be difficult to identify all cultural landscape contributing resources. As defined by the National Register, a contributing resource is a building, site, structure, or object that adds to the historic significance of a property. For example, a building or structure can be classified as an independent cultural resource by the National Register and defined as either a “contributing resource” or “non-contributing resource,” depending upon whether or not it adds to the historic significance of the landscape. However, the term “contributing resource” cannot be substituted for other landscape features that are not considered to be independent cultural resources by the National Register (i.e. vegetation and spatial organization). In some cases, those landscape features may be the most critical contributing feature of a cultural landscape, yet it can not be identified as contributing within the current National Register nomination process.

Cultural Landscape Inventory and Evaluation Process

Within the publications noted above, the National Park Service has defined a process to inventory, analyze, and evaluate the significance of cultural landscapes, as well as suggest appropriate methods for their treatment and management.

The first step in the process is to undertake ***historical research***. The intent of the research is to get a broad understanding of the context of the cultural landscape, begin to define the historic significance of the site whether international, national, regional, or local, and identify specific historic landscape features. The research entails studying both natural resources and processes (topography, hydrology, vegetation, etc.), as well as the layers of historic events and land use changes that have occurred on the site over time. Site specific research typically references plat maps, land surveys, illustrated atlases, insurance maps, postcards, pictures, paintings, engravings, photographs, journals, diaries, newspapers and similar sources.

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

During the historical research it may be possible to construct historic period maps that reflect major changes in the cultural landscape; these period maps typically correlate to changes in land ownership or major physical changes to the landscape. For each historic period, it is critical to identify specific landscape features that were constructed or removed. Identifying the significant characteristics and features in a landscape and understanding them in relation to each other and to significant historic events, trends, and persons allows us to read the landscape as a cultural resource.

Landscape features are the tangible and intangible aspects of a landscape that have either influenced the development of the landscape or are a product of that development. It is important to identify these features not only to determine when things come and go, but to assist in determining if any particular landscape feature contributes to the historic significance of the site. The historic landscape aspects typically studied provide insight into spatial organization and land patterns, topography, vegetation, circulation features, water features, structures, site furnishings and small scale features or objects. The historical research documentation may include a written narrative, historic images, as well as graphic maps illustrating the historic periods and associated landscape features.

After the historical research phase, the next step is to *inventory the existing conditions* of the cultural landscape. Typically the existing conditions inventory is guided by the historical research findings, especially related to any specific historic landscape patterns or features. The existing conditions survey identifies any and all landscape elements, no matter from which historic period; it is a current snapshot of the site. Documentation typically includes a written narrative and photographic log as well as graphic maps illustrating the location of landscape features. Technologies such as GIS, GPS and CAD are useful in documenting and understanding landscapes. The recently developed Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) program may also assist cultural landscape documentation efforts. A condition assessment of the landscape features is also a useful part of the existing conditions survey process.^{iv}

Following the historical research and existing conditions survey, it is then possible to *analyze and evaluate the overall cultural landscape and its features*. By comparing the historical research findings to the existing conditions survey, it is possible not only to identify which historic landscape elements remain intact, but also craft a significance statement based on the integrity of those landscape elements. As noted earlier, the National Register guidance on determining significance and assessing integrity also apply to cultural landscapes.

Cultural landscapes can be complex cultural resources to work with; as such it demands trained professionals to undertake the work. The NPS has trained Historical Landscape Architects, who in turn have developed a Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) system for evaluating the 390 parks in the National Park System. The CLI provides the NPS with baseline information about cultural landscapes in the national parks. Landscapes addressed in the CLI include those listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. NPS Regional Historical Landscape Architects work with State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) to confirm the eligibility of park cultural landscapes, as well as which landscape features contribute to the significance of the property. The other NPS programs that work with cultural landscapes use modified versions of the CLI process for their work. Several outside contractors have performed the work successfully, following review of their professional qualifications, and in some cases providing training opportunities.

Cultural Landscape Treatment and Management

Following the evaluation of significance and determination of integrity, it is possible to ***define an appropriate treatment and management strategy for a cultural landscape***. Because treatment of cultural landscapes is a specialized field within landscape architecture, the project team should be led by a landscape architect experienced in working with cultural landscapes. Depending on the unique qualities of the cultural landscape being treated, the team may include historians, horticulturalists, engineers, architects, archaeologists, ecologists, or other specialists. The site curators, managers and maintenance staff are an essential part of the team from the inception of the project, because its long term success depends on their continued investment in preserving the historic fabric of the site.

The focus of the project team is to use the historical research, existing conditions, and analysis and evaluation information to inform the cultural landscape treatment and management decisions. Typically this is done through creation of a Cultural Landscapes Report (CLR). The CLR serves two important functions: it is the principle treatment document for cultural landscapes and the primary tool for long-term management of those landscapes. A CLR guides management and treatment decisions about a landscape's physical attributes, biotic systems, and use when that use contributes to historical significance.

A CLR establishes preservation goals for the cultural landscape; compiles information on the historical development, significance and existing character of the landscape; identifies landscape features and values that make the landscape historically significant according to National Register of Historic Places criteria; analyzes and evaluates historic landscape features as compared to extant features; and proposes treatment consistent with the landscape's significance, condition and planned use.

A treatment is a physical intervention carried out to achieve a historic preservation goal -- it cannot be considered in a vacuum. There are many practical and philosophical variables that influence the selection of a treatment for a landscape. These include, but are not limited to, the extent of historic documentation, existing physical conditions, historic value, proposed use, long and short term objectives, operational and code requirements (e.g. accessibility, fire, security) and anticipated capital improvement, staffing and maintenance costs. The impact of the treatment on any significant archeological and natural resources should also be considered in this decision making process. Therefore, it is necessary to consider a broad array of dynamic and interrelated variables in selecting a treatment for a cultural landscape preservation project.

Some additional factors that should be considered when selecting an appropriate treatment for a cultural landscape include: change and continuity; relative significance in history; integrity and existing physical condition; geographic context; use; archeological resources; natural systems; management and maintenance; interpretation; accessibility; health and safety; environmental protection requirements; and energy efficiency.

One of the first things that may be done to a cultural landscape is stabilization. The intent of stabilization is to minimize any further degradation of the site and its landscape features while retaining its historic character. This may be the best interim protection while the historical research, existing conditions, evaluation and development of a CLR is underway, or if legal issues, fundraising or long-term management decisions are in process.

In 1996, the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* was published. The guidelines define the four potential treatment options: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction,

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

and illustrates how to apply the four treatments to cultural landscapes in a way that meets the *Standards*.

Preservation standards require retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric, including the landscape's historic form, features, and details as they have evolved over time. Rehabilitation standards acknowledge the need to alter or add to a cultural landscape to meet continuing or new uses while retaining the landscape's historic character. Restoration standards allow for the depiction of a landscape at a particular time in US history by preserving materials from the period of significance and removing materials from other periods. Reconstruction standards establish a framework for recreating a vanished or non-surviving landscape with new materials, primarily for interpretive purposes. Reconstruction is undertaken only in extenuating circumstances where extensive historic documentation is available.

Depending on the scale and complexity of the landscape, it is not uncommon to define one overarching treatment for the entire cultural landscape (i.e. rehabilitation) while smaller defined areas might have specific treatments such as preservation or restoration. Once a specific treatment is selected, the *Standards* can provide the necessary philosophical framework for a consistent and holistic approach for a cultural landscape project.

Long-term management plans and maintenance plans should work hand-in-hand with the chosen cultural landscape treatment. Management strategies are typically long-term and comprehensive, while maintenance tasks vary from day-to-day, seasonal, or cyclical, as determined by management strategies.

Maintenance activities are implemented before, during and after a treatment has been chosen, so maintenance must be considered as part of the protection strategy. The intent is to maintain the historic character of the landscape and its features by monitoring change, controlling growth and if need be, replacing with in-kind materials. Although routine horticultural activities, such as mowing and weeding, or general grounds maintenance, such as re-laying pavement or curbs, may appear routine, such activities can cumulatively alter the character of a landscape. In contrast, well-conceived management and maintenance activities can sustain character and integrity over an extended period. Therefore, it is critical that the management and maintenance of cultural landscapes should be considered when selecting a treatment.

One aspect of management that can play a critical role in understanding the cultural landscape is interpretation. In many cases, not all aspects of a cultural landscape will be intact for any former historic period. As such, it will be necessary to “fill in the historical blanks” through interpretation via brochures, maps, illustrations, narrative and photographs.

The Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS)

One related program that can assist the process of cultural landscape documentation but should *never* be considered a replacement for full inventory and evaluation of a cultural landscape, is the recently established Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) program.

Since its establishment in 1934 to comprehensively document historic American architecture, the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) has documented over 28,000 structures and made those records publicly available through the Library of Congress. The Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) was established in 1969 as a response to an increased appreciation for significant sites, structures and objects associated with the development of engineering and industry. Since the early 1970s, HAER has recorded over 7,500 engineering and industrial sites that are also publicly available through the Library of Congress.

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

Although landscape documentation has occurred at local, state and federal levels since the early 1900s, it has never been done systematically. And the past 25 years of growing interest in historic landscape research and good stewardship of cultural resources underscores the value of a similar program devoted to historic landscape documentation. Hence, in October 2000 the National Park Service officially established the Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) as a sister program to HABS and HAER.

Historic landscapes are typically “invisible” to both the public and the policy makers. Hence, like many historic properties, America's historic landscapes are subject to loss and change through inappropriate use, development, vandalism, and natural forces such as flooding. When historic landscapes are publicly identified as significant, unique resources they become “visible” and can be incorporated into local, state, and federal planning and documentation processes.

HALS will build on the HABS/HAER documentation tradition, capturing the dynamics of landscapes. Teams of students in landscape architecture, architecture, planning, horticulture, and related disciplines, as well as interested professionals, will record significant historic landscapes nationwide through measured and interpretive drawings, large-format photography, written narrative and other documentation techniques. The HALS project team works closely, learning from each other's disciplines, while creating a comprehensive documentation package of the historic landscape.

The National Park Service oversees the daily operation of HALS and formulates policies, sets standards, and drafts procedural guidelines in consultation with the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). The ASLA provides professional guidance and technical advice through their Historic Preservation Professional Interest Group subcommittee on HALS. The Prints & Photographs Division of the Library of Congress preserves the documentation for posterity and makes it available to the general public as it currently does for HABS and HAER.

The location, duration, and complexity of HALS projects are determined on the basis of historical significance, landscape type and potential partnership opportunities. HALS will work with the ASLA, state, local and national preservation organizations, academic institutions and other interested parties to develop projects and explore funding possibilities for both short and long-term documentation efforts. HALS encourages partnerships with private, government and educational institutions to develop landscape documentation and encourage landscape preservation.

Working with the National Park Service, the ASLA Historic Preservation HALS Subcommittee oversaw the development of the recently released HALS Measured Drawings Guidelines, Photography Guidelines and Historical Narrative Guidelines. All of the HALS Guidelines have evolved from well-established principles and methodologies set forth previously by HABS and HAER. Although each HALS Guideline relies upon this base methodology, they have each been uniquely adapted to meet the specific practices of landscape documentation.

During the summer of 2001, NPS undertook one of its first formal HALS documentation projects at the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in Woodstock, Vermont. A team of five landscape architecture students and young professionals created a series of 20 drawings depicting the formal and informal elements within this 200-acre managed farm and woodlot property. Some of the elements that were captured included the main house and associated formal gardens, the woodland transition gardens, the working forest and associated carriage roads that

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

wind through the site, as well as the evolution of the site over time. Drawing and photographs were produced.

Other recent HABS efforts that are landscape-focused include documenting a natural and managed cranberry bog in New Jersey that played a critical role in the development of that industry in the early 1900s; Woodlands Cemetery, a former estate on the banks of the Schuylkill River south of Philadelphia, and the John Bartam house and gardens also in Philadelphia.

Cultural Landscape Challenges for the Department of Defense

In reviewing the existing National Historic Landmarks and National Register properties already listed under the management of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Army Corps of Engineers and Department of Defense, it is clear that cultural landscapes are currently identified, whether or not they are thought of as such. For example, the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania wasn't just a building, but had associated grounds when it became a pioneer in Indian education; the numerous forts across this country (i.e. Fort Douglas, Fort Myer, Fort Adams) each acted as revolutionary entrenchments, westward expansion bastions, and Civil War sanctuaries that encompassed land as well as buildings. Finally, historic airfields, canal and lock systems and aqueducts all reside in a landscape that was studied and used to its best advantage while creating these engineering feats.

Although many of the following thoughts are challenges for any agency or individual addressing cultural landscapes, there are several particular challenges for the DOD.

1. Because no program or process currently exists within DOD or any of its military branches to address cultural landscape research, inventory, analysis, evaluation and management, they must be developed. It would be prudent to take advantage of existing philosophies and resources as defined by the NPS, specifically the National Register of Historic Places to guide development of those programs and processes.
2. Critical to development of the program and process is identification of appropriately qualified professionals to oversee the program and process. Minimally, teams evaluating cultural landscapes should include Historical Landscape Architects. Once again professional qualification standards have been defined by NPS and would be worth reviewing.
3. Knowledge Management. Because landscapes are inextricably tied to land, it is feasible to use GIS to assist in managing any acquired cultural landscape data. This could begin with existing geospatial information that is expanded over time to include images, narratives and links between other cultural and natural resource information.
4. Defining cultural landscape boundaries. Defining boundaries can be difficult because it directly relates to available historic documentation, especially land ownership over time. Several National Register bulletins provide an adequate approach to defining cultural landscape boundaries. The definition of boundaries will more than likely impact the discussion of to what extent is cultural landscape conservation compatible with the DOD mission? I believe the answer revolves around how DOD chooses to define the boundaries of the cultural landscape.
5. Defining historic significance. The National Register relies on existing historic contexts to compare historic resources against to assist in determining relative significance. This puts cultural landscapes at a huge disadvantage because few historic contexts have been written specifically for cultural landscapes. As such, typically much more primary research needs to be undertaken to create not only the basic historical research for a site, but the historic context as well. This is especially true for vernacular and ethnographic landscapes. Various regions of the NPS have created cultural landscape contexts on an as

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

- needed basis. For example, the Northeast and Southeast regions have created a colonial revival context and have an expertise in military earthworks, while the Midwest region created logging camp contexts for their use. Although it is unknown how many military landscape contexts have been created, because the NPS manages many forts, battlefields, earthworks and other resources similar to DOD resources, it is possible to expand and adapt existing references for DOD needs.
6. Assessing integrity and defining contributing resources. The limitations of the National Register framework and terminology can impact the amount of cultural landscape documentation needed to assess integrity and specifically identify landscape features that contribute to the historic significance of a site, as noted in earlier discussions.
 7. Many existing National Register Bulletins address the kinds of existing DOD cultural landscape resources that are managed including battlefields, aviation properties, mining properties, properties achieving significance within the past fifty years, designed landscapes, vernacular landscapes and traditional cultural properties.
 8. Need for Historic Contexts. There is a need for military-based historic contexts that encompass cultural landscapes such as study of the spaces that support the DOD mission: airfields, runways, roads, rivers, munitions complexes, as well as support facilities such as housing, the BX/Commissary, gym, warehouses, etc. These should be researched not per individual sites, but systemically. Recent NPS context research which may relate to existing DOD managed resources includes historic roads, historic trails and orchards.

RESOURCES

- Alanen, Arnold and Robert Z. Melnick, eds. *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Birnbaum, Charles A. and Robin Karson. *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 2000.
- Birnbaum, Charles. *Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*. Preservation Brief 36. Washington, D.C.: Preservation Assistance Division, National Park Service, 1994.
- Birnbaum, Charles A. and Heather Barret, Ed. *Making Educated Decisions: A Landscape Preservation Bibliography*. Washington, D.C.: Historic Landscape Initiative, Heritage Preservation Services, Cultural Resources, National Park Service, 2000. (GPO stock number: 024-005-01206-1)
- Birnbaum, Charles and Christine Capella Peters. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1996.
- Eyring, Shaun. "Vegetation Management in Large Cultural Landscapes: Techniques for Preserving Historic Fields and Vistas." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 1999, pp. 21-27.
- Greenburg, Ronald M., ed., Charles A. Birnbaum and Robert R. Page, guest eds. *Cultural Resources Management Bulletin: Thematic issue on Landscape Interpretation*, Vol 17, No. 7, 1994.
- Jackson, J. B. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Meier, Lauren and Nora Mitchell. "Principles for Preserving Historic Plant Materials." *CRM Bulletin*, Preservation Technology Update No. 6, 1990.
- Meinig, D. W. *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes: Geographical Essays*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Melnick, Robert. *Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Historic Architecture Division, 1984.
- National Park Service, Cultural Resource Management Guideline, Release No. 5, 1997 (NPS-28)*.
- Page, Robert R., Cathy Gilbert and Susan A. Page. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources Stewardship and Partnerships, Park Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program. *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process and Techniques*. 1998. (GPO Stock No. 024-005-01220-6) (ISBN 0-16-042855-6)

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

National Park Service publications that may assist working with Cultural Landscapes

National Register Bulletins

How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation

How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes

How to Improve the Quality of Photographs for National Register Nominations

Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes

Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties

Researching Historic Properties

Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating and Registering America's Historic Battlefields

Guidelines for Evaluating, and Registering Cemeteries and Burial Grounds

Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Historic Mining Properties

Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places

Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Historic Aviation Properties

Preservation Briefs

Preservation Brief No. 32: Making Historic Properties Accessible

Preservation Brief No. 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes

Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation

A Guide to Preparing a Plant Inventory for a Historic Property

Guide to Developing a Preservation Maintenance Plan for a Historic Landscape

On-line Sources for Cultural Landscapes

Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation (<http://www.ahlp.org/>)

ASLA Historic Preservation Professional Network (<http://host.asla.org/groups/hppigroup/>)

Association for Preservation Technology (<http://www.apti.org/>)

Institute for Cultural Landscape Studies (<http://www.icls.harvard.edu/>)

National Park Service Historic Landscape Initiative (<http://www2.cr.nps.gov/hli/index.htm>)

National Park Service Park Cultural Landscapes Program (<http://www.cr.nps.gov/phscl/>)

National Park Service Cultural Landscape Currents: (<http://www2.cr.nps.gov/hli/currents/>)

National Trust for Historic Preservation (<http://www.nationaltrust.org/>)

Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation (<http://www.nps.gov/oclp/>)

The Cultural Landscape Foundation (<http://www.tclf.org/>)

ⁱ National Park Service, *Cultural Resource Management Guideline, Release No. 5*, 1997 (NPS-28), p. 179.

ⁱⁱ Melnick, Robert. *Cultural Landscapes: Rural Historic Districts in the National Park System*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Historic Architecture Division, 1984.

ⁱⁱⁱ Within the Park Historic Structures and Cultural Landscape program, the Park Cultural Landscapes program addresses cultural landscape issues within the nearly 400 units of the national park system. Within the Heritage Preservation Services Division, the Historic Landscape Initiative assists states, counties, municipalities, non-profits and individual property owners, in essence everything outside of the national park system, to address cultural landscape issues. The recently established Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS), sister program to HABS and HAER, documents identified historic landscapes via written narratives, archival photography and measured drawings. The National Register of Historic Places provides guidance on how to nominate cultural landscapes to the National Register.

^{iv} In assessing cultural landscape condition, the NPS CLI process uses the following definitions: *Good*: The landscape shows no clear evidence of major negative disturbance and deterioration by natural and/or human forces. The landscape's cultural and natural values are as well preserved and no immediate corrective action is required to maintain its current condition. *Fair*: The landscape shows clear evidence of

Cultural Landscapes and the Department of Defense

minor disturbances and deterioration by natural and/or human forces, and some degree of corrective action is needed within 3-5 years to prevent further harm to its cultural and/or natural values. If left to continue without the appropriate corrective action, the cumulative effect of the deterioration of many of the landscape characteristics will cause the landscape to degrade to a poor condition. *Poor*: the landscape shows clear evidence of major disturbance and rapid deterioration by natural and/or human forces. Immediate corrective action is required to protect and preserve the remaining historical and natural values.